



## **Cadboro Bay Local Area Plan Update**

### **Potential Housing Options in Cadboro Bay Village Neighbourhood**

Community Survey - Open-ended Questions  
and All Comments Received

August 10, 2022  
Planning Department

## Contents

Purpose of this Survey .....	3
Community Survey Overview .....	3
Raw comment data .....	4

## Purpose of this Survey

The purpose of this survey was to seek resident and public input on potential housing options in Cadboro Bay. The survey built on earlier work completed through the Cadboro Bay Local Area Plan update process. Survey results will be used to help inform Council’s consideration of potential revisions to the Draft Plan.

## Community Survey Overview

The community survey provided an opportunity to receive feedback from community members on potential expanded housing options in the Cadboro Bay Village Neighbourhood. The public survey was available on-line from June 22 to August 1, 2022.

The survey was comprised of 4 qualitative and 16 quantitative questions that sought community input on various housing options.

A [separate survey results report](#) provides a full summary of quantitative questions. This summary provides a full account of all written comments submitted for qualitative questions. The comments are presented in an unedited format, with the exception of comments that contain personal information or inappropriate comments.

## Raw comment data

### Q6: Any comments about potential housing in the Village Centre area?

Out of 874 respondents the total of 426 comments were provided.

No	Comment
1	5-6 story in the very center with 3-4 story on the outskirts.
2	Maximum 4 storeys to keep in character of the village. While some increase in density is optimal, the character and nature of the village should be maintained.
3	A mix of commercial and residential up to 4 floors in height. Any taller and it would look out of place.
4	This is the ideal location for higher and denser units, very walkable to the bus route and to the shops. We will need more local residents to continue to support Pepper's, Smuggler's, Olive's and Lemongrass.
5	Would be a perfect place to house students at the undergraduate, graduate, and PhD levels, as well as staff and other professionals working at the campus
6	The Cadboro Bay Village Centre already contains a variety of housing forms in its immediate area, further additions of any kind will fit in. Additionally, as housing being an overriding concern, minor grievances centred around aesthetic complaints should be ignored
7	This area is a great community and more residents would really help out the local smaller businesses.
8	Anything over 3 stories will ruin the whole neighbourhood. Why not Gordon head?
9	We should be looking at big increases in allowable FSR and height in this area. We are in an extreme housing crisis. I would like to see a _minimum_ of 6 story buildings to be allowable by right in this area.
10	Developers use the "affordable housing" excuse all the time to maximize number of units thus max their profits. I hear they complained about the high price of land and need high buildings to make a profit. They've been making a killing past 20 yrs I don't care about their profits. Developers are in the "FIRE" economy which is unsustainable and doomed for the future I don't think we should be encouraging that type of economy any longer. 3 stories with commercial on bottom should be the max around the park and village. This is a tight spot and we can't take the traffic from high rises (4+ stories). Apartments/condos should be developed near 4 lane thoroughfares like shelbourne and mackenzie for example and all along mackenzie. High Density is more suitable to city centers and major traffic corridors not down in a little bay area. If I wanted to live in congested high density I woulda moved to Downtown victoria or langford. I paid big bucks and my taxes are 14000\$/year to live in a quiet'ish spot. Sounds like Saanich planning is willing to destroy our special quiet neighborhood for the sake of developer profits.Why?Developers lobby you too much. There is no way a high rise condo with views of ocean/mtns will be affordable unless you think 2M plus is affordable. Rents won't be affordable either. developers insult my intelligence pulling that line. They want to build ugly high density high rises to max profit then leave us with our neighborhood destroyed for eternity. basement and garden suites would be more affordable and suitable. I'm sorry but the whole world can't live on the island. Develop in areas that are

	already busy. with big roads. Trying to say this will address affordable housing issue is as shambolic as saying you can get affordable housing in the uplands or oak bay. I'm against destroying our lifestyle for short sighted developers to line their pockets. You've allowed the destruction of our ocean shores with outrageous walls and houses already.
11	Makes sense! Would be nice to see it abutt the park a bit more though.
12	Up to 3 stories
13	Rental and new condos are a must. Mixed use buildings with parking underground and buildings that engage positively with the street for pedestrians and cyclists
14	Many types and much. more density. It is a village core after all.
15	We desperately need more housing in this area.
16	Realistically this is the only area that may make sense for higher density in Cadboro Bay
17	go high at the village (two blocks), but keep the increased density low in other areas. Three stories is too high, to be mixed in with houses. Plus, all townhouse must have their own parking spots.
18	all of these questions are phrased in such a way as to have people vote on varying degrees of increased height/density when that is not at all what this community needs. There are many much better and more affordable locations suitable for higher density and increased height. Cadboro Bay is an expensive community because of its proximity to the ocean and unique/small town character - it is almost comical that Saanich would consider this location as suitable for high density/lower income housing, it is not suitable for that. Adding a modest number of single or two story townhomes may be suitably designed into the character of the community but nothing more. Also, it is highly contradictory, the restrictions that many homeowners have on garden suites, etc which would be a much more suitable way to increase density and allow homeowners to rent.
19	I support 3-4 stories but I am not concerned about developers profits at the cost of the area. Why doesn't saanich incentivize it for the developer to meet the communities demands.
20	This is already commercialized, adding infill and density would be reasonable
21	Incorporating a plaza square or similar open space would be key to adding density to the Village Centre area.
22	Build away from areas affected by sea level rise. Limit heights to 4 storey buildings. Keep the village feel - higher buildings will not suit the area.
23	It will be great to have more housing near restaurants and the ocean
24	Keep a village plaza and townhomes but leave height low and leave big trees and ocean views.
25	Four stories in village and garden suite and secondary suites both permitted on one lot
26	Height should not exceed 4 stories
27	All the areas are very suitable, please limit parking to limit traffic and environmental impact
28	Please no more than 3 to 4 story building
29	more sensible around the core village area
30	would support greater density up to 3 storey developments but not higher than current tallest developments
31	High density should be coupled with more transit availability and alternative transport options to reduce the associated parking requirements
32	Walkability and access to quick transit is important for both locations
33	Maintain original LAP draft or close to it. No more then 4 stories. Ecologically vulnerable

	area
34	Stop trying to accommodate EVERYONE who wants to live here. The infrastructure isn't able to handle the increase in population. Every toilet flush, every car takes up a parking space at local stores leaving parking impossible & the garbage goes to landfill.
35	Keep heights low!!!! Protect park space from urbanization- learn from what happened at thetis lake
36	If the area along Hobbs is further developed, there needs to be additional parking created and traffic flow changes made, to keep things safe for the park users, students at Frank Hobbs and local residents. People already drive too fast down Hobbs and further density could compound this issue. In addition, there needs to be some changes made to the four way stop at the bottom of Sinclair, as it is already a bottleneck for traffic.
37	More small commercial businesses on street level would be welcome. More restaurant options and other small independent businesses.
38	It is the logical spot for higher density housing to be clustered from a transportation perspective.
39	This is prime real estate in a platinum area with difficult access in and out, town houses and lower rise development, yes. Further towards Uvic and up Mackenzie , Shelbourne or Cedar hill would accommodate higher heights and more density . We still have room for infill homes with carriage houses. Also, what about liquefaction. 6-8 stories in the village makes no sense.
40	I appose anything over 30 feet high from original grade.
41	Go back to the daft LAP
42	Vancouver Island is a special place, Cadboro Bay is spectacular, don't ruin it with high rise buildings. There is no turning back once it starts and Cadboro Bay will be just another langford like mass of concrete. Pls understand something are worth saving. BC is massive, there a massive areas of BC that can support more people easily, Cadboro Bay should maintain it's charm and uniqueness.
43	It's simply unconscionable
44	Too limited and doesn't connect to uvic corridor where there is tremendous potential for housing.
45	6 to 8 story buildings are too high for the village center.
46	Very suitable for higher density
47	Do not feel this area needs more density
48	Make sure there is lots of walking path connections, sidewalks, greenways, trees. Also ensure the charm of the area is maintained with developments that include peaked roofs, cedar shingles, proper setbacks, parking, tiered landscaping etc.
49	Its right by the water nothing about this will be affordable
50	No more than 4 stories
51	Do not allow big block like towers that would block potential view corridors. Keep any towers "skinny". Provide one parking stall for every bedroom. Lots of visitor parking! Saying public transit would suffice to address this issue is not realistic. Maintain a quality of construction materials ie. good quality and interesting architecture. This is a first class location - build it to match the value of the location. Lots of green space on the building site, fountains, art etc. make it beautiful.
52	This would be the only area that should be considered as it already has a small mix of high rises and townhouses.

53	This area is beautifully kept and quiet. Expanding with buildings and large structures would be detrimental to the cadboro bay. More number of people residing in a small area. This will change the population numbers and create heavy traffic and congestion to a small community.
54	Cadboro Bay Village already has 2 condos. No more are needed. Traffic in the village is already bad enough.
55	I fully support more housing options and diversification in Cadboro Bay, especially rentals and affordable options
56	This map shows the village central area going way beyond what is currently commercial. This would allow large developments on currently quiet residential streets.
57	This is most suitable Cad Bay Area for more density
58	3 storeys max front rising to max 4 at back
59	European style residential up commercial down would be excellent
60	Affordable housing for low income ppl with disabilities & seniors
61	4 stories max makes sense around peppers and the pub but nowhere else.
62	More townhomes would be essential and attractive.
63	I only support height of maximum 3 stories with infrustructure being updated.
64	Keep it small so it doesn't lose its charm!
65	If there are multiple housing units added, they should absolutely not be higher than 3 stories. Higher will completely change the beauty and village feeling of this uniquely wonderful area.
66	If this was separated into 1a and 1b I'd have scored them differently. 1a is much better than 1b.
67	back yard cottages are the only development that Cadboro Bay should allow. It's very clear you are trying hard to sell out Cadboro Bay and other neighbourhoods to corporate developers who will be the only ones that profit or benefit from this plan. There is no need for all this extra housing unless the government is planning on increasing the population of Canada to 100 million in the next 15 years..... Oh wait.! That is a fact and i don't support it.
68	Village centre is not the right place. It lacks necessary infrastructure and currently serves the community in a positive way.
69	Higher density around the village is fine
70	There should be a variety of options: both condos and row-houses/ townhouses. I don't support heights above 4 stories.
71	The village is a unique place. We bought in the area because of it. Density populations areas should be in an area that is not already density populated. There is so many other areas for room for growth.
72	4 stories high is more than enough in this area
73	This is prime area to designate for a larger urban village provided flood risks are mitigated.
74	Maximum of 3-4 stories, with adequate parking area provided and distances from existing homes maintained to ensure privacy.
75	This area should be reserved for rental housing as the renters are the ones that need the cosaest proximity to services.
76	Not required
77	Great foresight higher density will save the earth it's not an emotional decision science tells us to density saves the earth.

78	Please do not develop.
79	I think this would impact the residential areas less...There are a lot of rentals already in peoples homes who rely on the income. Having apartments or townhouses would not necessarily increase the number of rental units.
80	I would not like to see more density on the water side of Cadboro Bay. Everyone should be able to see and access the water.
81	two story townhouses are ok in some very restricted areas -NO HIGH RISES IN THIS AREA-- MANY OPTIONS ELSEWHERE ON BUSY CORRIDORS FOR ALL OTHER DENSE HOUSING.
82	That was discussed in workshops prior to the June 11/22 massacre meeting. Let's go with those decisions.
83	I believe higher densification could lead to a better community with the addition of more amenities in the village core (i.e. barber shops, restaurant options, etc.). I would also like to see a more diverse demographic in Cadboro Bay.
84	I do not want to see any buildings higher than 3 storeys
85	this is not the neighbourhood for high density housing. little pockets of small houses in villages like this is what makes the heart of victoria and seperates us and gives us individuality and character from mega metroplis like vancouver. Build high rises on the mackenzie corridor instead.
86	Anything already commercially zoned eg. The Village on Cadboro Bay is to increase height, not residential
87	I believe increasing housing density in the Cadboro Bay area is the right thing to do as a matter of public policy but I think the focus of development in the Village Centre area should be preservation of commercial development opportunities. I would like to see the area bounded by Sinclair, Cadboro Bay Road, Maynard and Hobbs (including both sides of those streets) reserved for mixed commercial/housing developments. This may prove to be a larger area than is needed for commercial development in the long term (I'm imagining 30 years) but it's hard to reverse direction if you allow large buildings on an area that in retrospect would ultimately have best been part of the commercial core. I don't favour setting aside an area as a village square as this kind of thing may seem like it could be all things to all people, but in the end is likely to become dominated by those who don't have much respect for the place or other people who might wish to have a comfortable gathering spot. However, I do like the concept of a "high street", although I'm not convinced it should allow for automobile access. Parking looks like a problem for most any development in the Village Centre. Underground parking seems most desirable but may be economically or geotechnically limited. I don't think council should be afraid to approve limited numbers of parking spaces in housing developments. Maybe a less vehicle-friendly environment is a price folks will have to be willing to pay to live in Cadboro Bay.
88	The survey isn't clear about how many storeys it is considering. Increasing density means services need to be increased too, and at present, there is already a strain on ambulance, hospitals, fire, schools, day care, rec centres etc. Adding park space isn't enough
89	Current core buildings could be replaced and improved by becoming two storey with business below, housing above. I attended the discussion last night and was surprised/dismayed by Saanich suggestion that the current buildings be retained as is. They are not quaint, nor historic, just cramped and in needk of a more current facelift. Second storey apartments would not impede views, bring increased revenues and not include parking.



90	Why is there no accountability for Council blatantly ignoring the plan from 2018 that was worked on and had a good buy in from the community?? No one seems to want to address this elephant on the room. This new plan feels as if it's being shoved down the community's throat. Be accountable.
91	Land is very expensive in this area. Not sure how rental housing and affordable housing will be doable. I think this will be a hard sell for developers.
92	3 story limit. Prefer to see townhouses. No high rises. Maybe commercial on main floor and 2 levels of condos above or apartment rentals but no higher, I do not want to see subsidized, low-income housing come into Cadboro Bay. It is an affluent area and that is why we moved here. Sure people would like to live here. It's a beautiful area. I would like to live in the Uplands or on the water, but I can't afford it. I don't want to see our area compromised because low-income families wish to live here. There are plenty of lower to middle class neighbourhoods for those people to live in that can't afford to live here.
93	This is one of the most vulnerable areas of Victoria for earthquake disturbance of the unconsolidated glacial deposits. Anything higher than four stories could be especially at risk.
94	Anything over 3 stories should not be considered, as it would negatively affect views, neighbourhood vibe, and property value. Floating the idea of 6-story apartment blocks as a solution to the housing crisis is a disingenuous bid to make developers rich at the expense of residents.
95	Most of village centre should be townhomes not multi storey
96	Small scale expansion on Sinclair or Cadboro Bay road adjacent to existing development is reasonable. Limited number of duplex's and gardens suites elsewhere.
97	I think the higher density area should be restricted to an area closer to peppers and the village. I would like to see more 3 story buildings like the one next to mocha house. I have lived in Cadboro bay for 30 of my 40 years and am now raising my kids in the area. I love that the feeling of Cadboro bay has not changed much in that time but I would like to see some modest increases in affordable housing that don't affect the "village" feel that is so special in Cadboro bay.
98	Stick with the existing plan!!! It was vetted through community. DO NOT CHANGE THE EXISTING PLAN. And please don't present us with a choice of taller and tallest -- these 4-10 story buildings were not contemplated in the original Cadboro Bay Plan and they are not appropriate for this area. It would remove the village feel. Importantly, this area is already stressed in terms of infrastructure (e.g., traffic, water pressure and volume, electrical grid with frequent power outages. Saanich has not yet dealt with outstanding safety issues - for example pedestrian access and crosswalks on and off ten mile point and the beach access.
99	Some more town houses would be lovely but not anything higher than two or three stories. Gyro Park should be expanded on the Penrhyn St side (fill in the boggy areas) as the park is often really crowded already on sunny days.
100	This should be a high density hub.
101	It makes sense to provide denser housing in the village centre close to amenities and transit options.
102	Keep height to under 4 stories
103	This drawing has been artificially designated as 'Village Centre' when it in fact includes quiet residential streets with trees, vegetation, and gardens which will be irreversibly damaged. high rise apartments in this region. The previous plan which was presented to the community only a few months ago, allowed for changes in zoning which allowed for townhouse development, which I supported. Now, we are suddenly presented with the idea

	of including high rise apartment buildings which will completely alter the nature of this small community. How will infrastructure for such high density be provided in this small community? Has this been articulated or presented for discussion?
104	Max three stories
105	Increased height and density will ruin the feel of a quaint seaside village. As we know, land is expensive here--any resulting condos or apartments will only be affordable by the wealthy. At the recent meeting we were told that buildings had to be four stories or more to be worth it to developers and would be "affordable" for those making \$140,000 a year! That is NOT affordable housing. So you'd be destroying the village--and the whole reason many of us live here--just for some luxury condos. It wouldn't be charming or picturesque anymore--it would be much like Sidney probably with its looming 3-4 story condos crammed on every bit of land right up to the waterfront. Cadboro Bay--which should be a heritage site--will just end up looking like everywhere else. "The anthropologist Marc Augé gave the name non-place to the escalating homogeneity of urban spaces. In non-places, history, identity, and human relation are not on offer. Non-places used to be relegated to the fringes of cities in retail parks or airports, or contained inside shopping malls. But they have spread. Everywhere looks like everywhere else and, as a result, anywhere feels like nowhere in particular. ... The opposite of placelessness is place, and all that it implies—the resonances of history, folklore, and environment; the qualities that make a location deep, layered, and idiosyncratic. Humans are storytelling creatures. If a place has been inhabited for long enough, the stories will already be present, even if hidden. We need to uncover and resurface them, to excavate the meanings behind street names, to unearth figures lost to obscurity, and to rediscover architecture that has long since vanished. A return to vernacular architecture—the built environment of the people, tailored by and for local culture and conditions—is overdue." Darran Anderson, "Why Everywhere Feels the Same Now" in The Atlantic
106	We are in a housing crunch because of current Federal government initiatives whereby 500,000 new residents are entering Canada annually. If we truly want to help lower income Canadians find affordable housing, then Saanich Municipality should lobby the Federal Government to decrease the demand for housing by reducing the intake of new residents. Until we do that, Canada will have a housing affordability issue. By continually focusing on increasing supply, particularly when it's near impossible to find an electrician or a plumber or any other trade due to an overheated construction boom, you and other levels of government are failing it's citizens and acting in the interests of developers, banks & corporations. Ask yourselves, what quality of life lies ahead for our children by increasing the density of Cadboro Bay village, and any other community, by bulldoziing the existing housing and filling it in with 6 to 8 storey apartment rental buildings?
107	This might be the only suitable area as there are already a couple of apartments there
108	Maximum 2 story small town houses built not in Parkland would be suitable and acceptable.
109	Density is a deceptive concept. It breeds alienation, and what follows are more crime, more need for services(now the community costs more to support). the list could go on. Will you be also fund a library, a health care centre, an expanded school. there will be more children. wi
110	Multi-level walk ups with character
111	Please leave it as no more than 3 stories in height.
112	You shld not be mixing option of THs, houseplexes in with apartment buildings. Totally different impact on n'hood. And as usual, an opaque and leading.' question. The types

	should be treated differently. I.e. surveyed separately.
113	This is wrong - why is Cadboro Bay being selected for this torture? Why not take this to more appropriate places like the McKenzie, Quadra, Shelbourne areas?????? No one has explained to us residents why we have a target on our backs, after we have all worked so hard to be able to afford to live here.
114	There was no process so your opening wording is misleading.
115	I support a moderate increase in density for the economic prosperity and social/cultural vibrancy of the village. When considering built form, imperative to keep sunlight on the streets to maintain the Beachy village atmosphere. Please, please do not let developers/ the Province ruin Cadboro Bay Village. There are many places in Saanich to easily accommodate the Provincial mandates. This Village is a jewel in the Municipality and should not be ruined, otherwise it becomes like anywhere else.
116	Strongly discourage any changes to the existing zoning and LAP direction. Strongly disagree that Single Family houses should be replaced by higher density solutions.
117	Cadboro Bay land is VERY EXPENSIVE. I have given this much thought and feel that it is unrealistic to consider increased availability of housing in various price ranges in an area with such expensive land. Cadboro Bay is a rather unique place, with it being so close to the water, not much elevation and with climate change and increasing risk of flooding it's just not realistic. It's not easy for people to access the amenities of life; my preference is for increased density in more urban areas such as along Shelbourne; close to Hillside Mall, Walmart, Home Depot, etc etc. We don't even have a bank in Cadboro Bay, nor do we need one. Our Village is called a village for a reason. Please don't destroy the treed environment that people need in these times of extreme heat and floods. You will ruin this neighbourhood and once it's gone it's ....GONE.
118	Potential housing alternatives should be kept at no higher than four stories.
119	Council trying to impose an unsuitable choice among three options offered without recognition of existing Local Area Plan and with discussion not accepted of anything more than Saanich Councils 3 "take it or leave it" options. Water level is unsuitable for below ground parking which would be needed for development of the village centre. Three town house complexes are in the threatened "village centre" and these modest homes are apparently part of a Saanich Council plan to be heightened to 3-4 storeys, "modified"and densified; " I understand that Maynard Park is to be proposed for high rise dense buildings but without open park space for baseball, childrens activities etc - necessary since the Gyro Park area gets flooded and unsuitable in the winter months. I appreciate the need for low cost housing but to propose it for gutting and then reconstructing a village which is a functioning community? This appears absurd to me.
120	close to retail and parks, ideal for increased density
121	Maximum domestic over shop 4 stories: Domestic townhouse, duplex, triplex maximum 3 stories ( Design/look to fit in*)
122	Please NOT in the village centre but building housing can occur outside the village centre to prevent too much congestion. Put services and stores in the village centre and not housing...what a waste of this area to serve only a few rich people and not the whole community!!!!!!
123	I only support this if there us100% OFF STREET Parking!
124	The Village Centre is charming as it is and suits Cadboro Bay community as it is.
125	I would not object to low-level townhouses and more stores. I don't really like the idea of several-story apartment buildings.

126	No more development
127	Stick to the main village area without expanding to the surrounding neighbourhood. The Village Center should not go beyond Maynard park!!!
128	Further development should be limited to existing commercial areas on Sinclair, Cadboro Bay Road, church properties and garden suites on larger properties. Once these options have been exhausted / fully developed then it would be appropriate to have further discussion on rezoning options.
129	This would be a wonderful place to have diverse housing options, including market rate and non market multi-family housing, so people can live in pleasant parts of the region near employers like UVic and transportation networks. Overall, the Gordon Head area needs more diversity, but just seek to exclude people.
130	Need a mix of affordable rentals including 3 bedrooms for families
131	Leave it as is...
132	I am in favor of more density (townhouses) but not increased height
133	Density does not equal affordable
134	A lot of space available in Queenswood and Northeast from there.
135	Keep the buildings low and the architecture artful.
136	Cadboro Bay is not suitable for high rise . Four stories should be the maximum. Yes, suitable but keep it to 4 stories or less!.
137	why does the area have to be a square? I'm okay with the Village being 3/4 stories of mixed use market housing. Density everywhere will make housing more affordable. Why not look at UVIC and Queenswood (where I am) their wasted lands for more housing. Townhomes are great (North-Eastern Village and between Hobbs and Caddy Bay Road and along Caddy Bay Rd. Low-rise, mixed-use in the village would be cool but... you're talking about more density and then choking our ability to get around. HERE's AN IDEA: Take the north-bound bikes right and down Sinclair with an awesome feature path and through the eastern, relatively unused area of Gyro and back onto Caddy Bay (after the village and the need for congestive infrastructure there) with a series of humps over park-pedestrian under-passes making this a feature ride in the 'hood (Maybe a food truck license and 3/4 picnic tables for coffees/scones/etc as they leave the park on the north end). Then they are back on Caddy Bay Road and avoided the village. No they ride onto a slightly widened Caddy Bay Rd (say 3') and new bikes lanes that take them onto Telegraph and up Arbutus/Ash (Not Sinclair) and the new ones on Finnerty and the popular ride out to Mattick's Farm and beyond.
138	Densification should be restricted to the village centre, however increasing the height of buildings will change the character of the village substantially. Expand the core at the margins, but do not increase building heights.
139	Stay away from the beach side of Cadboro Bay Area. Global warming with water levels rising means any development needs to be at least on the Haro Rd side of Cadboro Rd. ie heading up the slope to UVic or above.
140	Denser, taller, and more inclusive housing can absolutely co-exist with rich people who don't want our neighbourhood to change. The Village Centre are can realize its potential with more mixed use housing AND more active transportation options.
141	My support for increased density is contingent on how it is done. I'm in favour of gradual, gentle, sustainable well-designed densification using a broad mixed variety of methods where suitable (garden suites, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhouses, co-ops, low-rise apartment blocks, etc.). I'm opposed to policies that tax properties based on their

	development potential, and encourage premature demolition of buildings that still have useful life and character. The construction industry has an enormous environmental impact. Maintenance or adaptive re-use of select existing buildings is more sustainable. While buildings such as Olive Olio's and the Paddleboard Shop (a former gas station), or the south side commercial including Peppers are not architecturally or historically significant, they are quirky and give the kind of unique personality and character that distinguishes one neighbourhood from the next. This is lacking when large scale, wholesale redevelopment happens. The most interesting communities have select examples from different periods in their growth. The project in Cordova Bay's village centre is an example of what not to do. The north side of Cadboro Bay could be redeveloped as a 3-story mixed-use with commercial on the street level and apartments above.
142	Whatever building is done, should be done outside of areas that will be impacted by rising sea levels. The heights of the buildings and look of them should retain a village feel, and not be imposing. Adequate parking will be necessary.
143	The area selected is too big. Try Kilgary Pl., Hobbs St., Sinclair, Cad Bay Rd. Height restricted to 4 stories max. with preference for townhouses, rather than high rises.
144	More duplex zoning and townhouses
145	Any further development in the village should stay true to the original LAP and not be higher than four stories
146	Any housing developments should remain true to the original LAP plan and not be more than four stories
147	3 stories is more than high enough
148	Option 1a : Village Core Increase is good.
149	the Village Centre area is a recent construct. This is now a much expanded area from what residents think of as the Village Centre.
150	Believe new housing options should be built along main transit routes - Sinclair, Cadboro Bay and Arbutus Roads
151	The Village centre does not have capacity for more cars.
152	Why not build public rental housing first. Three story, 4- 3BR suites per level. Fill them with families. Please don't build tall towers for the wealthy. They can have Vancouver
153	Smart growth is essential, Focussing more density in the village will help support local business and make a more vibrant community centre
154	Nothing higher than four stories
155	CB is not a high or higher density community. I would be against any densification.
156	The villages in Victoria are absolutely the best option for expanded building heights. This is because services are located in the villages. The more density is provided in villages, the more services will be created here, which also serve the greater community. Density in the villages is win-win for the community.
157	Increased traffic follows. I moved from Fairfield when the changes there created so much traffic we could no longer enjoy our yard. I am not against increased density but these changes were/are relentless and inconsiderate. Once the changes are made the personality of the neighbourhood is forever changes.
158	Development should be limited to existing commercial areas on Cadboro Bay Road, Sinclair, Penrhyn or coach houses/lane houses on lots over 8,000sq/ft.
159	Your definition of the Village Centre is far too wide and encompassing. The only area suitable for potential development would be between Sinclair and Penrhyn. Also, no more

	then 4 stories!
160	The village centre is the most obvious spot for more housing density. This will help the businesses thrive, and help the climate for walkability.
161	Add some senior rental housing options, great accessibility here. Try to divert traffic to Hobbs, current village will get too busy otherwise.
162	Ensure retail on the main and perhaps some underground parking. 4-6 stories would be fine in the village centre.
163	Don't overdo this. There is room for some expansion but the potential for congestion and overpopulation is very real. The needs of the current inhabitants should carry a lot more weight than the interests of developers and renters. The land values here are high and will remain high so low income housing is likely served better elsewhere. There is absolutely no room for anything over three or four stories in the entire Cadboro Bay to Arbutus area. Do not go there.
164	There may be spaces on Penrhyn but other areas are not suitable
165	Should keep the village feel, and be limited to south east side of Cadboro Bay, Carriage houses, low rise, and housing that fits in with unique and traditional feel of the village, Not another generic development.
166	I support 4-6 story mixed use development in the Village core..hopefully use amenity provisions to create some public open space.
167	The core could perhaps be an appropriate area for buildings up to 4 stories. I do not believe that large numbers of current Cadboro Bay residents should be pushed from their homes to make way for people from elsewhere.
168	Luxury housing allowing aging residents to live in walkable Village.
169	I support increased densification up to 3 stories high around the village core. Rented housing above shops is a good idea.
170	What makes you think, with the price of land, that any housing in the village centre would be affordable and not luxury? What impact does proximity to the sea have on suitability for building?
171	Tsunami zone
172	Lots of mixed use and more services please
173	We have elderly folk who walk safely to shops and bus stops. We have children who run freely to the playground and beach. How will we be able to safeguard these vulnerable people with higher density housing. We also have part of the high density already with the residences at the university.
174	This area will be below sea level in a century. It's a little late to raise density now. Also, the village area overlaps with the other two designated areas below. It is not obvious why adjacent lots of identical type on the same blocks are not included in any of the 3 named areas. Some of the non-included areas are more suitable in some ways for bigger buildings. This whole exercise feels manipulated to get the answers the survey designer clearly wants: tall buildings.
175	Concern over earthquake/flooding issues
176	Streets won't be able to accommodate the traffic increase with that many units.
177	Make sure any design still has the character of Caddy Bay. Don't let them install bad architecture.
178	It would make the family beach less family friendly/more of a party stop
179	I consider some of that area to be outside the real Village Centre

180	All the increased density is within the village center, what about Queen's Wood and other areas?
181	This area is not suitable for dense housing; space, access routes. Maybe potential for gradual increase in housing via garden suites
182	Please don't destroy village with more high rise buildings once this starts it doesn't stop - no room here
183	Don't approve
184	We like our village as it is. This is not a village to be built up for the profit of property developers.
185	Would restrict heights to 4 stories
186	Higher density should be kept away from water and park areas. Up Sinclair area, where it would be complimenting/conforming to present building on Uvic property. We want the character of the village to remain, once gone it's gone for ever.
187	more housing would be good, but it feels misleading to be asked that with a range of suites to apartment buildings listed for a yes answer... This survey appears disingenuous
188	Carbon Means Test (CMT) all new structures—if the intended end use function can be done somewhere else with existing structures and lower carbon input that option is selected. CMT accounts for the forgone, embedded carbon in all new building material—cement, glass, steel, aluminum, wood, plastic, dry wall calcium, and other new material base compounds. CMT accounts for the carbon abated with new structures in existing habitat. See the British manual "New Tricks With Old Bricks" for detail ( <a href="http://www.no-use-empty.org/files/New_Tricks_with_Old_Bricks.pdf">http://www.no-use-empty.org/files/New_Tricks_with_Old_Bricks.pdf</a> ).
189	Higher buildings would change the character of the community village significantly.
190	Have it remain what the village historically was
191	The village as it is now is unique and has a timeless quality. Judging from the plans I have seen this quality will be destroyed and the village will come to look like all the other soulless developments
192	Some street in the village could accommodate more height BUT the appeal and walk ability of the village must not be compromised
193	Low density, four floors maximum
194	I'm very supportive of higher densities. But I wouldn't be supportive of significant high-rise development.
195	low density
196	Low density and low heights. Maintain village characteristics. Build higher density on Shelbourne which already can support more people.
197	There should not be buildings higher than 3 stories anywhere in the village centre. We are a village not downtown Victoria with high rises everywhere. There should be ways to make higher density, but not higher than 3 stories. This has already been shown to work on Penrhyn street.
198	The LAP which was developed over years with community input did consider more housing through ground-orientated options. Suddenly Saanich presented a Hobbesian choice of 10 story buildings in three options. This "tall" option cannot be supported. The Saanich option would amount to having the tallest buildings in Saanich all congregated in a quiet neighbourhood that lacks some basic infrastructure (bus, sidewalk, lighting, pedestrian safety and crosswalks, storm drainage) and is at its limits regarding other infrastructure (power outages, water supply rate and pressure, sewage, parking). The entire area is in or

	near modelled sea-level rise zones. The soils for building are difficult at best (rocky or silty).
199	This village is already pretty busy; no need to make it a second Pandora Street.
200	Please do not add any - allow basement suites
201	Model project is corner of Cadboro Bay Road and Penryn backing onto Maynard Park, no expended area ov Village Centre.
202	the area already has an appropriate mix of single family and townhouse dwellings
203	Never going to be "affordable" . Look to support townhouses that will provide pleasing options for current residents to stay in their connected neighbourhood as they age.
204	It is important to retain the character of the Village Centre. While I would support some increase in density, I do not believe that any buildings greater than 3 storeys should be built in Cadboro Bay, except perhaps in the very central Village core. Building apartments will not solve the affordability problem as there is so much demand, we will never be able to accommodate everyone who wants to live here. Unless we build government-subsidized housing for low-income people, developers are going to charge top dollar for rentals and condos and all we will do is densify to accommodate wealthy retirees from elsewhere. In our current economic system, the only way to make desirable areas affordable is to subsidize housing or make them so undesirable that no one wants to move there. You will have to destroy what makes Cadboro Bay so special and such a wonderful place to live to make it affordable to low income people. It is a sad truth of our system, so don't sacrifice the way of life of current residents to appease the insatiable desire of people from around the world to live in Victoria. I do not live in this neighbourhood, however, so I would give more weight to the opinions of the people who live in the Village centre.
205	Do not ruin this area with over crowding
206	Housing in the village center area, will ruin it for everyone living in the Cadboro Area, and make it more difficult to get to shops. There is no joy about being treated like animals in a zoo. It is going to be awful. Who is benefitting from this? The developers. This is not from the community. This is to make profits for people that do not live here and do not have a long term vested interest in the quality of life and environment of the area.
207	There is a lot of traffic backed up to the entrance of the Uplands. Any development needs to have minimal additional car traffic. Elderly people don't drive as much. We have a lot of traffic already from students . Development needs to happen where the traffic can flow. Mackenzie area. Sound travels incredibly in the village area. Musicians conversations, trucks at Peppers can be heard up the slope of Sinclair and Killarney. Noise from cars, air conditioners, heat pumps noise will travel very audibly. The village is NOT the area to develop with more housing. It's also subject to tsunami risks
208	It is a well established neighborhood. People have bought into Cadboro Bay because they like it the way it is. They did not buy into a high density neighborhood. If they had wanted that they could have bought elsewhere.
209	This is a well established area which already has a number of multi-family developments. Replacing single family dwellings with more multi-family or rental housing developments would materially change the nature and character of this area. Most people have bought into this area because they like the character of the neighborhood. If they had wanted a higher density area or a rental area they would have located elsewhere.
210	consistency with other buildings in height and density.
211	Great spot to add taller condo building.
212	It's a lovely community as it is. Don't destroy this beautiful, family friendly neighborhood.



	UVIC had plenty of land on which they can build housing for their students.
213	Short of adding some height to existing commercial property, no further changes should be pursued
214	Ensure public access to beach is not compromised and ensure lots of parking is made available so that year round access to beach is available. We need to be able to park with kayaks, paddle boards, kids beach toys , etc so that means we need car parking close by. Also need to ensure the area closest to the beach that is subject to flooding is developed with the likelihood of future floods in mind.
215	More units will attract more businesses and services to the area making it more livable for everyone.
216	3 story max for immediate Sinclair and Cadboro Bay Rd, 2 story max in the rest of the Village Centre but should not happen as it does not reflect the intention of those home owners original conception of their neighbourhood, Street parking should be counted in individual property allowances, property taxes need to decline with increased housing density
217	No higher than 4 stories. It is supposed to be a village not a town or a city!
218	There are already condo/apartment options available here, so could expand on that and also add more retail space below.
219	Is this area safe for density? E.g., earthquakes and flooding?
220	Keep with the existing Draft Plan, which was agreed upon in 2021, before the Housing Committee interfered, trying to force a completely different set of options on the Cadboro Bay community.
221	Cadboro bay is served by four roads and surrounded by steep hills, so unless you enlarge the roads or public transit, density is going to be felt - the roads are too steep for bicycles unless you are training for the Tour de France!
222	Some townhome and co op rental options would be amazing!
223	I support additional density but with limited height increases (three-storey max.). It would be nice if this had been separated into two separate questions which addressed height and density separately.
224	It makes sense for gentle density closer to the Village amenities
225	Maximum 4 storey height maximum
226	Stay with the plan as per the workshop meetings and feedback from this spring. Do not change those results no matter what developers want.
227	Consideration of water level rising and possible tidal waves
228	I could see higher density in the existing commercial area to expand that and offer more commercial space as well as a community square as presented in the village design concept on slide 33. However, this will never be low income housing even if that is the intent as the real estate values close to Gyro Beach and in Cadboro Bay generally simply don't suit for that. Lower rent housing by nature needs to be in areas with lower housing/land costs.
229	Leave it as it is.
230	Higher density should be built in this area only
231	Traffic, personal vehicles, construction equipment, delivery vehicles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians make it the village core congested at the present time and the proposed densification will only impact more on the freedoms of movement in the area. Haven't heard the total number of people the densification proposal is anticipating but it will have a huge

	impact the existing community. Where is the traffic study including the costs to accommodate this increase in residents. Or has that even been considered?
232	Given the favorable location to the beach and the pleasant semi-rural feeling of Cadboro bay, it is not likely to ever sustain 'affordable' housing. However it will be ruined by filling small lots with multi-unit buildings and tall buildings in the. Core. There are more suitable locations for this type of development. More regal opportunities or multi-family living should be accomplished through garden/secondary suites as per existing OCP.
233	Sea level is maybe 3 feet lower than current level of land. The caddy bay road is the old sea frontage. Crazy to build on sand.
234	Stick to community endorsed 2021 LAP
235	as I person who lives in this area, I am feeling pushed out even though nothing yet is happening. It does not feel very good.
236	prefer more green spaces to more housing in the Village Centre area.
237	minimum 5 stories in the core and 4 stories the remainder
238	Define the area more tightly. E.g. no need to go south of Sinclair road or north of cad bay road
239	Question is too broad bcs Centre extends too far. Higher density housing is Highly suitable for some parts, e.g., Sinclair, Penrhyn, first 2 blocks of Hobbs up from Sinclair, Cad Bay Road (within centre area), plus area east of CBR. Substantial densification is much less suitable for cul de sacs west of Hobbs (Maynard, Kilgary) except first 1 or 2 lots in from Hobbs, and for area north of Maynard Park. The treatment of Kilgary west of Hobs is especially strange. Seven homes at the end of the cul de sac are deemed outside the center so not rezoned, but they are now abutted by 4-story townhouses. To preserve any character of neighborhood residential street will take more than seven homes at the end. Eithre the bounday of the center, or the re-zoning along Kilgary needs to move back to the first 1 -3 lots in from Hobbs -- close enough to connect to commerce on Hobbs, while leaving enough single-family homes on the upper half of the block to retain critical scale and community.
240	Honour the last plan; stop new "options" to ruin Cadboro Bay in order to line pockets of multinational developers.
241	This looks fine and was agreed upon in the original plan
242	the question would be, just where would you put it?????
243	This is a quiet village area. The current 3 storey buildings do not really fit well and any higher than that we be abhorrent.
244	This area is suited to 4 storeys with maybe higher density to 6 storeys to the northwest - along Hobbs and up Sinclair. Mixed use development is needed to bring more commercial services to support higher density.
245	Land too expensive for high density affordable housing in this area.
246	I dont think any height above the current condos would be helpful. The Village feel would disappear. I presume a four storey means from the ground up... and not on top of shops?
247	Many times during the day you cannot find a parking stop at the Peppers Store now. How are we to access current services with the proposed density increases.
248	only if there is a height restriction (four stories max) and ample parking.
249	This area is not an area that should be changed. We live here because of the uniqueness, there are many areas, such as McKenzie that are more suitable for affordable housing
250	I do have some concerns about the height above sea level of the Village Centre. That should be considered.

251	The size and scope of the villiage is what makes it special. As such, we strongly disagree with increasing density and the height of buildings. Additionally, the infrastructure cannot handle the density it has. Increased roads and road sizes would also ruin the neighborhood. Shelbourne and MacKenzie streets, where building complexes are right sized with the size of the intrastructure are better places to continue the densification that has started.
252	The size and scope of the villiage is what makes it special. As such, we strongly disagree with increasing density and the height of buildings. Additionally, the infrastructure cannot handle the density it has. Increased roads and road sizes would also ruin the neighborhood. Shelbourne and MacKenzie streets, where building complexes are right sized with the size of the intrastructure are better places to continue the densification that has started.
253	I'm a member of GVAT housing committee and while supportive of some increased height in buildings I am hesitant to allow only developers to be involved as I would be distressed if any rental building was scooped up by a REIT which would defeat the whole purpose of providing a mix of housing and rents. Could, the municipality purchase the Broadview Church property to build cooperative housing? Or make it rental so that the income from those rents would pay off the loan incurred by the municipality.
254	The whole character of the Village heart would be negatively impacted
255	This block is already highly congested
256	Go back to the community approved local area plan from October 2021. Do not turn this lovely little village into Uptown Mall! This is a natural place where the trees are taller than the buildings. Tall buildings would ruin that. I have lived in Cadboro Bay for 6yrs but visited this area regularly for 25yrs prior to that. I and many people I know came here and continue to come here because of the lack of tall buildings and urbanization. If people want to visit built up areas, there are LOTS of other areas already ruined by high buildings they can visit in Saanich and the CRD. People come here to get away from that! If you really want to expand access to groceries and other services for Saanich residents, why not add some more village spaces similar to Cadboro Bay to some of the many areas in Saanich that lack a central village within walking distance, that should be a higher priority than urbanizing this beautiful area.
257	The workshop went beyond the Village Centre - expanding it all the way up Sinclair?!! This is not what the community was agreed to in the final consultation process. All this is after the fact of consultation. Residents were against the University's expansion into our neighbourhoods especially when the University has an excess of lands and property on the main Campus as well as all the lands on each side of Finnerty between McKenzie and Arbutus. Why are they not utilizing their own property instead destroying Cadboro Bay forever. Much like what happened in Gordon Head when they leveled the forest to accommodate the University. What was being envisioned by staff did not fit at all in this community. There are so many students now - over 8,000 that move into rooms in homes left empty when the family has moved on. BNB's are taking up much of the rental space that could be used to house students. There are BNB's that are unlicensed and do not have permits. This would be an area to open up to rental units, in my opinion. The community agreed to a gentle increase in housing in order to preserve biodiversity and sense of community. The community agreed to Gently Density in the final consultation.
258	Happy with a maximum of 4 storeys, nothing more!
259	I feel the village is suitable for expansion in all directions. Perhaps 4 stories with commercial on ground and rentals above. Condos would be more appropriate outside of the core where only the wealthy can afford.

260	This will no longer be a village with the expansion plans.
261	leave it alone, single family dwellings.
262	My main concern is increased traffic and the infrastructure needs to be in place before considering any development. Cadboro Bay, Arbutus Road and Sinclair would all need to be 4 lanes. As it is now the backed up traffic up Cadboro Bay Road during rush hour is almost
263	Keeping the community of Cadboro Bay as a small and intimate quaint community is key. No need for lowering the community value of living here. With UVic near by it is important to keep the small vibrant community alive without watering it down and lowering the value of living here to a point of non inclusion, short term sightedness and no longevity plan for the ones who truly wish to live here, and not just occupy while convenient. mist of live here because we love our community and the vibrancy UVic brings but only on a short term basis.
264	My numeric answers express my views on expanded housing in the area.
265	Ensure architectural guidelines are consistent with the context of the Village and compliment village amenities and services
266	easy to overdo it... care needed.
267	want to remain "a Village"... not a high density neighbourhood
268	a perfect area for development and improved diversity of our community
269	There are already multistory building in the area close to amenities and this makes the centre an excellent choice.
270	The commercial village should NOT be sacrificed for more housing.
271	There is room for SOME densification in SOME of this area, provided it is done gracefully without significantly changing the "feel" of the village
272	I think that village height should be limited to three stories to preserve the views to beach.
273	The village centre should be left as low density. Keep the village shopping feel - like Horseshoe Bay & as Caddy Bay currently is. Please don't turn it into a housing corridor. Develop housing options further away from the Village Centre.
274	As long as it stays within the established bylaws and has NO unintended consequences on Mystic Vale, a protected area.
275	3 story max, on new construction
276	I'm not against change but I feel potential development should keep the village theme.
277	Increased height and density in this area will negatively impact the "village" feel and appeal.
278	I'd like to see more housing, including affordable rental housing aimed towards students and families. I'd be happy to see mixed use (like ground floor commercial under apartments) so that there is more access to goods and services for local residents. Keeping green space (especially tree cover) and avoiding large parking lots are also things I'd like to see. If it is feasible developing this area to be a bit of a hub with higher density, with more local amenities and good access to public transit would be what I would like to see.
279	Don't add too much too quickly. You could ruin the village feel.
280	The area marked on the map for increased density and building height is too large. The "Village Centre" should not extend so far from the Penrhyn/Cadboro Bay intersection. Any changes on Hobbs and beyond the one block radius from the Village Centre other than adding Garden/laneway houses/ duplexes and in house suites will change the character of the entire Village area

281	Unacceptable to have any structures or housing above 2. The Village have a soul and beach essence that will be completely lost with higher than 2 levels. The current modern vernacular is lacks soul and looks so horrifically boring and repetitive. I have a knowledge of good design. If this goes ahead with the current approach, The Village Centre will look like any other city or area of Victoria and CRD that has been renewed. Students will only be here for 4 -6 years and be gone and won't be staying. A community should loose its essence and soul. I haven't seen any documentation that creates an imaginative different approach. It seems that developers and planners are stuck in this unimaginative circle of this current vernacular. Who is looking back to include design lines and spaces that echo the true heart and history of this community. Where is that? It is ignored. Beach looks, materials, low people details that connect...please start using your imaginations.
282	Complete and compact communities are needed, but make sure you add trees and public areas
283	This is a horrible idea; and show a lack of concern for the community.
284	CADBORO BAY VILLAGE COULD REALLY USE SOME INCREASED DENSITY AND MORE COMMERCIAL OPTIONS AS WELL.
285	Some density but no rental apartments or development condos over 3-4 stories
286	This is where density belongs please stay out of other areas that do not have the same services and infrastructure
287	AS long as it is kept centralized around existing village core and/or up toward UVIC hill. Not supportive of single family areas east on Hobbs or anywhere toward Arbutus/Queenswood.
288	I just feel sad that our cozy, personal village centre where we always bang into friends while shopping, is going to have years of construction traffic and noise, and turn into another overly crowded centre of impersonal high rises...
289	Leave things as they are; we all purchased in this neighbourhood for a reason - that is having few or no rentals and wanting the enclave we currently have. Many of us have worked very hard to buy here and could have bought elsewhere but didn't for a reason. We pay a large sum in annual taxes to keep this lifestyle - don't change it. Also isn't this in the tsunami inundation zone-so why add more people here?
290	In the Village Centre area, the owners of these relatively small lots would suffer from loss of privacy created by higher building heights. As well, densification of housing in this area would increase our already growing problems with vehicle traffic - there are more people on the roads. Who needs this? Having more people would have a negative impact on the quality of life of existing residents. This demand for housing is mostly external - new people moving from the Mainland. Instead, why not reduce demand, instead of trying to meet it. We should not be encouraging more people to come here. Other than for the real estate / construction industries, it's a detriment to the interests of existing residents. If there has to be increased residential density, it should be in the areas with larger lots and bigger building setbacks, such as Queenswood and Ten Mile Point, where greater building setbacks would reduce the negative impact of new structures.
291	I would like to see a limit on height to that of the Element condominium development on Penrhyn Street. I feel it is fundamental to maintain numerous pedestrian public beach access ways (along with the continuation of vehicle parking at Gyro Park). Additionally, Maynard Park's boundaries should not be diminished and it should remain a public park.
292	Height is not recommended, more town home options no more than three stories. There are no services or stores in the area to support more people. Height is not the way to go.
293	It won't feel like a village Centre if you put high rises in it

294	The area is on very unstable land and not suitable for building high building. It also would ruin the character of the village. I am very much against this. Upper Sinclair road could possible be appropriate for some lower level apartments (max 3 to 4 story).
295	The existing village centre embodies what many mean when they say "village vibe".
296	The Village is wonderful the way it is. Also WE don't need or want it to expand any further as it is dense enough. Where the 3 "cottages were , perhaps Town houses would be good there. Every where else is as "dense " as needed/wanted. This is our homeland.
297	I think the boundary is too broad. Right in the village - maybe some high rises but definitely not in the Hobbs street area and roads off of Hobbs.
298	Higher density housing in this area will require increased public transportation options. BC Transit will need to be incorporated into such a project to ensure an appropriately robust transit route through this area.
299	I do not support the densification of the Cadboro Bay area.
300	Not interested in high rise buildings to be added
301	What happens to the renters who live in the impacted area when those houses are purchased?
302	In your presentation your indicated 2-3 stories behind current village. Yet 2-3 stories not viable. Developers would not build 2-3 stories as they would not make any big profit. ild 2-3 stories as there is very little profit for them.
303	This is a key area but he's very careful to not displace peppers groceries
304	I would like to see the Village Centre preserve more or less and it's current state
305	I am not in favour of housing expansion in the Caddie Bay Area.
306	Not in favour of increasing density
307	The village is too small and is already congested with traffic.
308	In addition to increased height & density not being aesthetic to this area, this area is not suitable for potential housing due to flooding, underground streams and sea level rising
309	Most development should stay at two storeys but could be infilled as in the LAP that was completed most recently. There could be some three store y townhouses or small apartments but only in the very centre should it go to four storeys and definitely not more than that. Should buildings go to six storeys I feel the whole village atmosphere will be lost.
310	Please include affordable housing
311	Closer to the center of the village would be more appropriate for increased heights, while moving further away should be more density focused.
312	I believe that area is potentially subject to flooding in the event of an earthquake and sunami.
313	Nothing above two storeys
314	nothing above two storeys
315	Back to the draft LAP
316	Global warming - ocean rise, wave & water table issues hollowing out footings and foundations.
317	Step the increased density across the Village Centre, peaking between Penhryn and Sinclair.
318	Stop interfering and leave us alone
319	Any new housing must respect the village feel and aesthetics of the existing Village Centre.

320	If increased traffic, the road between the 2 halves should be closed.
321	It is dense enough. Do not understand why you are cramming more density into this area; where there is plenty of open space in Saanich for housing, infrastructure, parks, etc
322	Earthquake and tsunami zone
323	There's no solid reason this housing has to be in the Village Centre. There is a character to the centre that would be harmed and other locations (within easy walking or transit) need more consideration. We don't need a West-Van-gentrified village, and this is not at odds with rental housing.
324	This is the right place but focus the attention off the existing village sites, don't make me lose my grocery store
325	Some but has to fit within current buildings
326	Town house development similiar to the Royal Crescent in Bath, England
327	Max height to what is there now
328	Height limits need to be 3 stories or lower, main should be highest. Hobbs is Not a main artery, Arbutu Cadboro Bay Road should have highest buildings. Existing houses should not be adversely impacted by having adjoining properties suddenly several stories high.
329	If the village had better density, it could create great opportunities for people to live, and attract a number of businesses creating a vibrant area for people to enjoy outside of the downtown core.
330	Small co-op or non-profit housing clusters of max. 3 stories, with tree canopy cover retained or improved. Unless it is truly purpose-built affordable housing, it will not be affordable.
331	Height limits are the most important factor for those already living in the area. Many seniors including my household planned for decades of living here, and renovations to existing homes, to age in place close to village centre. Highest buildings should be on the main arteries of Arbutus, Cadboro Bay Rd and Sinclair. Present density is likely higher than acknowledged by Saanich due to numerous unofficial basement apartments.
332	Heights could be increased but not beyond 3 or max 4 stories and only in select corridors where views are preserved and buildings do not compromise access to sunlight of adjacent properties. Important to provide sufficient parking if this were to occur. Concerned that the Village is in a liquefaction area and that there is already significant congestion. Cadboro Bay Village has a character and ambiance that should be preserved. It should not mirror what can be found in a downtown high density area.
333	There is no need to ruin our village with expansion. We already accommodate the thousands of U Vic students in our area.
334	No height above 3 stories west of Hobbs.
335	I am against this expansion plan. This is not what the original community submitted.
336	my opposition to higher density/elevation housing in Cadboro Bay is not because I don't support affordable housing, rental options etc, but it is completely nonsensical to focus these efforts in a very expensive, oceanside community like Cadboro Bay. It is not sustainable. Whatever is built will not be affordable, or if it is slightly more affordable inititally, it is not sustainable, and if subsidized, why should taxpayers be subsidizing or Saanich forgoing optimization of tax revenues (same as being subsidized by other residents in the community) for this unsustainable, nonsensical option. There are plenty of oher places in Saanich where more affordable and higher density, higher elevation housing is more sustainable and suitable. All that will happen with this initiative otherwise is to have unaffordable, higher density, higher elevation housing that is subsidized by other taxpayers

	and devalues the community. Rather than ask other taxpayers to subsidize (directly or indirectly) this, why not fix basic infrastructure in Cadboro Bay, like municipal sewer to all residents.
337	leave as is
338	The viability of a robust Village core depends upon higher density is to provide customers and patrons for the services provided.
339	In my view, heights should be no higher than the current condo complex near Gyro Park. There is something to be said for the unique character of the area.
340	The first area considered for increasing density should be the areas currently zoned and/or being used commercially. The blocks on Cadboro Bay Road between Sinclair and Maynard would be the first place to start, and the the blocks from Gyro Park up toward Hobbs. Second choice would be UVIC edge.
341	Village center is not aptly named. This should be between Penrhyn and Sinclair. I live on Arbutus which isn't the village center.
342	Heights should be limited to six floors
343	Perhaps a redo of the west side of Cadboro Bay shops to incorporate shops and apartments as recommended years ago by Architects from Vancouver who helped the residents form a Local Area Plan but no more than 3-4 stories high.
344	People have moved to this as it is a quiet village no one wants us to have higher density people of paid a lot of money to have this process and this is where they want to be government
345	Leave as is. It's already too busy in the village core with terrible infrastructure. So much has been taken away already. Minnie Mountain, the field where Aspen road is now. The field where Beachview place is. So much has already been taken away from Cadboro Bay for housing. Leave it alone!!
346	The village already has the right amount of height and density. No More!
347	The village size and density is what makes it unique and special. The community planning process seems to be a done deal that is being foisted upon those living here. While the residents themselves might be a smaller portion of respondents or covering multiple people in one submission by giving input as a family, we are the ones living here and have chosen to do so based on the existing community
348	FOcusing simply at Cadboro Bay Road and Sinclair Road, I could see reconstruction of the existing commercial properties to incorporate more density and height. Absolutley not in the surrounding areas such as around Maynard Park. These are lovely neighbourhoods as they are. Allow people to have secondary suites in their homes as well as carriage homes in back or front yards.
349	This is probably the best option for higher density housing with 3-4 story rental units. Many people who currently live in the area would like to stay here, but downsize and use the equity to rent.
350	Focus on lots that do not have businesses on them currently
351	Building height and density increases will ruin the special quality of our village.
352	I am concerned about the area on the map as village centre. I think it should be a smaller area and heights no more than today.
353	keep it as a seaside village!
354	The geology of the Village Centre is the worst possible location for more intense building development. The earthquake danger map:



	<p><a href="https://cmscontent.nrs.gov.bc.ca/geoscience/PublicationCatalogue/GeoscienceMap/BCGS_GM2000-01.pdf">https://cmscontent.nrs.gov.bc.ca/geoscience/PublicationCatalogue/GeoscienceMap/BCGS_GM2000-01.pdf</a> shows the site as red and checkered for amplification, liquefaction and instability. Tall buildings would be at particular risk. Low-height buildings are the norm for such susceptible areas. The character of the Village is just that: a village. Residents live here because they value the character of the community. We should not have to put up with outsized development just because it suits construction companies. Profit should not enter into the equation; rather, the distinct village character of these unique neighbourhoods should be the guiding principle. Trees and greenspace do not enter sufficiently into the LAP. Our tree cover is essential to the village feel, as are the waterways, which have been culverted as they flow down from Mystic Vale. They should be redaylighted and the green character of the village should be enhanced. Low-height townhouses with increased treed surroundings would suit the Village.</p>
355	<p>When a big earthquake comes, this area will liquify and receive a tsunami. Why would you increase population density given that highrisk? Also, the residents have strongly resisted making this unique area more urbanized. Why should a few develoers sway council against these wishes?</p>
356	<p>With sea level rise, the entire Cadboro Bay Village area is at risk, thus building further does not make much sense.</p>
357	<p>Not more than 4 stories:</p>
358	<p>Do not bring more density or high rises to Cadboro Bay Village - why not go to other areas close by that are more suitable - ie., Gordon Head, Shelbourne, etc.</p>
359	<p>4 story maximum height is the most desireable to prevent feeling closed in and disconnecting the ground level on street and in villagefrom the surrounding homes</p>
360	<p>I am not supportive of using this area for more dense housing.</p>
361	<p>The Village character is important to maintain, as has been mentioned numerous times throughout the process of developing these plans. Higher stories right in the Village core does not fit with this expressed desire. Other options, notably the UVIC boundary proposal, is much more preferable.</p>
362	<p>How would increased car traffic be handled?</p>
363	<p>There is already enough congestion from traffic, parking, and population in this area. We should be focusing on supporting the ecology of this area, not building upward, laying more concrete over natural waterways, and increasing light and noise population – all of which will contribute to the degradation of this area. Cadboro Bay offers rich habitats for birds (owls, hawks, herons, eagles, and other species). Development would seriously compromise this ecological infrastructure, to the detriment of both wildlife and ultimately us (humans). Residents of Cadboro Bay recently complained enough about the impact of dogs in the park on migratory birds that a bylaw was passed prohibiting dogs off leash. Intrusuve, highrise development is far more destructive to the wildlife than a couple of off-leash dogs. More noise, more lights, more traffic, more garbage, more windows to fly into – all these aspects of new development would negatively impact the environment of this area. Higher buildings will impact corridors of birds in need of protection. I see herons flying over Peppers all summer. We should be pooling resources to protect and enrich this area – not degrade it – and to steward the rich ecology it offers that in so many other places is disappearing. Highrise developments are not disconnected from climate change and habit destruction.</p>
364	<p>good idea!</p>
365	<p>Additional buildings in the village center area must be carefully planned and should not exceed the height of 3 stories in order to maintain the Village scale and character as stated</p>

	in the objectives of the LAP to maintain the Village scale and atmosphere r to maintain the maintain the village
366	should be no more than 3 stories high
367	Cadboro Bay should remain three stories or less.
368	the boundrys of the "village are too far north " and should not include the Maynard park immediate vicinity. This would destroy the park use for the rest of the community by blocking sunlight etc. It would essentially destroy the park as the refuge that it presently is for the residents of the immediate neighbourhood.
369	No increase to building height, no increase to density. Cadboro bay village is nice, don't ruin it.
370	Would ruin the feeling of the village if it was built up
371	3 level maximum
372	"Increased height" is too ambiguous: increased compared to what's currently there or what was in the Draft LAP? 5 stories is the limit of what folks will accept, I think.
373	This has already been addressed in the LCP which was 2 years in the making and involed considerable thought.
374	Allow subdivision of any lots >10,000 square feet, rather than stuffing in large buildings and condos . ALL parking MUST be OFF STREET!
375	This is title is very misleading - the map shows a good part of Cadboro Bay - actually not the real Village Centre! This makes answers to the question of density for this area uninterpretable. While slightly higher density might be appropriate for Cadboro Bay Road and with a block, it is NOT for the remainder of the area. Franks Hobbs school is hardly village centre, and it is definetely not suitable for higher density.
376	New housing types should not be foused / jammed this small area near the beach. Consider adjacent Gordon Head, now a poorly designed suburb with no centre or amenities. Saanich has already approved the too-large and very ugly University Heights property and allowed overbuilding at Cordova Bay. Sanich needs better planning and design. The curent Cadboro Bay planning options ignore prrvious comminity input. Saanich needs intelligent, well thougj outy plan
377	This is not the place for it. Don't overdevelop the beach area!
378	increase building heights to six storeys for rental apartments
379	It's a great spot, since there is the big hill behind, building more density won't feel as tall
380	Stop densifying natural green spaces
381	Development should be limited to Sinclair and Cadboro Bay Road.
382	love the area and would request to leave as is for elderly population.
383	Ludicrous idea that will negatively affect the area
384	It is busy enough now with traffic and pedestrians. Any more housing will only cause more congestion.
385	any increase in density should be limited to the sinclair / cadboro bay rd corridor. the the housing in the remainder of the 'village centre' should remain single family or townhouse dwellings. the attraction of cadboro bay is it's diversity of housing styles and friendly neighbourhood atmosphere most townhouse
386	I could see a couple more retail/restaurants in that area or a max two story apartment/townhomes.
387	Heights should be in keeping with the current village perspective.

388	Keep it low, no more than 3 storeys
389	Tsunami & sea-rise risk has grown (see latest CRD maps). Only build up hill from existing village. Maintain low height (2-3 storeys) to preserve village small scale character. Achieve more rental housing by infill and encouraging both carriage homes and basement suites. Don't force people to upgrade old homes to 2022 standards or rental housing will be lost. Don't densify Sinclair hill. There is no room for transit!
390	there is already too much density
391	Some new housing and density is fine but ruining the entire feel of this neighborhood is not desired by anyone on our street. How will these streets handle all the extra traffic?
392	I am concerned about traffic along Sinclair and Cadboro Bay Road. I wouldn't want there to be a need for traffic lights.
393	It all depends on what level of height and density - the question is too open ended
394	Additional housing in the Village Centre area would negatively affect the charm of this idyllic area.
395	This whole concept seems to be driven by developers looking to make a lot of money and not the residents of Cadboro Bay who are paying taxes and your salaries
396	It is already too congested an area, there is not enough space for added housing
397	Already too congested
398	Very important to maintain small seaside village feeling/ambience and maintain views of park and beach
399	Very important to maintain the small Seaside Village atmosphere, including the low height so as not to block the view, or overshadow the park & beach! Keep this from being a built-up, congested vacation destination resort!
400	Cost of land may prohibit building some potential housing.
401	This is the most popular option; however I would like to see more different types of housing and no high-rise. Multi-level building units do not belong in Cadboro Bay.
402	Do not go beyond 3-4 storeys. Affordable housing should not be built "cheaply"! A solid foundation on our sandy soil needs to prevent sinking and structural and water problems in the future. The trees, grass and green spaces are so important to the area. Do not build boxes.
403	We'd like to see a more vibrant village centre with more shops and restaurants and events like Oak Bay and Cook St.
404	These should be single family homes only.
405	This area is underlain by Capilano Sediments: poorly consolidated material left by retreat of the last glaciation ca. 13,000 years ago. In the event of a nearby earthquake of Richter scale intensity of ca. 7 or more and associated horizontal stresses, such sediments can lose their structural support of buildings. The effect is magnified if buildings are higher than about three stories. This is why the concrete foundations slabs laid for the new Uvic residences were made extremely thick beyond what would normally suffice.
406	If going ahead ..go low.. 3 -4 stories max..
407	This is exactly where increased density should occur. Not in bordering areas.
408	There is an opportunity for evolution of evolution of the hub to a more dynamic hub.
409	I support expanding here, however, only on new sites; please keep existing areas intact
410	Preservation of the Village character and streetscapes should not be sacrificed.
411	There are other parcels of land that are more suitable than the village core.

412	Any new housing options should be 3 storeys or less.
413	Increased density CANNOT exceed 2 stories, in order to maintain the current character of the village, maintain the 'light' which is so noticeable in the neighborhood.
414	Keep development to a minimum don't cause overcrowding with townhouses or apartments as this reduces the enjoyment of living in the area due to competition for resources such as parking. People already travel to the area to enjoy the open spaces so increased density will just cause more traffic and general congestion.
415	With the massive amount of growth and construction at Shelbourne and McKenzie, there will be ample accommodations available. Expanding village will only increase population too much.
416	Area dense enough
417	I think this would be the best option, let's build up the village and create a walkable community!
418	Need for one level or senior living housing but not necessarily high rise; perhaps more creative cluster housing with shared garden space.
419	I think building up the Village Centre area offers the best option for development focused on aging in place and people with mobility issues, but not necessarily other demographics. I am also concerned that it's likely that any increase in the local area population will be accompanied by an increased demand for business development, and the Village Centre area would also be the best location for commercial growth. If this area is chosen for increased density now and ongoing housing pressure leads to another option being pursued over time as well, I wouldn't want options for commercial development in this area precluded by residential developments that are too difficult to remove later.
420	This area is clearly among the most suitable for higher density housing. However, as argued for in the previous rounds of community consultation as well as the Local Area Plan Draft document, this should include not higher than 4 stories. It should also be in consideration that the section of this area east of the village center around Gyro Park is really unsuitable for large building given the fact that it is largely built on sand and prone to flooding. Given the increasing weather severity and rising sea levels we are going to see due to climate change, high-density development and high-rise development here is extremely unwise.
421	Focus on new sites not yet developed with commercial
422	any kind of changes requires a vision which is consistent with the traditional character of the village, as seen in Penrhyn Close; density would increase traffic and affect quality of life (this is a unique community with an unmistakable character of bonded neighbours and a true village feel.
423	There is no need to build tall buildings in Cadboro bay, we will lose our skyline and what makes the community to only make developers more money, there is no way to make apartments or townhouses for under 1.2million. Also the roads cannot sustain the traffic
424	The Village Centre area is too big!
425	The proposal for over 4 story housing options is NOT suitable for any part of Cadboro Bay. Prefer 1b over 1a, however, you need to speak directly - one on one- to the people who would be effected by expanding the village core. For some people they have their life savings in their homes - significant changes re zoning and poor roll out could have significant negative effects on them. You clearly have heard from the voices that have had access to the information and who have an agenda. I am not convinced that your samples for your data from any of the areas are actually representative of the population being impacted. Many people did not know anything about these recent proposals - it feels as if

	Saanich was just trying to slide them through.
426	I feel that 4 stories in the Sinclair Rd to Penrhyn should be the maximum height

**Q8: Any comments about potential housing in the Northeastern area?**

Out of 874 respondents the total of 341 comments were provided.

No	Comment
1	Maximum 4 storeys with commercial added in lower floors in keeping with the current style
2	Any new building should be incorporated into the neighbourhood without dominating the skyline. No 8-10 storey building.
3	Same reasons as above, perhaps best suited to 4 rather than 6 story residential
4	Would be a perfect place to house students at the undergraduate, graduate, and PhD levels, as well as staff and other professionals working at the campus
5	This area already contains beautiful townhomes. It is more than suitable for more
6	Allowing this area to develop would greatly improve the local economy and make this great community far easier for people to live in and enjoy
7	terrible idea
8	We are in an extreme housing crisis, I would support up zoning to 4-6 stories for this area.
9	same as above. Why is the island responsible for developers profits? This area is not affordable and never will be. People don't fall for that buzz word from developers. They are smacking their lips at the thought of million dollar plus per unit profits. That's it and I'm mad at Saanich planning and council for trying to pull this █████ like people have low IQs. Like are you planning to make 4 lane highways out here too? I pay 14000k/year in taxes and council should consider just downsizing instead of dreams of becoming Vancouver please. High density is suitable where there is already apartment buildings have you looked elsewhere like all along MacKenzie? Where there's big roads. As a tax payer I feel like Developers have taken over city hall. Low rise buildings 3 stories max around the village would be fine not eight story buildings ! I went to the saanich thing a couple years back at goward house and it seemed to me the staff are enamored with making the village like downtown I think youre too lobbied by developers they are full of █████ like the way you allowed them to get rid of the development permit area on all the waterfronts. That needs to come back! The developers scared all the waterfront owners with lies I went to all their meetings they lie. Stop turning our coastline into another europe with huge walls you destroy the coast like you allowed the Thompsons to do on smugglers cove.
10	Land assembly will be a challenge for developers. Pre-zoning is a must to ensure timely process.
11	All areas are suitable for increased density. Some may not be so great for over three stories but every neighbourhood should be zoned for missing middle at minimum.
12	We desperately need more housing in this area.
13	I support this type of invisible density
14	Only after Village area has been completely updated
15	If more density needs safer sidewalks and crosswalks. Allow duplexes/triplexes/garden homes/suites. Keep the neighbourhood feel.
16	Many students live along the number 11 bus. Increased height and density will be great for those who catch the 11 right by there
17	Should be garden suites and secondary suites both permitted on a lot
18	Height to not exceed two stories. Use courtyard homes

19	All the areas are very suitable, please limit parking to limit traffic and environmental impact
20	We adamantly oppose the northeastern village expansion
21	would support unto 3 storey developments, town houses etc
22	Some density such a garden suites/duplexes/triplex
23	No.
24	Preserve the integrity of the neighborhood and protect park land. We don't need high rise and high density in this area. It only lines the pockets of developers
25	This area should stay single family or duplex as it is quiet with mature trees.
26	Possibly duplexes and row type houses.
27	Back to the draft
28	Why not do NE expansion AND UVic edge?
29	This area should have the potential for three story townhouse. These townhouse should be made with elevators, no barrier bathrooms and potential for a small suite for a caregiver. This would allow people to stay in their homes as they age and provide accommodation as well.
30	Do not feel like this area needs more density
31	Make sure there is lots of walking path connections, sidewalks, greenways, trees. Also ensure the charm of the area is maintained with developments that include peaked roofs, cedar shingles, proper setbacks, parking, tiered landscaping etc.
32	Its right by the water nothing about this will be affordable
33	This area would be great for duplexes and multiplexes and three-storey townhouses, not tall condos
34	Don't have a strong opinion
35	There might be some areas when townhouses might be accommodated.
36	This area has a large number of small children and expanding it will cause traffic safety issues with children walking to school. It will change the small community vibe negatively. There's a reason why large buildings have not been built here before. No one who lives in this area wants them. Residents have moved here for the fact that it's quiet and untouched by urban developments.
37	Cadboro Bay was already screwed by Saanich when Minnie Mountain was taken away as a park and turned into Wedgewood point.
38	2ndary area to Village Centre for more density
39	This area makes the least sense for any expansion to the Cadboro Bay region.
40	Traffic is already bad enough on Arbutus rd - a residential street that is also an artery. Any additional building in this area would turn Arbutus into McKenzie. Nobody wants that.
41	I see more environmental hazards to the bay and bird sanctuaries if this area was developed...yikes!
42	Again I only support is the height is only maximum 3 stories.
43	This is ok as it doesn't ruin the village
44	No Need. Unsuitable for people living and working in the area currently.
45	Ensure multiple units are no higher than 3 stories
46	This seems like the best option to increase family oriented housing options. It also seems like having some traffic oriented toward Arbutus would be less clogged.

47	Horrible idea and a great way to ruin people's homes and lives.
48	Better option than the village
49	Additional high density buildings in this area would be fine.
50	I would support row/townhouses or duplex/triplexes in this area
51	These are residential areas that have grown slowly over many years. Concentrated building would ruin the feel that people have spent a lifetime saving for because it's NOT densely populated.
52	Potential housing in this area should be in form of more garden suites and duplexes instead of single family homes
53	Current village area is too pinched - this provides more room to expand and area is appropriate (close walking distance to core village and bus stops, flat land)
54	Not required
55	Water levels rising
56	Great idea
57	Leave it how it is.
58	two story townhouse only. HIGHRISES NOT SUITABLE HERE MANY OTHER AREAS ON BUSY CORRIDORS FOR THAT!!
59	Why are you bringing this location forward now? You should have brought it forward in the initial meetings.
60	I think that the village core would be the better spot for densification, but I still think this area is suitable as well.
61	Same comment not higher thsn 3 storeys
62	do not develop cadboro bay
63	Again, or in existing residential areas. We live on Hobbs and do not need increased traffic
64	what about Rowley? older housing stock and no views to block; proximity to school
65	See above. The proposal isn't clear.
66	Maynard park is far too small for the proposed numbers of residents and all the current activities for which the park is now used. The park should be doubled in size to fit the proposed increased in populations.
67	Not a suitable area at all.
68	Dig down 4 feet and you will find water in Caddie Bay - it is marshland. I do not think this is suitable for high density housing.
69	Same comment as above. No one living in their houses wants to be overshadowed by high rises or have them looking down into their backyards.
70	Same seismic risks as for Village Centre.
71	Any densification project should be walkable/bikeable, with no additional parking. More people should not necessitate more automobile traffic. Again, a 3-storey maximum should be maintained.
72	Townhomes only
73	limited number of duplex and garden suites would be acceptable
74	No Change to existing
75	I think the the area closer to the village core should be where the density should be concentrated.



76	I am not familiar with this community
77	Land assembly for development will be a challenge. The area is very walkable/bikeable to the village and beach. I wonder if a Cadboro Bay Rd and Arbutus Corridor approach would have been better.
78	Please stick with existing community plan, which was developed over several years with good community input. Same comments as above, strained infrastructure. Not to mention the impacts on residents of tall buildings. Please address outstanding infrastructure needs - safe walking.
79	More townhouses with little gardens would be lovely. No tall buildings.
80	I would support more infill in this area, duplexes, garden suites, maybe even three-story townhouses, but nothing higher.
81	Keep height to under 4 stories
82	This area is a quiet residential region. Townhouse development is an option that would likely be acceptable to the community . However, high rise apartment buildings will completely alter the nature of this region.
83	Rental suites in existing houses and garden suites
84	See above.
85	Similar comments to my previous rant. Saanich needs to start considering the wants and needs of it's current residents and the environment that we all share. Why does Canada need to grow to 100 million people by 2200 and who is pushing the agenda? People are getting fed up with government and planners giving us a choice of bad, worse or nightmare. Start looking at quality of life rather than GDP as a measurement of success. Any local politician that does, will get my vote.
86	These are mainly single family homes. Tasteful duplexes might work or again, no more than 2 story small townhouses
87	not appropriate.
88	Low rise townhouses
89	Only secondary suites in homes.
90	Low rise only. Townhouse, houseplexes.
91	see my previous comments? Why are we being targeted for this ruining of our neighbourhood?
92	You should stick to the extensive process conducted by the neighbourhood itself.
93	Absolutely do NOT support this option, including townhouses. I think there should be heritage protection for the modernist housing here, it is such a special place with the 1950s and 1960s low density housing forms. Cherilee, Lauder, Dawes have a unique ambiance that will be ruined by intensification. I think increased density should be by UVIC and up to Shelbourne and Cedar Hill X Road where it would not ruin the quiet, peaceful atmosphere of this community.
94	Strongly discourage any changes to the existing zoning and LAP direction. Strongly disagree that Single Family houses should be replaced by higher density solutions.
95	There is already housing in this area, single family homes that have supported the community for decades. Increasing the density here is simply not acceptable. As I said, my feeling is that you should focus on areas that are already in major arterial routes. I can certainly see higher level multi family affordable housing in the Shelbourne area and there wouldn't be the rampant destruction of habitat in that location. I grew up in that area, (Shelbourne, Oaklands Avenue, Cedar Hill Road) and fully understand that those areas

	aren't as expensive nor as ecologically significant as Cadboro Bay.
96	It's a terrible place to put even four story buildings in. Though increased housing with additional suites would be fine.
97	There appear to be more options and less concentration of houses/residences in this area than in the village.
98	far away from retail centre for seniors
99	Mix of single family, duplex 3storirs maximum. Again visual suitability ie design, is must. (see comment further on n survey
100	I only support thus if there is 100% off street parking
101	Much less keen in having this area developed.
102	No more development
103	You are going to ruin the "quaint" quality of the area. Why not do Queenswood as well (ha ha).
104	Development should be limited to Cadboro Bay Road or Arbutus properties, church lands or garden suites.
105	Would be a great place to live for families, seniors and others. Could use a bit more transit.
106	Leave it as is...
107	These are the single family residential areas of Cadboro bay. What is left of you turn this into high rises? Ten mile point and the extra affluent of caddy bay.
108	Only if the city stipulated small 2-6 unit buldingg.
109	Again, keep it to 4 stories or less.
110	3-story townhomes with suites where developers can find a few land rool-ups is a neat idea. no more height than that as it would be unfair to the expectations of existing residents unless you give them 10-15 years to plan. See my awesome bike oath idea above
111	Ditto question 8
112	How might we get more bike lanes and walking paths along sinclair and arbutus? Adding density will have a lot of traffic implications, so let's solve for that from the beginning.
113	The previous argument for gradual development applies here as well. Our street is within this area and our neighbours have done lovely upgrades to mid-century houses to extend their life and give them personality. In order to make this wonderful street accessible to more people, I'm in favour of gradual densification, including garden and interior suites which can be done now. As single-family homes come to the end of their useful life, a variety of sustainably built, human scale (preferably 2-story - better for aging-in-place) duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes or townhouses could be introduced. There might be opportunities for 3 to 4-story apartments near the church on Arbustus Road.
114	I think density in this area should be kept a residential heights (e.g. 2 stories, max 3) and allow suites, garden suites, townhomes/duplexes.
115	again, lines are in the wrong area. development along Cad. Bay Rd. from Sinclair to Maynard makes sense, but most of the highlighted area doesn't
116	Outside of developing low rise buildings in the church parking lots it does not make sense to allow increased density on single income housing lots
117	whatever is developed must be in character with the urban forest and highly treed nature of the area. Blocks of 5+ stories are not what this area needs.
118	Any additional development in this region should take into account the impact of rising sea level & climate instability.

119	Would negatively impact those living in single family homes in that area. However, if it happens, small 3-storey luxury, well built townhomes with grassy courtyards most appealing.
120	don't think anything in this area should be high density or above 3 storeys. This area has a beautiful tree canopy and a private, quiet neighborhood. It won't be that way with higher density and height.
121	Generally this area could be suitable however adjacent to Maynard Park isn't ideal due to increased traffic on Maynard and proximity to the elementary school crosswalk on Hobbs
122	Keep the housing low level. No higher than three stories
123	Not appropriate
124	See above
125	This is a single family housing area that should be preserved as such. Apartment or condo housing is not appropriate for this area.
126	Low apartments
127	Development should be limited to lane houses, limited duplex's. Also, the north side of Arbutus in Queenswood is not materially different from the Southside (referred to as the Village). Any development allowed in the Village should also be permitted in Queenswood bordering Arbutus Road or QA lands.
128	Strongly opposed.
129	Yes I recognize the overhoused and wealthy homeowners in this area will resist the idea, but it's ludicrous to maintain mansion-only zoning in an area so close to the University. Why are only extremely wealthy residents allowed to live near the beach?
130	Beautiful location but will make traffic through current village busier, not that great for students. Great for families and seniors.
131	Duplexes and fourplexes would be suitable here. With smaller 2-4 store developments closer to the village.
132	again, nothing over 3 to 4 stories and go easy on the density. High density will create the same problems they have in Sidney where the inhabitants are pissed off due to high rent and purchase costs combined with traffic problems and no parking.
133	There may be potential for development of BVU lands somewhere in future.
134	I support this option to expand and use church sites as possible sites for increased densities. However the eastern boundary should be truncated at Cherilee. however missing middle 2 story infill for aspen, lauder, dawie ie. suites, duplexes, 2-4 unit townhouses should end at Cherilee. the area including Aspen, Lauder and Dawie can be used for infill, suites, duplex, panhandle, garden suites etc but retain 2 height limit. the
135	Luxury senior housing allowing residents to downsize their homes and move into walkable caddy bay
136	Possibly some townhouses, not dense housing could be added without destroying the character of the area.
137	this would be a fabulous space for a community centre and a library
138	This is already a highly used area for parking for people using the park and beach. Where are they supposed to go? Once again that cuts into the safety area for seniors and children
139	What a muddied mess of a survey. Feels very manipulated. Parts of the Northeastern area are in an earthquake liquefaction zone. Whose dumb idea is it to build 6-story residential housing there?
140	Again, increasing traffic by that much will impact livability negatively and decrease safety.

141	It would make the family beach less family friendly/more of a party stop
142	As per above, leave Cadboro Bay alone and increase density on the Shelbourne corridor
143	Garden suites only
144	Don't approve
145	No village expansion should be allowed
146	This is residential. Any height increases would be detrimental to the area. It is an area suitable for low rise.
147	This area we would like to see developed , but away from the water and Maynard Park.
148	Same as above
149	It completely ignores the character of the neighborhood.
150	Higher buildings would change the character of the community village significantly.
151	This has historically been single family housing, this is what we moved here for. Leave it alone!
152	Same comments! Densification will destroy the uniqueness of the neighborhood
153	Woods on one side bird sanctuary on the other, I do not see densification making sense here
154	I wouldn't support high-rise apartments in this area. But no problem with townhouses, duplexes, granny flats, etc.
155	not suitable
156	Low density and low heights. Maintain village characteristics. Build higher density on Shelbourne which already can support more people.
157	I think this area would be good for potential higher density housing, but not buildings higher than 3 storeys.
158	The LAP which was developed over years with community input did consider more housing through ground-orientated options. Suddenly Saanich presented a Hobbesian choice of 10 story buildings in three options. This "tall" option cannot be supported. The Saanich option would amount to having the tallest buildings in Saanich all congregated in a quiet neighbourhood that lacks some basic infrastructure (bus, sidewalk, lighting, pedestrian safety and crosswalks, storm drainage) and is at its limits regarding other infrastructure (power outages, water supply rate and pressure, sewage, parking). The entire area is in or near modelled sea-level rise zones. The soils for building are difficult at best (rocky or silty). This North-east expansion is even worse than the "Village" expansion because of sea level rise and particularly bad existing traffic and pedestrian issues at the Cadboro Bay/Tudor/Seaview confluence. If it were possible to give this a "zero" or even a "negative" ranking I would.
159	Strongly against it. There is no more space to fit another massive ugliness.
160	No, it is not appropriate. Please leave Cadboro Bay alone!
161	same comments as 5 & 6
162	increased density is not needed or wanted
163	Again some possibility for townhouses along main street and a modest height increase on United church land for seniors housing.
164	I accept that some increase in population density may be necessary, and I am willing to accept the Draft Local Area Plan for Cadboro Bay and its proposals for moderate densification, however I am strongly opposed to all three higher density options in the

	revised plan requested by Council. Seventy-three percent of respondents were willing to accept the Draft Local Area Plan with increased density provided through garden suites, patio homes, duplexes, etc. However, any plan proposed should be in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood, which means that any buildings greater than 2 storeys in height in neighbourhoods currently zoned for single family dwellings are not acceptable. I am deeply concerned that the proposed radical changes in zoning for the Northeastern area will ruin what is special about Cadboro Bay. I do not live in this area, however, so I would give more weight to the residents of this area.
165	I live in the Northeastern Village Expansion area and have an orchard. How dare you try to expand the village into a small town in and around my property, which is being used to grow food and enhance the food security, which the densification department doesn't care about at all. How are we going to reduce carbon consumption by outsourcing food production globally instead of locally to supply those living here?
166	I'm not sure where traffic will go? Will there be community gardens put in, electric shuttles, dog friendly areas?
167	Same comments as above.
168	Same comments as above.
169	this is a single dwelling neighbourhood. any increased density doesn't fit.
170	Townhouses and low-rise condos could go here
171	It's currently a lovely family community with a diversity of young families to seniors. Don't destroy this neighborhood. It is not at all appropriate for multi-unit buildings. Traffic is already an issue. There is no infrastructure for additional density.
172	This is a beautiful neighbourhood that should not be destroyed by housing density
173	Ensure public access remains available or is increased.
174	There is room for multiple units in the area of the church on Arbutus. It will be coming up for sale and I think the United church would look favourably on lower cost units.
175	This should not happen as it does not reflect the intention of those home owners original conception of their neighbourhood
176	Are you planning to displace all the people who currently live there?
177	Where are the current residents supposed to go as already fairly dense with low-rise houses, I'm assuming properties would be bought up by a developer based on who's willing to leave?
178	Is this area safe for density? E.g., earthquakes and flooding?
179	Keep with the existing Draft Plan, which was agreed upon in 2021, before the Housing Committee interfered, trying to force a completely different set of options on the Cadboro Bay community.
180	We have friends living here. We know their feelings.
181	More townhome and co op rental options
182	I don't think the character of the neighbourhood supports increased density
183	Maximum 4 storey height
184	Stay with the plan as per the workshop meetings and feedback from this spring. Do not change those results no matter what developers want.
185	This is a beautiful area with large single family lots bordering on some of the most expensive real estate in Saanich. It does not suit for high density housing, apartments, or rental units.

186	Leave it as it is. We moved into a R1 housing area not a 4 plus story area.
187	Directly connected to the village core
188	Perhaps the utilization of the United Church property but go with an organic increase in density with garden suites and duplex and quadplex approvals.
189	Same comments as above.
190	Same issue low level of height above water
191	Stick to 2021 LAP. Garden suites, duplex maybe. Nothing over 2 stories!
192	Smaller lots could be ok
193	Prefer no high density units
194	Seems a good place to maintain single family residence
195	Here too I suggest the area is drawn too broadly - there are big differences in suitability for increased housing density across the area. Highest at points nearest village center, e.g., along Hobbs, Maynard, and Cadboro Bay, plus along and adjacent to major streets served by public transit -- continuing east on CBR, and Arbutus. Rest of area less suitable.
196	Against "potential housing in the Northeastern area.
197	a wall of high rise apartments does not appeal; how do you handle all the vehicular traffic in the village
198	This is a residential mostly single family dwelling neighborhood. There is no appropriate fit for multistory buildings here.
199	This area can support more density as it is walkable to the village core. This area is not as suited for mixed use development. New density may need more commercial services.
200	Traffic will be horrible through village.
201	I see this as a pleasant family residential area. It is removed from the " Village".
202	not appropriate
203	This is not the place for high density
204	The size and scope of the villiage is what makes it special. As such, we strongly disagree with increasing density and the height of buildings. Additionally, the infrastructure cannot handle the density it has. Increased roads and road sizes would also ruin the neighborhood. Shelbourne and MacKenzie streets, where building complexes are right sized with the size of the intrastructure are better places to continue the densification that has started.
205	This is a single family dwelling area and we strongly disagree with increasing density and the height of buildings. Additionally, the infrastructure cannot handle the density it has. Increased roads and road sizes would also ruin the neighborhood. Shelbourne and MacKenzie streets, where building complexes are right sized with the size of the intrastructure are better places to continue the densification that has started.
206	Go back to the community approved local area plan from October 2021. Do not turn this lovely little village into Uptown Mall! This is a natural place where the trees are taller than the buildings. Tall buildings would ruin that. I have lived in Cadboro Bay for 6yrs but visited this area regularly for 25yrs prior to that. I and many people I know came here and continue to come here because of the lack of tall buildings and urbanization. If people want to visit built up areas, there are LOTS of other areas already ruined by high buildings they can visit in Saanich and the CRD. People come here to get away from that! If you really want to expand access to groceries and other services for Saanich residents, why not add some more village spaces similar to Cadboro Bay to some of the many areas in Saanich that lack a central village within walking distance, that should be a higher priority than urbanizing this

	beautiful area.
207	This area is not suitable for multiple occupancy
208	Once again, any further development in this area should not come at the expense of what's left of the forest canopy that has been trying to recover from a negative status as it has disappeared at an alarming rate to accommodate development over the past 15 years. Why break up a community into chunks of housing, that may or may not fit in with the scope of keeping our community intact, and continue to be known for it's semi-rural aspects. Why do you think VIHA moved in on the QA lands? Million dollar views are hard to come by. Anything developed on this land would not be affordable, or perhaps even safe as we live in a subduction zone.
209	Like the single housing feel of this area. perhaps the United Church (when sold) could be available for 4 storeys retirement community
210	Much better for condos and/or single family homes
211	No local I have ever talked to wants to expand the village in that area. The layout and character is simply not designed to be a village and it doesn't suit the area.
212	single family only.
213	Again infrastructure needs to be in place before development.
214	Keep the community feel alive and strong.
215	See 6)
216	Prefer to see this area remain single family with secondary suites
217	not suitable
218	see previous comment
219	It may be possible to densify slightly with suites, garden homes and a few duplexes, but any more than that will adversely affect the character of the neighbourhood
220	Please keep increased density away from the Village centre. Put density into areas already providing housing. Keep kids in neighbourhoods where other kids live & they can spread out & play safely away from coffee shops, grocery stores etc. & where they can play safely in parks & playgrounds with grass & little traffic. Wee kids don't want to be in a village core. Look how lovely the Hobbs School grounds are. That's the kind of area kids want to live & play in.
221	Are you crazy? This would destroy our community! We don't want another downtown Victoria!
222	3 story max, on new construction
223	I'd like to see more housing, especially affordable missing middle housing that still has small yards/gardens but sees greater affordability and density.
224	I think increased density would be better in the core of Cadboro Bay.
225	Any changes other than adding lane way houses/ duplexes and in house suites will change the character of the entire Village area
226	It's too far from the commercial core. It will just result in more traffic problems. Curve where Cadboro Bay Rd. turns into Telegraph Bay Rd is a pedestrian hazard! Better to concentrate in the heart of the comercial Villange area.
227	This area is NOT appropriate for high-density living; and I can't believe that this would be considered by Saanich.
228	No rental apartments. No developments over 2 stores
229	Also acceptable for medium 4-6 floor density

230	Not appropriate to go near Queenswood area
231	This is definitely not an appropriate area for high rises and rentals and increased traffic and crowds. Cadboro Bay, including this peaceful area is by the wishes of most owners/tax payers, meant to be a place of peace and of single family homes and lots of green space and nature. Please don't destroy this place we all love so much.
232	Again, this area is a happy single family neighbourhood. Give your head a shake! Who is asking for this???
233	Again, for small lot areas, increased building heights and densities would diminish our quality of life. This kind of growth should not be accommodated - just because there is a demand by outsiders to live here is not a good reason to allow it - look after the interests of existing residents, not the newcomers - we don't owe the rest of Canada a place to live. .
234	I would like to see a limit on height to that of the Element condominium development on Penrhyn Street. I feel it is fundamental to maintain numerous pedestrian public beach access ways (along with the continuation of vehicle parking at Gyro Park).
235	These is a very old neighbourhood with proximity to beach and forest. The land is very expensive. It is fiscally irresponsible to purchase such expensive land for lower income housing. There are so many other areas where land is cheaper. There are many character homes. People bought homes in this area for the views and the trees and nature. High buildings and density will destroy the character. This is a deal breaker for anyone in Saanich to propose. The road is already very busy and load and unsafe with crossings.
236	I believe that this area can be left as is ( as others should & hopefully will be. ) For more housing there are several areas in Saanich further away from this area such as land that has not been developed near Mt Doug or areas near there.
237	Again too broad. Should be confined to the beige area only.
238	Higher density housing in this area will require increased public transportation options. BC Transit will need to be incorporated into such a project to ensure an appropriately robust transit route through this area.
239	I do not support increased housing in the Northeastern area of Cadboro Bay
240	Don't see a need for change
241	Many of the homes in this area already have suites or 2 families living together.
242	Seems like a logical extension and a decent corridor
243	I support expansion to protect the character of the village itself
244	Strongly not in favour.
245	Why is height the only thing being considered for density? Height is hard to solve because no one wants to be next to a tall building. There are other variables which can solve density and empower local home owners (infills)
246	With due respect, how many different ways can the question be asked? Leave the draft LAP of dated October 27. 2021 as it is with the comments made at that time for adjustments.
247	Certainly the land currently occupied by the church on Arbutus would be an ideal site for an increase in density - I think small, cottage-like houses clustered around a communal garden would be in high demand by seniors who want to stay in the area and would free up larger properties for younger people. Or small, two to two and a half storey apartments or townhouses could be built here, leaving plenty of room for trees. There could be some garden suites increasing density in single family properties. I am not in favour of greater increases in height in the area.
248	Should be more focused on density and not necessarily height.



249	Why are you proposing to tear down good housing so you can build apartments - isn't it sort of silly to replace something that doesn't need replacing.
250	Not above three storeys
251	nothing above three storeys
252	This area is totally not suitable to increased height or density. The focus of any increase in either height allowances or density increases should be in the core area, incorporated into the shopping complex of stores.
253	Back to the Draft LAP
254	Same issue sea level rise & hydrostatic issues
255	Infill and suites okay. No condo titles.
256	As above
257	This is an established residential area. Additional housing must limit height to 2 storeys and/or "granny flats" within the existing home or back of property where large enough to accommodate.
258	Be careful, we don't want hi rises going right to sidewalks, with no trees or green space
259	as above
260	A village surrounded by high elevation and high density housing is a city. This is still too close. Further, what will the residents of dense housing do with their dogs since there are no off-leash areas in the village area now? (Maynard Park has no fencing and it is not a practical option.)
261	Nice area to expand but definitely lesser density due to its proximity to the rest of Saanich
262	Build within current 2 stories. Allow church BUT restrictions on height. Your options for 4-6 are NOT okay
263	Road access is very poor. High auto and pedestrian accident probability
264	Leave as is
265	Height limit should be 3 stories, main arteries such as Arbutus should have highest buildings
266	This area is underdeveloped and could give way to complimenting an enhanced density for the village and create more opportunities for people to live, work and play in Caddy Bay
267	Our planet is burning, people! This is an area of mature tree canopy and significant urban forest; many homes with food gardens and fruit trees. It can better serve as an area of invaluable natural capital than yet another heat island of multi-story expensive investment developments that treat housing as a commodity in an REIT portfolio.
268	This is an elitist neighborhood with no intention of ever having more diverse housing for lower income individuals
269	Height limit of 3 stories for this area, mostly on main arteries and 2 stories on residential streets
270	Would support townhomes, garden suites, secondary suites, but not buildings over 3 stories.
271	No expansion needed to further increase the financial profits of developers
272	Some more density, nothing above 3 stories.
273	absolutely NOT
274	see previous comments. Slightly more suitable because less close to waterfront, so less expensive and slightly less unaffordable to different incomes, but still unaffordable and unsustainable.

275	Priority should be given to increase density within the village and to the south and west of the village. Access density on the northside will increase traffic that has to pass through the village in order to exit. That is not desirable.
276	Why stop at Arbutus. Queenswood has considerable more potential with its large lot sizes.
277	Height restrictions should be 6 stories
278	Do not increase density or height here. It will change the nature of where we want to live. The “community plan” is anything but. We feel the Plan is developer focused under the guise of community consultation. Saanich, please really listen to the residents. We may not be as numerous a group as the businesses/developers, but this is Our community!
279	The size and scope of this is good now. This is a ruralish community
280	Absolutely do not allow multifamily or increased heights in this area!! Allow people to have secondary suites in their homes as well as carriage homes in back or front yards. This is a beautiful single family neighbourhood.
281	There may be opportunities for infilling and adding granny flats. It would help if approval process was streamlined and not driven by the need for increased revenue.
282	Decent area for village expansion, I'd like to see hobbs, arbutus and Cadboro with higher density and then lower density like large townhouse projects in the interior
283	This classic residential area should remain as is. One exception is the United Church on Arbutus. The developer that buys the Church when it becomes available for sale, could consider a community of townhouses for retired people
284	This neighborhood will be ruined by the expansion.
285	Absolutely NOT. Doesn't fit in with anything currently there. Allow suits and small building as there is now. Make it less expansive to create these. Some work has been done already I see in the news
286	Trees and greenery need to be brought back to this already sun-parched area. It is orange on the earthquake hazard map (not immune to a high amount of damage). Any development should take into account the relationship of the location to Cadboro Bay itself: water flow, scale of buildings down to the Bay (NOT tall apartment blocks), and symmetry of housing/buildings relative to the slop down to the BAY, access to the beach and the park, etc.
287	see previous comments
288	The land is a bit less low lying, however it is still at risk with sea level rise.
289	Town Houses, Duplex. Triplex, Garden suite
290	Not suitable for more density or high rise housing. Not needed.
291	The southeast corner of this area is NOT suitable for increased density due to the high risk of increasing sea level in the next decades. Nothing seaward of the cadbora bay road should be developed to higher density
292	I am very opposed to development in this area.
293	Not desirable, other than the specific area near St. George's church.
294	Ditto to above comment.
295	the proposed infill which could include carriage houses, garden suites, duplexes and homes designed to look like single family dwellings ( but with possibly 4 units) are the ways that can be used to increase density without affecting the village appearance. More legal secondary suites should be planned.
296	This is an idiotic idea

297	this suggestion is driven by church stakeholder's who wish to build more housing for the congregation. The residents hardly need more housing in this area
298	Not suitable, don't ruin the neighbourhood. We can not take the extra density. There is already to much traffic.
299	Definitely not, would completely change the feel of that end of the beach and village
300	Townhouses and low level apartments only
301	Zone it up to 3 stories with fourplexes permitted everywhere.
302	There is a school and daycare /pre-school establishments in this area. Parentst walk and/or drive their childen to the facilities. Increase density would be prolematic.ilities. ia whereparents walk their children to school
303	Allow subdivision of any lots >10,000 square feet, rather than stuffing in large buildings and condos . ALL parking MUST be OFF STREET!
304	Please see my answer above. The area enclosed is very large, and it is simply not reasonable to ask opinions about such a large area.
305	A better choice. But nothing over 3 stories. Saanich needs to be more concerned with good design and local input. This survey should be restricted to local residents.
306	This is unlikely to be a cheap area, though.
307	Not suitable, for semi rural housing
308	Definitely single family develing preferred. Suggest to leave as is.
309	See above
310	see comment on 7 above
311	Not possible! No space. All pre-occupied homes.
312	Any new condo development should not be higher than two stories to fit with the village aspect of the community.
313	Expand into Queenswood instead as that is where all the huge lots and acreages are
314	This area has institutional land (the united church and the hospital) where conceivably subsidized housing could be built for lower income families and seniors. Arbutus road is on a bus route. Low height infill could be encouraged on some larger lots including along the edge of Queenswood. Thanks again
315	none
316	This area should be left alone.
317	Same comment as question 6 above.
318	Retro fitting a legacy neighborhood w mostly bungalow and 2 level single family homes to 6 story multi family &/ cheap rentals is disrespectful to the existing community by changing a stable demographic to a transient demographic
319	Would be disrespectful to existing community of bungalow and 2 story single family homes
320	No structures above 3 stories should be permitted in this area.
321	What happened to our LAP? Nothing higher than 3 stories! Laneway / Garden houses, additional suites are suitable.
322	Again, cost of land would make units available only to those with substantial incomes.
323	This is furthest away from the village and UVic corridor, so this area makes the least suitable option.
324	3-4 storeys only.
325	Quit tearing down smaller homes to fill the entire lot with monster homes

326	These should be single family homes
327	Same points as in Edge area comments, and Village Centre.
328	Depends on tall of structures are being considered in yhis residential area. Cadboro bay road MUST lower speed limit to 40 in this zone. It's extremely loud right now and with more traffic, it will be in tolerable. It's also very unsafe for people to cross the road to get to the beach. More crosswalks are needed too. Jsut a matter of time before some kid is killed on this road. Let's be proactive so this never happens.
329	The potential here seems more limited than option 1, but it does have the advantage of a connection o the village core.
330	This is a residential area of relatively small lots and one- and two-storey homes. It should remain as such.
331	Modest expansion here please
332	lack of/inadequate sidewalks
333	Some room for infill housing and suites, without impacting the area aesthetics negatively.
334	This is single family and not suitable for tall buildings. Any development needs to keep with the character of the neighbourhood which means 2 storeys or less.
335	Low density houses with off street parking. Aim to reduce congestion in this unique area. People are already travelling to the area as a destination there isn't enough parking for the current usage and there is significant congestion.
336	Most traffic comes from University down Sinclair. Village area should be kept around what we know as current village. Do NOT need to expand the 'lowlands of Cadboro Bay' as Northeastern Village.
337	I think this area is suited to 2-3 story housing units but not large apartment blocks.
338	The southern portion of this section is likewise unsuitable for high-rise development given the low elevation in combination with the make up of the ground.
339	would change the sense of community
340	I still don't see how traffic will work and why we need to really increase destiny as it will not be affordable... I didn't by a place here to have garden suites. Density should be in corridors as was discussed years ago and make Cadboro a place to visit
341	The proposal for over 4 story housing options is NOT suitable for any part of Cadboro Bay.

**Q10: Any comments about potential housing in the UVIC Edge area?**

Out of 874 respondents the total of 413 comments were provided.

No	Any comments about potential housing in the UVIC Edge area?
1	Maximum 6 flors to increase density without building huge high rises
2	This area is quite strip and the potential for taller building to dominate to skyline should be considered. Traffic on Sinclair is already busy, will new development include upgraded roads.
3	Rentals here will help students and UVic staff have more options within walking distance of campus. It will midigate transit overcrowding espeically as BC Transit can't find enough staff. Just please make a better sidewalk on Sinclar, which should happen regardless.
4	Being close to Frank Hobbs, UVic and the shops, this space is ideal for students and young families. Townhouses, row housing, and apartments/condos should fill this neighbourhood. There is still plenty of room for SFH in Queenswood and Ten Mile.
5	These streets provide a quiet buffer to the hundreds of children that attend Frank Hobbs and the 3 daycare/preschool facilities on either side. To increase density you would have massive traffic and parking issues and a safety risk for children. Do you know that many families use Sutton and Camelot for school parking and as a walking and biking route to get to these facilities? A small increase in density could be viable, but making this area 6 story mixed use commercial will absolutely lay waste to this entire neighbourhood. We do not need another commercial centre. Even calling it "UVic edge" is mislaeading as we are currently separated by four traffic turns from Mackenzie/Sinclair currently. Imagine if the property you've spent years developing for your family, with retirement plans to stay in place is utterly destroyed by city planners. This is not just a loss of view or a few extra neighbours - you are planning to make my street unliveable for single families. What gives you that power to drop a bomb on my family and neighbours entire way of life?
6	Would be a perfect place to house students at the undergraduate, graduate, and PhD levels, as well as staff and other professionals working at the campus
7	Above all, the land adjacent to the university, with its larger dorm facilities and proximity for students, should be considered a highly opportune zone for rental housing
8	Students make up a large percentage of this city, and its economy. Currently, there are not enough residences to go around for students, forcing many to seek out alternatives to UVic for their education. The risk of losing these students will harm everyone in this city. More housing must be built to accommodate them. Development here will improve land value as well as the quality of life for its current residents
9	We are in an extreme housing crisis. I would like to see series density allowed here as it is so close to the school and the dorms they have already constructed. building 4-12 stories seems good here.
10	Build more housing!
11	slightly better suitability for low rise and townhouses close to uvic where it's already got multi family. but I still don't believe we should destroy our area with high rises!
12	This area should really be zoned for pretty darn dense apartments and things. It's touching uvic! Just need to add better connectivity with those dead-end streets. As part of re-development and upzoning, get little strips of properties to form a more cohesive path network.
13	Absolutely no commercial or over 2 stories. It's a ludicrous plan. This is a school area and it

	will be very unsafe for the children
14	Definitely!
15	We desperately need more housing in this area.
16	Don't mind low-rise buildings in around village core (option1) as there are a few such buildings there already
17	The only area here that would make sense would be the existing commercial area on Sinclair Road.
18	as above
19	Lower income housing for UVIC students etc should occur either on UVIC grounds and/or near to UVIC on lower cost real estate. Looking to waterfront communities for lower income/higher density/higher housing is nonsensical and not sustainable. It just risks ruining the unique community that so many people cherish. The community is also sadly lacking basic infrastructure and support - eg doctors, healthcare, accessible clinics, parking etc. The proposals I've seen that contemplate 4 or 6 or even 8 and 10 story structures are absurd and very worrying. I am generally pro-development as all places evolve, but I've lived in places in the world that evolve/grow without logic and the character of the community is ruined (not just changed, but ruined and the place no longer becomes appealing). Consider only 2 or 3 story structures and look at the bigger picture for where lower income housing is more likely to flourish over time (not in a very expensive oceanside community)
20	I feel for the people who live here and don't want the change but I think higher density makes sense here. I worry it would turn in to a student ghetto if not designed properly though. Nice 5-6 stories makes sense for families that go to uvic and the surround schools who might have a lower income
21	This area is close to the school and only carriage/lane house/cottage type infill would be appropriate
22	This area already has the high-rises at UVic hovering over Sinclair and Evelyn Place. This area appears to be the one that is being punished by proposing 4-6 storey buildings. Can you imagine having a six storey building behind you, cutting out the sun, with people looking into your backyard. I am totally against the proposal, University Edge will be completely ruined.
23	Do not build tall towers here. Protect the tree canopy. Cap height to 4 story buildings. Need a plan to plan for traffic congestion as those streets all funnel out past Frank Hobbs elementary, Arbutus Grove preschool, and QA. A mix of low rise condos/apartments and duplexes/triplexes/garden homes would better preserve the neighbourhood feel.
24	We need more housing here, there's so many uvic students!
25	This seems the best option as it's close to the school for younger families. Not 6-8 stories though.
26	Traffic would be hideous, too many people and too little light. Not to mention the fact that up on a hill, it would look HUGE!
27	Some rental buildings as we head up to Uvic
28	Currently UVic edge houses many families with children. Increasing building heights there will negatively impact traffic/liveability/walkability
29	All the areas are very suitable, please limit parking to limit traffic and environmental impact
30	This area already high density due to uvic family, no more potential housing should be added in this area

31	most natural option, if it has to happen
32	The "UVic Edge" as defined here does not make any sense as a square, especially when there are roads that cannot be reached easily due to Frank Hobbs school fence. .
33	support up to 3 storey with townhouses, duplexes etc
34	Missing middle style development here would be ideal, and would help alleviate the student housing crisis
35	No through road and high pedestrian traffic on Sutton make this a poor location for high density, though duplexes/coach houses would fit well
36	No more then 4 stories and not in the proposed manner of rows and rows of condos.
37	Stop developing. Stop incentivizing developers for short term gain.
38	Placing housing closer to uvic makes sense
39	As a former parent of a child that attended Frank Hobbs Elementary school, there is no ability for the UVic Edge area to accommodate more traffic flow. Haro Road is already a bottleneck and it cannot take an increase in density. It would be unsafe for students and residents.
40	Yes, this is an excellent area for increasing density through vertical builds.
41	I support higher density and height along Finnerty rd area. Possibly down to Haro Rd. No further south.
42	Back to the draft
43	More housing, yes, but not taller than existing zoning. The question asks about more housing, i take ir the question should read "any questions about multiple story high density buildings"... If yoy dont ask clear questions the answers are irrelevant.
44	Extremely important - proximity to several schools, parks and soon to be upgraded Sinclair road.
45	Makes sense. Most people fail to understand that there is a road allowance at the west end.....the end of Camelot and Sutton.
46	Do not feel this area needs more density
47	Make sure there is lots of walking path connections, sidewalks, greenways, trees. Also ensure the charm of the area is maintained with developments that include peaked roofs, cedar shingles, proper setbacks, parking, tiered landscaping etc.
48	Its right by the water nothing about this will be affordable
49	This makes the most sense for a rental usage since it is close to the university and furthest from the beach. You don't want infill housing. To me it looks cheap and downgrades an area. Look at the new development on Iona drive area near UBC. Currently large lots with small houses. Now is the time to do it before homeowners put too much money into renovating and they would not be interesting in consolidating. Regardless these sites are under developed. Not sure what the density is but I have not seen new homes developed in this area. The interesting part is that insurance companies for homes only allow 4 people to be tenants plus one caretaker.
50	This area is should definitely not be considered. It is already busy and there is a huge high rise going up at UVic. 4 to 6 storey apartments and increased density would destroy this area. Please do not let this happen. Areas close to the ocean should be preserved, not have dense housing constructed there. New homes and apartments would not be affordable given land prices in Cadboro bay. I have to think that any push to increase density is really just a way for the municipality to collect more tax revenue at the expense of a beautiful area of Saanich. Please do not be short sighted and allow increased density and high rises to be

	built. This proposal is causing me sleepless nights and worry. I can't imagine how awful it would be to have a high rise behind me blocking out the sun, to say nothing of the increased traffic and noise. As it is, I have a rental beside me and the noise on summer evenings is unbearable.
51	Uvic has many other options to increase our housing. They've already built two new residential buildings that have over 700 students each. They have enough funding and property to continue to do this in a non-suburban area.
52	Use the land that is already being used for family housing. Tear those down and build condos there.
53	Too close to the school. Traffic already a concern there. These already have smaller single family homes that could accommodate garden suites. If you build up in this area it will tower over the school and lower parts of cadboro bay. Adjacent to haro and Howard woods - negative impact.
54	More housing near the university is important to support students
55	This makes a bit more sense due to its proximity to Uvic, but I think the other side of uvic (Mackenzie heading towards shelbourne makes way more sense!)
56	Absolutely inappropriate... use UVic property to build higher
57	This makes sense for additional density
58	There is enough housing available for students, we need for ppl with disabilities & 55 plus
59	Not at all suitable should remain current residential zoning
60	Townhouses and duplexes would make sense there. Nothing higher.
61	Ideal place for more townhomes; close commute to UVIC/bus routes and to the village.
62	I only support maximum height 3 stories with Sinclair's infrastructure being updated.
63	That's fine
64	Build in this area.
65	ensure multiple housing units are no higher than 4 stories
66	This would make the town center focused on the university and reduce the neighborhood feel. 8-10 storey buildings are too high. Having housing that would likely become dominated by university students adjacent to Frank Hobbs is not ideal.
67	Uvic has enough land to build housing if they want. I do not support demolishing single family residential to build high rises and town homes.
68	Best suited with current neighborhood environment
69	This area is too close to uvic making it a defacto "party zone" for 8 months of the year and a ghost town during the summer. Nobody will be happy due to noise from short term tenants. Duplexes that encourage longer term tenants/families (due to higher square footage) would be smart.
70	Given the proximity to transit, I feel this area is most suited to higher density. It is unlikely that anyone on a modest income who moved to CB would shop exclusively in the village. Providing increased density in the UVic Edge area would allow people to use transit or cycle (note- Saanich need MUCH BETTER cycling infrastructure) to University Heights for major shopping. Increased density in this area would also allow UVic employees and junior faculty to live near their work, thus reducing vehicle usage.
71	N appropriate location for duplex or row house development.
72	Townhouses would be great if there is room



73	Housing expansion should be in form of garden and basement suites and duplexes replacing single family homes
74	Very important to expand here - UVIC is a major contributor to economy and provides diversity. It makes no sense that Cadboro Bay currently has its "back turned" to UVIC - should be a whole vibrant area that includes the university, right down to Gyro Park.
75	Would you appropriate the existing homeowners?
76	This should remain residential single family homes. There is a need for family homes with yards, still.
77	No multi floor building. Maybe duplex or triplex, garden suites.
78	Limit to duplex
79	Great idea they need to travel less distance lessen carbon footprints
80	Leave it how it is. Do NOT develop this area whatsoever.
81	Greenspace of university should be open for multi uses , dog walkers, parks etc.
82	Why are you bringing forward new locations at the last moment when the LAP was 99% completed. This is disrespectful to the taxpayers/residents of Cadboro Bay who worked for hours over years to develop the plan. Now you want us to do it all over again. What changed?
83	This is my least favourite area of increased densification. I feel like this could lead to lots of congestion on Haro Road and Arbutus Road, as traffic would be funneled through there.
84	again do not want >3 stoery buildings
85	way too expensive to develop this hillslope. the construction costs will drive up the unit prices. it would be better to develop on the other side of UVic
86	NO WAY!
87	Living on Hobbs Street, this area should be done designated single family residential, as it stands
88	students; proximity to UVic transit hub for those who can't afford a car or whose lifestyle includes choosing to take transit to reduce their carbon footprint; older housing stock; little concern with existing views being blocked; proximity to school
89	See above, how will you increase essential services?
90	Having already removed the area on Arbutus which was designated to be for student housing, nothing has been done. Why does the University want to acquire more land when they already have taken ownership of this heavily wooded tract of land which residents of Cadboro Bay wanted preserved.
91	Too close to the school...1 road in, 1 road out.
92	If this is to help accommodate UVic students, then I think UVic should be involved in these discussions.
93	These homes were built with better materials, such as full dimensional solid lumber, than what is now often used (e.g. chipboard joists). More significantly, they're mostly owned by longtime residents who have invested in maintaining them to a high standard, including upgrades over the years. If and when Uvic needs more student housing or academic facilities, the university has plenty of terrain available within its own property.
94	The potential density will create huge traffic issues along Sinclair Road which is only slated to be a two lane road. Although no numbers have been released , potential of six story buildings could add up 5000 people to this area and possibly more! This will change the whole concept of the community as it has been outl8bed in the presen r LAP.

95	Once more, 6-storey apartment blocks are inappropriate, but 3-storey row houses would be acceptable. This area is closest to the UVic bus loop, and is still walking distance to the village core, so has the greatest potential for measured, tasteful, moderate densification.
96	Mostly townhomes only
97	The character of this area would be completely destroyed. Cost of housing would increase because of it's location
98	Development should be limited to duplex's and gardens suites. UVIC has more than enough land that they could develop if wish to expand student or staff accommodations (ie. dog park) (
99	Any changes should be at Uvic edge only. Uvic should be dealing with their own housing issue this is not a community issue..
100	I have lived on Camelot Rd for 12 years. During this time, many of the original owners have moved and young families have moved in. Rather than tear down the 1950 homes, the homes have been renovated and extensions built On tax assessments these homes have no value. In reality, they are beautiful homes with vegetable gardens, many with secondary suites. The neighbourhood is a community of seniors, school aged children from K to university and babies. Residents talk about what is happening on " the street " To tear down these houses is to destroy a strong multi aged community.
101	Close to transit and the university but a bit of a hike up and down the hill to retail amenities. This option would benefit from a new pathway along Penrhyn and through Frank Hobbs to facilitate active transportation.
102	Not suitable for tall buildings. Will cause overshadowing of the existing house and Frank Hobbs School. Also, safety and traffic issues. And it is a large slope - concern about earthquakes and safety of structures down slope.
103	Increase the commercial/retail zoning up there so there could be a really cute and useful university village.
104	More high density between Haro and Finnerty raods
105	I think this is an ideal area for 4 to 6 story residential buildings
106	Keep height to under 4 stories
107	Town houses, suites in existing houses, four-plexes and garden suites
108	See above
109	Similar comments to the last 2 - plus - Start focusing on our natural environment, which is being increasingly destroyed by every new development that Saanich moves forward with. Continue the way we are and with what is being presented for Candboro Bay, for Mackenzie & Shelbourne, and elsewhere in our city and across Canada, and it won't matter what you plan for low cost or rental housing, because we will no longer have an environment that sustains human life.
110	This area is definitely not appropriate for the type of development being proposed. There are already several rental houses with several people living in them. One of these houses is near where I live. The tenants are noisy and the police were there twice yesterday. The proposed development of rental units will exacerbate the situation.
111	Same vomments
112	no. this is not appropriate.
113	Rental units for students
114	Traffic would be dangerous

115	Secondary suites in single family homes.
116	Keep higher density away from village core i.e. move the boundary further to the west.
117	Not only would you be destroying an entire neighborhood, you would be meshing Uvic and Cadboro even more than it currently is. No longer is Cadboro bay a peaceful part of town but instead an extension of Uvic.
118	Leave these residents alone! Put housing in already densifying areas of Saanich - you know where those are. Leave us alone!
119	Again and aggressive forced choice aggression with no planning of development merit.
120	This is the location for increased density. Closer to student hub where affordable rental options are needed, closer to Shelbourne and Cedar Hill X Road, away from the beach and views to the beach which should be protected from the negative impact of taller built forms.
121	Strongly discourage any changes to the existing zoning and LAP direction. Strongly disagree that Single Family houses should be replaced by higher density solutions.
122	I can see the wisdom in having more housing near the major arteries such as McKenzie and Shelbourne and even Cedar Hill Cross Road west of Mt. Tolmie. The land presumably isn't as expensive, the tree canopy has already been compromised and the risk of flooding not an issue. No more than 3-4 storeys.
123	Again, my concern is with fewer height restrictions, not density.
124	As one climbs Sinclair hill the problems of the water level lessen and this opens up choices for increased density of accomodation.
125	great opportunity for student housing
126	The average retail worker or home care worker could easily be accommodated in Cadboro Bay if UVic had provided more housing for its students. Instead the students take whatever low rental units are available for however months they are at University then leave and the units to stand empty for part of the year. UVic, Instead of enrolling them without accommodation should be responsible in providing them with housing.
127	Same as North Eastern Section
128	rental housing is needed for UVIC students
129	I only support this if there is 200% off street parking
130	no
131	Haro Road should not have densification address it would not be good for the school safety
132	This area makes more sense as it approaches UVIC and moves away from the park.
133	No more development
134	Maybe, but no higher than 4 stories,
135	These are quiet residential streets with large trees and should be left as is. If there is a need for increased housing for UVic then UVic can utilize their own extensive properties including the dog park and property on Arbutus.
136	So close to UVic, to transportation and shopping in Shelbourne Valley, and to the beachside amenities. For the future of greater Victoria, we should be opening places to live in pleasant parts of the region, not just packing the "less fortunate" into the Douglas Corridor area while using exclusionary zoning in areas like Cadboro Bay to create preserves of wealth and homogeneity. The purpose of land use regulation should not be economic segregation.
137	Leave it as is...
138	See potential for increased density in UVic residences. Not increased height

139	Because the is already bordered by university housing and the campus it seems the area would be best suited. Also, the land here is slightly less expensive and could be better suited to variable income residences. But let's be very clear: affordability is not achieved by density. Developers might sell 10% of the first round at 10% below market but these will be bought by investors and quickly sold for market. Please consider densifying where the numbers make more sense: maple wood, cook st, feltham.
140	The UVic edge would likely cause less traffic issue than the Northeastern expansion. Again to encourage community allow buildings of 2-6 units.
141	More suitable than other areas for taller buildings and expansion.
142	same as the Northeast. 3 or 4 lots can becomes 8-12 3-story townhomes with mortgage helpers. More density on Sinclair and NO BIKES LANES ON SINCLAIR,
143	This is where rental units should be accommodated.
144	Away from rising water concerns and suited for students if rentals allowed
145	What's the partnership opportunity to build rental and student housing? For example, UVic is up to some shenanigans on the Cedar Hill Corner - "retaking the property line" with a fence (with no collaboration/consultation with the neighbours) so the goodwill between the university and residents is, to say the least, eroding (e.g. several residents work and campus and will have to drive, which makes the streets dirtier with pollution and more dangerous for our kids ... futher, multiple folks have said "maybe we just won't house students anymore!" in order to demonstrate power to the university, which reflects the need for better partnerships between the community and the university). Are they building towers at Cedar Hill Corner? Are they building research or teaching facilities? It's going to be one of the only parts of campus that is closed off to the public and, based on this plan, is totally incongruent to the Cadboro Bay neighbourhood outcomes.
146	Use University lands for that purpose like many universities have done.
147	I think this is where sensitively, sustainably designed higher density with a mix of apartments, townhouses, duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes could be best accommodated. Consideration for reducing traffic near schools would be important. Design could include such features as terracing buildings back to keep human scale at street level, development around green space courtyards linked by pedestrian paths away from roads, use of mass-timber construction, integration of natural elements
148	My concern with this area, is that most of those streets funnel onto Haro, and I would be worried about more traffic and congestion going past the elementary school and preschool - cars already ignore the posted speed limits/school zones and congestion is an issue at certain times of the day. Housing density in this area should be achieved through garden suites/suites/duplexes/townhomes.
149	too big an area. Right at the edge of Uvic family housing provides potential for similar housing with little impact on the community (except for the involved homeowners, of course) and along Sinclair near Uvic, but the rest of the Uvic edge is a nice, quiet neighbourhood.
150	Need so much more student affordable housing
151	I hope to see as much affordable housing built in this neighborhood as possible, at as low a price as possible to the renters. If Uvic edge is the best place to do it, develop away.
152	There is only one road into Frank Hobbs school and it is a dead end street that is very busy during school hours with traffic. Increased density along this corridor would be dangerous for the elementary school children who attend the school and also to the preschool children who are at Arbutus Preschool. This options was clearly not thought through

153	Any development in this area should not be included past Frank Hobbs Elementary as it is a dead end road into the school and preschool which is already incredibly busy
154	Single family neighbourhood appropriate for that area. UVic can consider building on it's David Lam land instead.
155	some small pocketsof potential for 3 storey higher density along sinclair. Still going to be \$1M + condos/townhouses
156	This could be suitable if done in consultation with UVIC however feel closer to Shelbourne is a more suitable location to avoid traffic congestion in Cadboro Bay Village
157	This is the only semi reasonable option. Proximity to transit hub is key. I don't agree with the premise of any of these options though if extreme heights being contemplated to satisfy developers. There are many better areas with lower land costs. Eg mcKenzie between UVic and Shelbourne, Mudguard area. Cadboro Bay is in a bowl and unsuitable for these type of extremely dense buildings on expensive land when so much cheaper land is available in Saanich.
158	Should promote private multi-family housing with shared facilities similar to dorms for students
159	Keep the housing low level. No higher than three stories. Stop pandering to developers
160	This would nicely complement the other side of the street of the University of Victoria
161	Not appropriate
162	See above
163	This is a single family housing area that is not appropriate for apartment or condo building.
164	This area makes sense for a bit more density. Close to the university and schools more families may like this area. The roads have been narrowed though and this will create traffic problems.
165	I suspect this area was chosen by the planners as a sacrifice to protect other areas of the village from development and uproar. If UVIC requires more housing then they should first develop their own lands that currently sit idle. Saanich should be pushing the university to develop housing options on their own properties before voting to increase density in bordering neighborhoods. While out of sight from the rest of the Village, the 6 story condos proposed would increase the local population significantly and put too much pressure on the roads, facilities, beach in the area.
166	Established neighborhood with an Elementary school.
167	This should be obvious. Housing near the university should be as dense as the geography allows.
168	Great location for families and students, keeps traffic out of current village, not the best for seniors due to elevation (not easy walk for seniors), senior housing best close to the village..
169	Rental housing for students would be much appreciated. Again some retail on the main would be nice.
170	Nope.
171	There are few areas to develop here. Sinclair road can only take so much volume even if improved. A high rise would present parking problem. We already have family housing. There is such density of traffic when AM andPM pickups at school occurs. There is no way to get out of sub division. I do not think that breaking up single family dwellings to put up 4 to 6 stories of housing which will just increase traffic and parking. Too much density bring s problems into area. I lived in Central Saanich near a high density low income housing.

	problems.
172	Should be low - density and keep the feel of the current neighbourhood. More parks, community gardens, Naturescaping, carriage houses not townhouses
173	should be considered but current problem here is street access.(only exit is Haro at Arbutus) ,, opening Haro to Sinclair at top of Sinclair hill is much too dangerous blind spot..
174	In addition to affecting many current Cadboro Bay residents, this development would be detrimental to Haro Woods and the bird and plant species that it provides habitat for. It would also lead to serious traffic congestion in the school area. There are congestion issues now. It would not be a walkable area for the 75+ year olds that the plan describes accomodating. The hills is fairly strenuous, even when taking the route through the school yard.
175	Luxury senior housing allowing Caddy bay residents to sell their homes and relocate to walkable Caddy bay village and beach.
176	Where is that eastern boundary? Would it intrude onto invaluable green space?
177	slope stability
178	Inviting more students and faculty into the community would be super.
179	Now the safety area around Frank Hobbs school is being compromised!
180	Parts of this area could be made higher density, but there is a lot of variation from block to block. No way 6 stories would work; even 3 stories would be unworkable in parts of the area.
181	Best option keeping traffic flow closer to UVIC traffic
182	It would make the family beach less family friendly/more of a party stop
183	UVIC Edge should stop at Haro road and Frank Hobbs southern boundary.
184	As per above, leave Cadboro Bay alone and increase density on the Shelbourne corridor
185	Keep heights to 4 story no higher
186	Don't approve
187	Cadboro bay village is already home to many UVIC students. No room for more.
188	restrict height to 4 stories
189	This area we would like to see developed , but away from Maynard Park. So shifting the development area to the left a block or two.
190	Same as above
191	UVIC is driving this agenda, not those living there, who voiced their outrage over it at the online LAP Q&A. It would be a subsidization of UVIC, whose expansionist model has had their population increase by 2000, over the last 2 years, which is in comparison half the entire population of Cadboro Bay.
192	Higher buildings would change the character of the community village significantly.
193	This area would possibly be more suitable for densification
194	Right next to the elementary school AND a preschool, a HIGH foot traffic area for young children. Densification is NOT appropriate here
195	Maximum four floors
196	This is where student accommodation should go
197	ridiculous
198	Low density and low heights. Maintain village characteristics. Build higher density on Shelbourne which already can support more people.

199	I do not think this is a good area for increased housing density. It is hard to build there and there would be too many trees taken down. This area is a protective shield for the village as it is now. It protects the village from the noise of the university. NO TREES TAKEN DOWN PLEASE!!!
200	Tall development in the UVic edge will lead to VERY congested traffic on Sinclair and on MacKenzie to the west. Saanich a few years ago explicitly planned to reduce and disincentive traffic in this area by REMOVING traffic lanes along MacKenzie - - it appears that adding density would now be a complete U-turn from Saanich's previous planning to service this area. The LAP which was developed over years with community input did consider more housing through ground-orientated options. Suddenly Saanich presented a Hobbesian choice of 10 story buildings in three options. This "tall" option cannot be supported. The Saanich option would amount to having the tallest buildings in Saanich all congregated in a quiet neighbourhood that lacks some basic infrastructure (bus, sidewalk, lighting, pedestrian safety and crosswalks, storm drainage) and is at its limits regarding other infrastructure (power outages, water supply rate and pressure, sewage, parking). The entire area is in or near modelled sea-level rise zones. The soils for building are difficult at best (rocky or silty). This UVic edge area has a lot of very steep land that developers may love because of the great views to the bay, but that would lead to especially bad overshadowing of properties to the east and north and may pose difficulties regarding soils and slopes stability. Please remember that Saanich is prone to earthquakes and could experience soil slumps / failures and earthslides.
201	Not suitable in any way. The area is fine as it is
202	UVIC has its own territory. Cadboro Bay should not be responsible to house their students.
203	Very upsetting to those who live there. No! Leave the residents there alone.
204	same comments as 5 & 6
205	increased height is undesirable; some additional density via low-rise townhouses may be ok
206	This area is not homogenous. Some borders on vital green space and wildlife space. A blanket density increase doesn't seem appropriate.
207	Living in this area, I know it well and am completely opposed to increased height of buildings and densification beyond that proposed in the Draft Local Area Plan. This is a quiet neighbourhood where many homes have been significantly renovated or rebuilt. It has a wide range of demographics - including increasing numbers of young families with children, older adults and seniors as well as students who occupy suites in many homes. I suggest that our current neighbourhood is more likely to have affordable housing options for students than new apartment buildings. To allow 4-6 storey housing units with commercial use in our neighbourhood would destroy its very fabric. It would negatively impact the environmental integrity of the area where there are dozens of large trees and much wildlife. It would increase traffic which would not be compatible with the need for safe transportation to Frank Hobbs School and the two adjacent day care centres on Haro Road. This area is already influenced by the high density of student housing at UVic. Just because we are on the "edge" of Cadboro Bay does not mean the solution to higher density should be foisted on us, or that the ugliness of apartments should be hidden by "tucking them away" in our neighbourhood. The idea that a new commercial centre could be created next to UVic is unnecessary and threatens the current Village Centre by diluting the customer base. I am deeply concerned that the proposed radical changes in zoning for this area will completely destroy my neighbourhood.
208	Who wants this? UVIC? Or the locals? It's obviously not the locals.

209	This is more plausible. Regular Shuttles to schools ? Rental housing for families only? We don't need high end housing. It must be affordable for working families. Include a community health center? What is the traffic planning? Community gardens? Play areas? Walkability? Walk to village, shuttle back?
210	Same as above.
211	Same comments as above.
212	added units would help with housing UVic students.
213	Fantastic spot for a tower or large development
214	Terrible idea. UVIC can build student housing on their ample land. We don't need to destroy this lovely family focused neighborhood.
215	Ensure affordable rental housing is included form students. Consider bike and pedestrian access but also remember we have wet cold winters and people need cars, public transport and that means so cars for vehicles too including lots of parking.
216	There is room for increased density but it would be crucial to improve roadways in the area. Sinclair is a shabby mess now. There will be many more pedestrians in the area and it's difficult to walk across Sinclair. Pedestrian s need a proper traffic light at Cadboro bay @Sinclair. NOT A ROUNDABOUT
217	This should not happen as it does not reflect the intention of those home owners original conception of their neighbourhood
218	Same comments as earlier 1. No higher than 4 stories 2. Are you planning to displace all the people who currently live there?
219	Same comments as above - these are small, low traffic, quiet neighborhood streets that cater to families and the schools within the area. Adding density here will result in overpopulated streets and commuting, as well as a potential degradation in residents of the area.
220	Housing for students as well! So good.
221	Keep with the existing Draft Plan, which was agreed upon in 2021, before the Housing Committee interfered, trying to force a completely different set of options on the Cadboro Bay community.
222	See above. For Pete's sake, do you really think people living in multi million dollar single family homes are going to be happy. They certainly won't vote for a council that does this to them!
223	More townhome and co op rental options
224	As this area is higher elevation and visible from the surrounding area, redevelopment should include large tree planting to maintain viewsapes.
225	This area is too close to two (potentially three) preschools and one elementary school. The increased traffic will be unsafe for children and families. I also have concern about UVic students living in a condensed manner off-campus. Younger adults are learning how to be good neighbours but there is huge potential for conflict with living with families. Party situations with large quantities of alcohol and drugs do not mix well with young families.
226	Maximum 6 storey height
227	Yes UVIC Edge area is more suitable for higher density than down near the village center and beach area.
228	in favor of in-fill housing, basement suites, duplex (&3plex, 4plex) housing, some low-rise housing
229	This is the only area in Cadboro Bay with any possibility for higher density, rental and low



	income housing may work. Although still not ideal with looking at Saanich as a whole, it makes some sense for UVic students and other potential rental and higher density living.
230	Uvic can build on their own land to increase house. But not in R 1 areas.
231	UVic has plenty land to build their own housing needs without ruining a quiet residential area
232	Supports student rental
233	Utilize some of Frank Hobbs school fields for densification.
234	By its proximity to UVic this area may have more potential for some multi-unit developments, to help support much needed housing for the university community.
235	Just that a lot of the properties between Cedar Hill X Road, Crestview, are owned by very senior aged people or their grandchildren and might make for a better area of densities housing. UVIC Edge is only good due to acquisition costs, the new pump station Haro Woods neighbouring Queen Alexandra Hospital grounds. Looking sing that changes the whole of what makes this area idyllic
236	Stick to 2021 LAP. Garden suites, duplex maybe. Nothing over 2 stories!
237	Same comment again. Area drawn too broadly. Highly suitable for increased housing density closest to U Vic edge -- along Sinclair and immediately adjacent to present U Vic family housing, less so elsewhere.
238	Against "potential housing in the UVIC Edge area.
239	I live in this area and this was not part of the original plan. I find this change disturbing as there was no interest in this area until the June 2022 meeting. Is this a sign of other quick changes that may come down the road?
240	just what land is available there? until Sinclair Rd is fixed increased traffic in area a recipe for disaster
241	At the SW end, adjacent to UVic, 3 - 4 storey buildings may work but my previous comments apply elsewhere
242	This area is best suited for higher density and even mixed use development, particularly along Sinclair and across from UVic.
243	Best option by far.
244	The Sinclair side of the hill might accommodate some increased height without inflicting buildings as an eye sore. Trees and greener need protection. How would land be procured??
245	Nothing higher than 3 stories
246	I am sure the people currently living in this area are going to be very excited about having their neighborhood taken over by multi-level high density housing. Proposed density increases will completely change the character of this area.
247	not appropriate
248	This is a better area to increase density
249	We strongly disagree with increasing density and the height of buildings. The University has plenty of property along Henderson road, which is a larger road to handle traffic. Also, it is not a single family home area. Suggest that should the University wish to expand it look in that direction, rather than altering the residential neighbourhood that is Cadboro Bay.
250	We strongly disagree with increasing density and the height of buildings. The University has plenty of property along Henderson road, which is a larger road to handle traffic. Also, it is not a single family home area. Suggest that should the University wish to expand it look in that direction, rather than altering the residential neighbourhood that is Cadboro Bay.

251	The area labelled the 'UVic Edge' (conveniently excluding all the families living in UVic family housing in our neighbourhood) is a neighbourhood. It is filled with young families, seniors, students and multi-generation homes. Most people here have worked hard and sacrificed to be able to live here because of the beautiful natural environment. People want to live here because this is a quiet family neighbourhood filled with giant trees and wildlife. Many have secondary suites so they can afford their mortgages and taxes. This is an area that suits garden suites, two storey homes and duplexes but NOT 4-6 storey buildings. As a homeowner and resident of the UVic Edge, I am vehemently opposed to the re-zoning of this area to 4-6 storey commercial mixed-use housing. It would destroy the safety of the neighbourhood with an elementary school and daycares at both ends. UVic is currently building large student housing buildings and has plans for more. Other high-density building is occurring at McKenzie and Shelbourne, where there is infrastructure to manage the high density. Do not destroy this beautiful area by allowing the building of over-priced condos that no one in the neighbourhood, especially not the families, would be able to afford. Below market housing is still out of reach for most people. Find areas where land is less expensive and create partnerships with not-for-profits to build true affordable housing.
252	Stop it right now. This community has been under attack by UVic since 2012. Seriously - we are not anyone's Edge, we are a community that shares many natural elements and a sense of pride. We have been a consistent advocates for these natural areas in our small community since the 70's. About the time UVic started expecting the 'external' to solve all of their housing needs wanted Saanich to house their students, when UVic has ample space to provide housing on the main campus. They have underdeveloped land along McKinzie and Finnerty - on both sides that would include the DL Family centre and along Gordon Head at Cedar Hill X Rd. The intention of UVic back in the day was to house all of their students and not rely on the municipality. Now we are living under threat of becoming UVic's bedroom community and forced out of family homes. Many residents who worked their entire life time to own a home in neighbourhoods in the community. No hand outs. Purse sweat equity for many who wanted to protect something important and leave it to their children. What is the point of destroying a community to accommodate the University? UVic changed McKenzie Avenue 2012 Finnerty Rd to start Spring 2013 UVic Roundabout Feb 2012 UVic Parkade Sept 2012 UVic CARSA Construction to be completed by 2015 UVic purchases Sister's of St. Anne Queenswood land for Campus now being developed. Cadboro Bay residents have been under assault for 10 years. Nature and humans are once again being attacked by the University of Victoria.
253	Perfect section for high rises, perhaps upto 6 storeys; good density for U of Vic students
254	Best option for rentals to accommodate UVic students
255	An odd choice of name. This is not a part of UVIC and the locals who have voiced much opposition to this, should be the only voices considered.
256	This makes the most sense given its proximity to the university imho
257	leave it alone.
258	Maybe a better location as access in and out could be easier to accommodate
259	Not in Cadboro Bay, please.
260	See 6)
261	Makes total sense to increase density and walk ability for faculty and students
262	no
263	see previous comment

264	The area completely lacks the necessary infrastructure to support this concept.
265	The section of this area which is near Sinclair and adjacent to UVic already has a significant component of formal and informal student housing and could be densified somewhat with low-rise rental accommodation
266	Lots of green space for kids to play in. Don't cram them into high rise accommodations. It's not healthy for them.
267	UVIC is addressing housing with it's new highrises on campus which are already a blight on the landscape!
268	This is a small residential area where th allowance of 4-6 story units would destroy the essence of the neighbourhood. The proximity to UVic does not in actuality offer significant potential increase in number of affordable student housing. This area is adjacent to UVic family housing which is mostly in the townhouse format.
269	Considering this area is within walking distance to UVIC it seems like rental housing aimed towards students would be ideal to encourage. I'd love to see this area be higher density, relieving surrounding areas from some of the student demand and concentrating a population that uses more transit closer to an existing, necessary transit hub.
270	This area is UVic family housing and other single family houses. I don't see where you could really add too much, except maybe some backyard suites.
271	Any changes other than adding Garden/laneway houses or duplexes and in house suites will change the character of the entire Village area. There MAY be options to allow higher density along Sinclair Road, but would need to be looked at very carefully, with those residents affected closely involved.
272	UVic has high density housing and office use. This is where Cadboro Bay is actually pulling it's weight when it comes to higher density affordable housing. It's simply not true that we are not doing our part so stop criticizing us!
273	I think this is the most natural continuation of the village and offers the best fit for the character of Cadboro Bay
274	This would be reasonable; and makes sense given the immediate proximity to UVIC.
275	IN ORDER TO SUPPORT THE EXPANSION OF UVIC I AGREE WITH HIGHER DENSITY IN THIS AREA. I OWN THE HOUSE ACROSS FROM UVIC FAMILY HOUSING AND THE AREA IS SUPRISINGLY QUIET. INCREASE THE STUDENT POPULATION IN THIS AREA MAKES SENSE.
276	No apartments or condo developments over 2 stories
277	This is the best area to expand the village. I could see this becoming the next cook street village
278	I think this has the most potential because of the geography and relatively cheaper houses
279	Not suitable for more housing
280	Yes, okay toward UVIC but being mindful and considerate of existing single family home streets. Nothing higher than 2-3 stories. Duplex or triplex okay.
281	If you absolutely have to build 100s of units somewhere in Cadboro Bay, then this is at least the least bad option, as it is near the University, where thousands of people study or work. (And high rises there at least can't look any worse than the UVic residence buildings just built, that look like a depressing grey prison with tiny windows preventing any escape...Please at least insist they look more inviting than those high rises...
282	Worst option. This is a slope. Quiet streets. These are the most moderately priced single family home properties in cadboro bay and you would be taking that away. Would destroy this neighbourhood.

283	Clearly the person who came up with this idea doesn't have children that went to Frank Hobbs Elementary. This street is a poop show 80% of the week so terrible idea to plopp more people here too. Again, a happy single family normal neighbourhood where hard working people selected to buy their homes. Rental and higher density? Stop!!!
284	I would like to see the east side of Gordon Head road developed between McKenzie and Cedar Hill X and the old Dog Park on Cedar Hill X. Uvic is a major user of rentals. Also the the UVic family housing could be densified. Financially these options are viable as it is UVic/Public land
285	Again, owners of these relatively small lots should not suffer a reduced standard of living, just because some misguided people want to accommodate demand from outsiders to live here.
286	If density is to increase, I think it would be fundamental to maintain the existing green space around Frank Hobbs, the Arbutus Grove daycare centre as well as the entirety of Haro Woods Park as it exists currently. It is crucial for citizens to have a variety of green spaces to use in their neighbourhood (potentially reducing carbon gases in seeking similar less manicured green spaces further outside the city limits) not just manicured park lands.
287	This is the best area to build the regions housing. It will not block views, there is more land, they houses are not as old Close to Frank Hobbs and Campus view. Supports the university.
288	It's mostly UVic students that want small rental units. Put them close to uvic if you have to
289	Only along upper Sinclair road. The rest is residential neighbourhoods that should remain as they are
290	I think that area may work for having suites and some houses ( no condos or apartments!!!!) might develop and become bigger.
291	NO - Beige area only!
292	no higher than six stories please
293	This area is most appropriate due to the proximity to the existing transit hub at UVic.
294	I do not support the densification of housing in the UVIC Edge area
295	Uvic has its own market. Cadbury bay and the surroundings feel right with mainly single dwelling homes
296	The old house stock term that I have heard used is not accurate. This is inappropriate for 4 to 6 storey development. The roads can't accommodate the additional traffic required for the additional density
297	Currently great transportation hub at UVIC denser housing with limited parking, residents at UVIC edge would or could utilize UVIC transportation. More people need more schools. UVIC Edge is close to middle and high school.
298	Not necessary--who benefits???
299	Already crammed with many students per house. These students are a part of our community and deserve housing plentiful enough near UVic for them to live comfortably and in the arrangements that suit them, instead of having no choice but to accept overcrowded single family homes
300	This is probably the best area at the new housing and mixed use development as it would be the backdrop to the village
301	We all know we need more housing. This is the place!
302	Same comment. We are all residents and not experts in determining suitability.
303	If it means expropriation of homes it's not suitable.

304	It seems this idea is to accommodate more students for the University and would be an eyesore to entering Cadboro Bay Village. It would also be disruptive for current residents who live nearby.
305	There is certainly potential up on the flat where existing UVic housing stands but would be very difficult on the steep slope of Sinclair Hill.. The entrance/exit should definitely not open onto Sinclair Road. Also there is a group of new houses on the slope on the north side which have been built within the last ten years so it would be extremely wasteful to replace them in the next 50 years.
306	This is a family oriented community with lot of kids. It should be kept as is
307	There isn't any.
308	Not above three storeys
309	nothing above three storeys
310	It seems essential to support students and their families with providing them affordable housing near UVic
311	This area is totally not suitable to increased height or density. The focus of any increase in either height allowances or density increases should be in the core area, incorporated into the shopping complex of stores.
312	Back to the draft LAP
313	Housing heights no taller than the tallest tree in the area.
314	Along Sinclair Rd and at the top of the hill, more housing (especially rentals for students), would be appropriate. Within this area, I would apply the same constraints as I mentioned for the Northeastern area.
315	Let's get some variety in people living here. Homeless are settling in very nicely in Regina, among several communities
316	As above
317	Traffic issues with elementary school and 3 daycares
318	A much better option. UVic itself has dense housing and higher building structures. The location, flow, continuity, aesthetics, and architectural integrity makes sense. However, 6-story buildings do not belong surrounding an elementary school where parents bought into the community as is. It's unfair to create a semi-urban surrounding to a suburban school setting. Further - and I make no claims either way - I would be curious about crime stats with low income housing. If it is not worse, then it isn't a factor and it wouldn't be fair to be exclusive of low income families. If it is, the practical reality needs to be factored into the planning.
319	Density has to go somewhere in Caddy Bay and this is the spot
320	Still only max 3 stories and close to UVic
321	Dangerous auto and pedestrian access and egress
322	Specific but only up to 3 stories
323	Streets right next to UVic could have additional density .
324	This area should be developed, it could provide a number of spaces for young families close to local schools. It could also help with housing students close to UVic which would help ease some of the burdens on rentals for families in other areas of Victoria
325	Small development of 2-3 story truly affordable family-oriented townhouse or cluster housing co-op would be ideal near elementary school.
326	Increased density with no consideration of SinclairRoad capacity is very worrisome

327	Only streets immediately adjacent to UVic should have higher buildings, other density options of duplexes basement apts granny flats townhouses within residential streets.
328	This area has greater potential for higher density, particularly on the areas abutting UVic. Again, nothing over 4 stories would be supported closer to the Village. Also concerned about the liquefaction properties of this area.
329	People already own homes in this quiet community area. Are they to give up their homes for profit of someone else?
330	Same as before. Some suites, some carriage houses. No apartments.
331	NO. No more taking down trees. This area will not sustain what you are planning.
332	see comments on question 9, same comment
333	best area for Uov Vic rentals
334	Excess density in this area should be reserved for townhouses to help preserve leafy feeling that surrounds a village now. It is not appropriate for high-rise.
335	Height restrictions
336	Re do the family housing area. Another area taken away from Cadboro Bay. Used to cross that field going to school.
337	UVIC has lots of property along Henderson., which is already a busy road. It should not encroach on this residential community
338	UVIC should not expend in this direction. They have plenty of property in busier areas that can be used rather than changing the community they boarder
339	As in #8 above
340	This is the best area for medium density (4-6 floors) and higher density! Even better than the village honestly. Maybe a light touch in the village and then focus new housing and commercial development here.
341	Best area for rentals for U of Vic students
342	The expansion should be confined to the area west of Haro Road.
343	Same idea. Allow in fill within current housing.
344	better area but still don't want increased height of buildings
345	There is an incredibly steep slope here. That portion would be ideal for selling high-priced real estate but absolutely unsuitable for tall buildings or dense development, because of the earthquake risk and because of how unsightly it would be, especially if projects go in piecemeal without an overall view of conformity (which is usually how these things have happened in the past, viz. the apartment housing clustered along the cliffs beyond the Wedgewood Estates).
346	this area is higher ground, outside liquifaction zone.
347	From a sea level rise perspective, this area makes the most sense.
348	Town House, Duplex Tripex, Garden Suite
349	No suitable for more density or high rises. Leave the neighbourhood alone.
350	Family and student suitable rentals. Owned by city/university or at least strict rent controls
351	I am adamantly opposed to increasing density in this well established neighbourhood.
352	This is by far the best solution, provided there are walkways, stairs (a funicular for elderly folk? - not out of the question) and green pathways, including bike lanes, stroller lanes, etc. It has much less impact on the character of the Village plus more possibility for considering parking as a part of the plan. Devoting part of the Village to parking is not in keeping with

	the wishes of many.
353	Probably more suitable as UVic is pushing for more housing for students and staff.
354	This option is the least intrusive.
355	Not suitable
356	These is the potential to have units of 3 stories or less here but one needs to be mindfull of the traffic issues created by increased density in particular near Frank Hobbs school.
357	THIS DIVIDING OF THE FOUR RIDICULOUS OPTIONS IS AN EFFORT DIVIDE US. GO AWAY AND LEAVE US ALONE!
358	This is a vibrant neighbour hood that does not need low rise housing
359	Not suitable. We can't take the increased density. Caddy Bay is already to busy with visitors and current residents.
360	The least bad out of a number of 3 very bad locations for high rise buildings
361	Similar town houses or low level aparty
362	4-6 stories along Sinclair is the max; you must protect the tree canopy and Haro Woods from degradation.
363	If the housingwereto be more than 3, maximum 4 stories high it would really ruin the approach to the seaside aspect of the village.
364	Allow subdivision of any lots >10,000 square feet, rather than stuffing in large buildings and condos . ALL parking MUST be OFF STREET!
365	This is a neighborhood of single-family houses for the most part, but with a lot of student rentals. There are many residences on the campus. Higher density is not appropriate here. Higher density needs to go near i) malls, stores, and services,, ii) transit and arteries, and where there is the infrastructure to allow it work. Not in regular neighborhoods. In addition, the land value will make any rentals very expensive - thus you will not address the cost of housing, but only attract out-of-town buyers. The local demographics clearly show that this nieghborhood is desirable for retirees. It will not help the local housing crunch if you bring in more people
366	UVic is already over-building with its giant new residents. It is not Saanich's role to focus on UVic accomodation so this should be varied types of housing.
367	As long ad this is not taken over by UVic housing. UVic is alrady overbuilding the ruining the ring round with too much housing density (expect more rowdy student parties).
368	On the edge of the campus and closer to shops...great area to add density to to add more of a continuum
369	Uvic has enough land to build rentals
370	There isn't sufficient access to deal with existing school and residential traffic. Let UVIC develop their own lands.
371	tall buildings are being built on Shellbourne and would keep in that area.
372	see comment above
373	Not enough land to redevelop. All taken by homes! And should probably be kept that way.
374	Again any new building should be restricted to two stories to fit the village feel.
375	Keep it close(r) to UVic
376	Closest to a transit hub. Somewhat lower land values "might" support affordable housing and purpose built rentals. However this option needs to be discussed further street by street.
377	none

378	This area is closer to UVIC and seems to be a more suitable area. I would not want to see changes to the elementary school grounds.
379	Realistically this increase in potential housing is probably a necessity.
380	I am guessing that the U of Vic has some interesting thoughts on your plans? They are likely not interested in any new development
381	This is a more suitable area to increase height/density as it is closer to UVic and is a less congested area than village centre
382	Better area than 2 prior, closer to UVic & less congested
383	No structures above 4 stories should be permitted in this area.
384	No building should exceed 4 stories!
385	perhaps UVIC could add more housing to its own property instead of advocating for extra housing outside of its boundaries.
386	This is close to the suitability in the Cadboro Core, however, I like to stress the need for the need for different types of housing and that high-rise are not the only option. Please do not allow Cadboro Bay to have multiple-unit apartments. I would move away.
387	2-4 plex townhomes. Perhaps some 4-6 storey condos .....affordable housing for students and low income workers.
388	Uvic has a large land bank and it is Uvic's responsibility to plan and construct adequate student housing and not to shift the responsibility to Cadboro Bay community. It should take a page from UBC's approach to student housing.
389	The logical choice for development and increased density.
390	Single family houses only
391	In a capitalism based economy and real estate environment, if people want to own a home in one of Canada's inheritances, they need to obtain adequate education and skills training to earn incomes that can support buying premium real estate. Sorry, but that's the deal, folks. Of course the Victoria area needs to facilitate housing for people with a range of incomes in various service occupations. Bulldozing long established post WW2 neighbourhoods is NOT an acceptable option. Saanich Council members who disrespect the emotional, family attachment and long tenure of the homeowners who have been proudly maintaining and updating their Cadboro Bay properties, are insulting this community. The appropriate development lands within the tight confines of our capital region, bounded on three sides by the ocean, are limited and ultimately will be filled up. Obviously, expansion westward, as is occurring, will become the ONLY option. To paraphrase Clint Eastwood: "A [council] has to know its limits."
392	Uvic has lots of accommodations in the works and the noise and traffic of additional saanich student focused housing is not what the majority of local residents want
393	UVic has nowhere near exhausted it's land base on campus for more housing. It should use that first.
394	Students struggle to find affordable housing
395	Such housing in this area would not respect the area's established character and local identity. Moreover the is area is physically separate from the village hub.
396	Cadboro Bay should not be building with a view to housing students. UVic has just built two large residences. However, if any density in the area is desirable this should be the area - to a maximum of 3 or 4 stories.
397	This seems the most logical place for growth, close to the existing village and other community assets like UVic, Frank Hobbs and parks



398	I am more supportive of density here than anywhere else in Caddy Bay
399	This area presents the best opportunity to match the demand and supply in terms of location. Students and faculty constitute significant demand, and desire to be close to campus.
400	This is single family and not suitable for tall buildings. Any development needs to keep with the character of the neighbourhood which means 2 storeys or less.
401	I am only in favor of increasing density with 2 story town houses, secondary suites and garden suites. NOT highrises.
402	Better suited to high density increased accommodation for students and general population
403	Uvic already has extensive amount of un used property!
404	u vic should keep their housing on main campus
405	Cadboro Bay Village should not be an extension of the University but should be its own entity.
406	To me, an expansion of building height and density in Cadboro Bay is best met through this option. More affordable housing options are likely to bring in families, and intensified residential development in this area is best positioned with respect to schools. In addition the ease of access that it offers to many buses at the UVic transit hub might induce a greater share of new residents in Cadboro Bay to use the transit system rather than rely on a car. As well, increasing housing next to UVic seems to provide opportunities to increase community use of a great set of existing facilities. The houses in this area are largely of the same "mature stock" vintage and might be more easily acquired than existing homes in neighbourhoods that have a mix of older and newer developments. Finally, taller buildings up the hill might not face quite as much pushback from neighbours as ones proposed lower down as there is probably less of a view that stands to be blocked by new development on top of the hill.
407	The eastern portion of this section is unsuitable for high-density and high-rise development as the steep slope of sinclair road and the section to the north are susceptible to slope degradation which is not only a concern to any new potential developments but the existing homes and properties as well.
408	Oldest stock it seems, seems the better chance for decent priced housing
409	already full of houses, use garden suites and secondary suites
410	Again makes no sense.. keep density to the corridors and where major roads are to accept the traffic
411	Support housing Haro Road area towards Shelbourne.
412	The proposal for over 4 story housing options is NOT suitable for any part of Cadboro Bay. The proposal of 4-8 or up to 10 storeys has come out of the blue and would have a devastating impact on the community and neighborhood. University edge is a place that is full of children walking safely to and from school, home to owls and birds who rely on the trees (that large buildings would end up taking down), and the light would be limited by the height of the buildings. The increased density could have a devastating impact on Haro and Goward Woods - areas that people have worked hard to protect. Increased density that is being proposed in this area would lead to increased traffic (the types of apartments proposed would NOT be affordable to students, and those who could afford them would also inevitably be able to afford cars). As a side note- there would be more rental housing in the area in the forms of suites and garden suites had Saanich approved those ideas earlier (it was not easy to put a suite in a decade ago).

413	I don't think that housing in that area should be changed other than a duplex when a lot becomes available
-----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Q20: Do you have anything else you would like to share?

Out of 874 respondents the total of 443 comments were provided.

No	Do you have anything else you would like to share?
1	Not impressed with the way Saanich has gone about this latest diversion . Council members will get punished next election for not respecting residents wishes .
2	People bought here for the neighborhood it is today. We know development happens but this is a money grab from saanich. There are lots of other areas just on the other side of uvic that suit these big buildings snd cheaper land. McKenzie from Uvic to quadra. All of blenkinsop - nobody uses that land for farming (or few). Yet you allow McMansions to be built instead of developing into a new community.
3	Seems like the Village Core should be developed first to see if there's even enough interest in increased housing in the overall area. I don't support mixed commercial use in the UVic area as I feel it's too close to the school to bring in busy commercial traffic.
4	Cadbro bay went through an extensive LAP in the past year, Saanich should not be "reinventing the wheel" to accommodate developers desires. Increased housing density should be accompanied by increases in infrastructure to accommodate the proposed population increase. School capacity, transit capacity etc. Many people live in Cadbro Bay because the chose to live in a village type setting. With current building costa, inflation and labour shortages, to presume to build anything "affordable" to the average family is wishful thinking. While there is a market for downsizing from houses to condos for some current residents of the area most of the new residents under the increased density proposed will be high net worth people from outside of the area. The current redevelopment at University Heights and UVIC are already going to increase traffic and population in the area.
5	Although the existing housing stock in the Cadbro Bay Area is older, many of us chose these homes for exactly that reason. The planners and developers assumptions that we would all want to tear down our character homes for newer options is incorrect. I would also like to suggest that Saanich follow the example of Victoria and require any homes being torn down be required to recycle as much material as possible rather than taking everything to the landfill.
6	Cadboro Bay already has decent mix of shops and restaurants, meaning new residents can make many trips on foot
7	If we don't build denser and up, families won't be able to afford to continue to live here. They also won't be able to afford to move here. Without young people and working professionals, the village dies.
8	I literally cannot sleep and have spent hours crying over this. My husband and I have invested our lives into this property on Sutton Rd. with plans to build a garden suite for our retirement (and renting our main house). We have sacrificed for years (only owning one vehicle, very limited vacations in local areas, limited spending on entertainment, etc.) to ensure that we could build a "forever" life for ourselves on this street. I just don't understand how you can just destroy all of that without ever consulting us. All previous designs did not include any changes to Sutton, Camelot and Evelyn and we were absolutely ambused by these new plans. Have you ever even walked these streets? Particularly on school days? Please, please, stop this insane idea.
9	Mixed use buildings are important for creating community and destination. Transit oriented living is also important - many people could live here without the need for a car, especially so if active transport and bus transit is maintained and enhanced in the area (I understand

	bike lanes are being put in soon!)
10	Housing is like food, to have a relative abundance of it than a relative dearth of it is an unambiguous and obvious good in society. One does not need input as to whether eating is a good thing or not, we simply know it is. With housing this principle is the same, more housing is an unambiguous good compared to less housing, full stop. Because of that the only reason to not provide this additional housing, especially in a housing crisis, would be if there was an EXTREMELY good reason not to. So I would like to share my view that complaints of aesthetics (shadows, character, lot coverage) or of minor convenience (availability of parking, street traffic, etc) should come second to the profoundly large benefits of additional housing in Cadboro Bay. We wouldn't call the provision of food into question because we don't like the look of other people's dinner, so we ought not constrict the provision of shelter because of neighbours preferences around character and traffic
11	Please for the love of God give us affordable housing and the ability to form community
12	I believe the housing market is artificially manipulated by the current zoning laws to the detriment of everybody in the community. Development does not have to be encouraged, but if it is allowed, market pressure will cause new development to be built to the benefit of everyone in the community.
13	Who are the councillors that are proposing these changes? Affordable housing in an expensive neighbourhood is a ridiculous proposition. Saanich can't dictate sale prices so the developers will just make as much money as they can. Doing this under the guise of affordable housing is not only fake but offensive. These new condos and apartments will not be affordable and will only benefit the developers who will make millions at the expense of a unique and beautiful village. Why wouldn't you choose a more affordable neighbourhood to develop affordable housing?
14	I grew up in Cadboro Bay, and everyone who I grew up with has had to leave the area due to affordability. I am extremely fortunate in that I managed to purchase a home in the Shelbourne area of Saanich, but most of my peers are not as lucky. We should have been building townhouses in this area in the 80's (and we did! Before they were made illegal). That was the time for 3 stories. Anything below 4-6 stories in an urban village is completely irresponsible urban planning in 2022.
15	We're in a housing crisis.
16	I don't like highrises over 4 stories. 4 stories with commercial use might be ok on uvic land and where uvic has student housing. I don't understand how you can make affordable housing on private land. On publicly owned land I can see how you can make low income or student housing and if there's enough buffer land around i might be supportive of up to six stories but only if it's surrounded by buffer like on uvic land. people out here paid big bucks for houses because they don't want to live in a high density city. Why does saanich planning want to change our neighborhood into a high rise development area? We live in greater victoria with many muni's Saanich muni doesn't have to become high density like people can't move to condos in langford and view royal or downtown. Greater Victoria has tonnes of development like this it's only a few miles away. Saanich should think about other ways to make money like downsizing city hall and lay offs if they can't make their budget. piling in more people will result in high muni costs of maintaing sewers and roads it won't be savings in the longrun. High density belongs in city centers. Saanich is kind of a rural muni.
17	We're in a housing crisis and climate crisis, not upzoning and building around walkable neighbourhoods is arson.

18	Build more of everything everywhere
19	Saanich has come back with an absolutely ABSURD plan of building a commercial/res mix of up to 6 storeys on 4 streets on Uvic Edge. Saanich is throwing everyone’s votes, consultation, surveys and desire in the garbage. We will vote every single candidate out in the next election if this plan passes. Four voters alone in this household and we are already campaigning online for this.
20	I'm supportive of below market rentals where ever they make sense. They don't have to be in any particular area. The same with mixed use buildings. I think that 4 - 6 stories can accomplish these goals.
21	Saanich has, thus far, utterly failed to address the housing crisis. Incredibly restrictive zoning regulations has made hiring people more expensive, starting businesses more expensive, and our exports (education in particular) uncompetitive. Artificial restrictions on housing stock degrade quality of life in order to enrich owners at the expense of everyone else's quality of life and the welfare of the economy.
22	Consultations with affected communities is a must.
23	Perhaps building affordable housing in one of the nicest areas of Victoria would take away from its charm. I grew up in this area, went to Frank Hobbs and have now worked very hard to be able to afford a home back in Cadboro Bay to raise my kids in and I think it absolutely ridiculous that there is talk of ruining the beautiful aspects of Cadboro bay by jamming more people in this area with tall buildings, an influx of people and cheapen the cost to live here. Having pockets of nicer neighbourhoods occurs all over the world and shouldn't be attempted to be “fixed.”
24	Thank you for considering ways to create more inclusive neighbourhoods and housing options for those who weren't fortunate enough to buy a house 10+ years ago.
25	I don't think Cadboro Bay is well suited to significant new development. If any, the existing commercial area could potentially support condos being built above the existing commercial space if limited to 3 stories.
26	I don't see any real reason to increase density in Cadboro Bay other than Saanich wanting to increase it's tax base. Leave Cadboro Bay alone!!!!
27	increased height of construction and affordable housing don't fit with Cadboro Bay character at all
28	high buildings only on cadboro bay road, where currently there is commercial/business
29	Please reconsider these proposals for any structure over 3 stories. If you want to build upscale/high end townhomes with suitable building heights and densities then that would somewhat match the high land cost of prime Cadboro Bay real estate that you are talking about. If you are looking for apartments or lower income housing, there are 50 better options for that in Saanich. Cadboro Bay land is too expensive to subsidize to that extent and it is absolutely not sustainable and would just end up over time to be █████, high rent housing that diminishes the community. Instead first focus on two story townhomes in suitable areas, and ease restrictions in the community on things like garden suites or similar rental suites in homes. I'm not a fan of those either, but that is the natural progression from where we are today before considering this ridiculous proposal of 4,6,8 or 10 (???) story structures. I appreciate that developers make more money when they build higher density/taller structures, but that is not a reason to do it. We do not serve the developers, they are not the community. This whole process appears manipulated and rotten and I think Saanich planning and city seems to have forgotten who they serve - taxpayers in this community. It's absurd.

30	I think the community is scared of change because we all love this village so much and don't want to ruin it. We worked very hard to buy a house down here and feel it is a privilege not a right. That being said I do support light densification that allows people to age in place and allow more families a chance to get in the market (4plex?)
31	The current proposals were put forth at a meeting ~ Jun 2, 2022 but nobody from the UVic Edge area was there. These plans will not create affordable housing. Mackenzie/Shelbourne and West of UVic have much lower land costs.
32	I don't understand why an area like Cadboro Bay should be ruined. Future generations will not thank you. This whole proposal is horrible.
33	In general I support densification in Saanich, But I do find these proposal are suited for developers and not the ability for the local land owners to improve there lots with rentals additions and other options. we are held hostage's to upgrading lacking community infrastructure services such as side walks and storm drains for blocks. If you want diverse housing options for a broader income spectrum we need hefty cost road blocks lifted for the lack of the city's infrastructure.
34	Development should include infrastructure for active transportation, and the EQ hazard should be thoroughly investigated prior to building any new housing. Overall I'm supportive of more diverse housing in Cadboro Bay!
35	I find it very disappointing that Saanich worked with residents on the LAP for over two years, and now have quickly changed it to try and push through 6 and 8 storey buildings in an area where that would not fit the neighbourhood vernacular, and does t address potential congestion and safety concerns. Stick to 4 storey buildings max. Keep the village feel. It seems like Saanich is in the pocket of developers with this - have out of the box funding options for more affordable housing been explored? Like co-ops? Government grants? Using some of the 20% increase in my property taxes? What about resining Queenswood and 20 mile point to allow subdivision (2x10,000 foot lots if properties are divided would still retain their tree canopy), or allowing garden suites/suites in those areas? Why has no development been proposed for Queenswood or Ten Mile Point? Also, the streets at UVic Edge all funnel past Frank Hobbs and Arbutus Grove - what is the plan for potential increased traffic and congestion next to the schools?
36	I am in support of denser and more affordable housing. I am glad to see the crisis be approached by my government.
37	There is so much land in Queenswood and Ten Mile Point. I fear that the village will be less desirable if it is crowded and has more traffic. I will lose my ocean view if this goes ahead. Also, please consider the earthquake hazard and the fact that the ground will liquify if there is a major earthquake.
38	It would make more sense to look at other parts adjacent to Cadboro Bay where the housing is falling apart now and units could be built that would support AFFORDABLE houseing. Certainly no developer will make money if affordable is considered
39	Thanks fir the opportunity
40	Gentle densification should be prioritized. Cadboro has unique structural elements that make it a sought after destination. Increasing density aggressively will destroy its uniqueness.
41	Please do your part to absorb some of the housing required to get us out of this housing mess. I'm worried I won't be able to afford to live anywhere in the CRD if local governments continue to prioritize the aesthetic preferences of wealthy white homeowners over the material wellbeing of their most vulnerable constituents. Also please strictly limit the amount of parking, induced demand means if you provide parking people will drive, and thats

	terrible for the environment. Speaking of, denser housing is also far better for the climate, so given the current situation there it seems ludicrous to even consider trivialities like aesthetic preferences for low density. Single family zoning was created to segregate neighborhoods by race and class, and to raise property values. It is now, and always has been, fundamentally exclusionary and discriminatory.
42	Similar to many others, we specifically bought our house in Cadboro Bay because of the special and unique feel of the area, being seaside with a small village, lots of green space and less people. As residents and taxpayers of this area, we feel our opinions should be heard for the future of our neighbour and we strongly oppose the new idea of northern village expansion, in particular. We support additional accomodation in our area through garden suites and secondary suites but in NO way do 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 story buildings belong in this area. Everywhere in the world, there are desirable areas to live, that are not affordable for everyone. Many of us have saved all our lives buy in this area because of how it is currently. The traffic has already increased in this area, we simply cannot handle a significant population increase in Cadboro Bay as it would be WAY too congested.
43	Concerned about increased traffic and parking, ensure infrastructure is in place to support more residents (ie upgrading Sinclair road). Given the high cost of land in the area I don't believe that affordable housing is realistic no matter what the height of the development. Therefore focus on greater density that fits with the current village look and feel. By adding more inventory to the overall market it will help with pricing. Need to include Queenswood and Ten Mile Point into the discussion as these are the least dense areas with the most opportunity to increase density
44	Development in this area is essential to growing a strong community and alleviating the housing crisis
45	Excellent location, increased bus routes would help that area of more people begin to live there
46	Cadboro bay residents in general are not opposed to increasing density, but placing 6 story apartment blocks would make for a denser neighbourhood then cook st village and more analogous to James bay, which is a drastic change.
47	This is in stark contrast to the gentle densification proposed. It is developer driven as the first LAP draft would not generate enough revenue (but really how much is too much). It feels like an appeasement to create housing. This will it provide house for lower income. Look to Mackenzie /shelboure. On bus routes walkable. Near Uvic. Not in ecologically vulnerable areas. This is a huge experiement that will have a gem of saanich eroded in the name of social good- but won't actually help.
48	Just STOP developing. Public transportation isn't sufficient. We have NO Do tors. While it's wonderful that people want to live here, sometimes we just have to say, sorry, but NO. NOT right now.
49	Great initiative - we need more density and more affordable housing.
50	Please address parking and traffic flow considerations with all options, not just for residents, but for shoppers.
51	I'm pretty tired of the angry online "discourse" (rants) where, as with other community issues, only voices of the Old Guard are being heard. This is not a safe community to share concerns which do not align with the views of the self-appointed community "leaders." Perhaps bringing greater diversity to this Cadboro Bay through increased housing density will help dilute the stranglehold that these folks currently have, which would be a very good thing for this community.

52	I moved to this neighbourhood for the quiet feel. Putting in multi story buildings in cadboro bay will destroy that. It's already happening along shelbourne which will already increase traffic in cadboro bay. No need to continue to add to it. That is what downtown is for.
53	The previous page does not fit with any options I can support. I support some of the options but only on part of U-Vic edge.
54	Remember the institutional lands. VIHA sits on 40 acres.
55	Make Cadboro Bay into a REAL village. Currently it is under sized, exclusive and frankly, frumpy.
56	We need to think of the future. Development and density will happen. Having a proper plan will allow for Cadboro Bay to improve. We need more services in Cadboro Bay. Medical clinic, barber shop, Red Barn Market. The commercial buildings that in place now are very old and are past their prime and won't be replaced without increased density.
57	Cadboro Bay has so much potential and desirable village. Please ensure that developers include walkway connections, green spaces, trees and a design aesthetic that fits (peaked roofs, charming, tiered near main throughways).
58	Housing is desperately needed everywhere. I love my big house on a big lot but I am open to change and won't be a NIMBYer even if it's uncomfortable for me.
59	If the purpose is to offer more housing for students, this area should not be changing the bay. this
60	Make sure there is lots of walking path connections, sidewalks, greenways, trees. Also ensure the charm of the area is maintained with developments that include peaked roofs, cedar shingles, proper setbacks, parking, tiered landscaping etc. Make sure developers don't build the same thing over and over and do it as cheaply as possible. ARCHITECTURE MATTERS!
61	It's right by the water nothing will be affordable and it will fill with university students not families. The infrastructure is not there and traffic will be a mess.
62	As mentioned before; one parking spot per bedroom plus lots of visitor parking. Consider view corridors so don't allow "blocky" type developments ie "skinny" towers is better. Keep quality up! Ie stone or brick work, interesting architecture, water features, art work like statues or water wall displays. Make it first class because the area calls for it with its great location. Keep the cheaper multi use developments up by Gordon Head area better infrastructure and transportation. If people purchase and rent out their condos then they can do that.
63	To address the current housing shortage densification is absolutely required so ensuring that this is done in a thoughtful and planned way is best for the community. Impacts on the local area will be primarily be positive so everyone needs to get on board.
64	I just want to add that Cadboro bay will be destroyed if the plan for increased density goes ahead. There are many more appropriate areas, further along McKenzie for example. I have to wonder if there is a developer behind this or if the municipality is just interested in increased revenue with no concern for taxpayers quality of life.
65	The lack of transparency of this initiative has been appalling. It has left residence in the Cadborough bay area feeling unheard and undervalued.
66	Cadboro Bay is already busy enough with the amount of people living there already. It can't support more condos. Build them along shelbourne street.
67	Using the words densification/affordability does not give planners and developers the right to ruin a neighborhood.
68	Village centres should be primary focus for heightened density throughout greater Victoria...



	current established single family home neighborhoods should be retained for foreseeable future
69	4 stories max and in the UVic edge area, keep 4 stories to along Sinclair
70	I applaud the effort to densify, but it must be done cautiously
71	We left Vancouver and bought in Cadboro Bay 4 years ago because of the density and feel of the neighbourhood. Most of the proposed plans will drastically change the feel of the area other than adding density on the UVIC Edge and the Village.
72	Strongly suggest that residents of 10 Mile and Queenswood not be given as much influence when these proposed changes are going to affect those of us nearest to the village centre. We are a young family who specifically moved to the area because of its quiet, walkable character. There are other locations in Saanich more suitable for densification. We already have folks from all around town coming to enjoy the beach, so much so that the beach parking fills up and people park on our property because we are near the beach access. Adding more residents and their vehicles to this mix would be problematic.
73	Please support those who are ppl with disabilities & 55 plus
74	Cadboro Bay should be left alone
75	I would like to see granny flats / carriage houses, and two story duplexes and townhouses and do not support anything beyond that.
76	Change and development is essential for any community with respect and responsibility to the environment; build environmental friendly housing with community gathering parks for animals and people. Incorporate nature trails to the existing Mystic Vail trails.
77	Housing is a human right, we should be encouraging below market rentals in our community!
78	Keep the village as it is!
79	Leave Cadboro Bay Village as it is.
80	Please ensure that the unique character of Cadboro Bay is not undermined or ruined forever.
81	It's worth looking at places that have done this well, like Oak Bay, which has managed to maintain a great walkable small town character while also having a variety of housing types. It's also worth looking at places that are just terrible, like the Shelbourne and McKenzie area to ensure that sort of car centered development is not allowed.
82	Where are you thinking all of these people to occupy 8-10 story buildings will be coming from? We do not have this level of housing needs in this country at this time.
83	I attended both the in-person workshop and the online forum. I think there is a lot of people living in CB who do not recognize their privilege. They are sadly lacking empathy for the many young people who are priced out of the housing market. Yes, we do not want to completely lose the character of the neighbourhood, but failing to add density will only result in more massive houses, increasing carbon footprints without providing much-needed housing.
84	The university should cap their student body. Allowing more room for families.
85	There are so many other areas that would be better suited for densification. Please consider areas such as Hillside (particularly around Hillside mall) and Gordon Head. These changes do not need to happen in Cadboro Bay. Land is expensive here and any new buildings will just create more expensive housing options not affordable housing options. I think densification should be initiated on busier streets such as Shelbourne, Cedar Hill Cross etc. it does not need to happen in this quaint beach side neighborhood. I am raising a young

	family on Cherrilee and there are so many young children and families in this area that would be devastated by the dramatic proposed changes. We moved here for the quiet streets and safe walk to the village.
86	Keep green, good connected paths (require developers to plan this!), and attractive buildings. You might get less resistance from current Cadboro Bay residents if you advance some options for designs requirements so they can have their own community character and not have fear there will be ugly block tall buildings everywhere.
87	Leave Cadboro Bay alone!
88	These proposals seem to be an end run around plans which have already been shown to local residents. This is not an area suitable for high rise construction. Buildings over three stories will destroy the neighborhood and threaten the heritage homes located here. Not everyone gets to live in their first choice of neighborhood, particularly when just staring out in life. Many of the homeowners in this area have been here for many years and/or have worked their way up through the housing market to be able to afford to live here now. Businesses such as AirBnb have impacted the rental market and created difficulties in finding rental accommodation. As long as they are allowed to continue new properties will be sucked into that vortex as well. There will be no way to create enough rental homes to meet the demand. Building numerous high density condos or townhouses will not solve the problem.
89	The prior Communiity Engagement Plan provided a very thoughtful plan, developed after extensive consultation. That Plan should be the basis of any future development.
90	Leave the village centre and the surroundings as is
91	In my opinion these three options represent the work of a council that is out of touch with what voters and residents in the area affected value and cherish in the neighbourhood and area that they live.
92	Density is the way to go why does Saanich fight what most of the civilized world regards as progress ?
93	No notice of plans. Changes have been made since original submission
94	Please do not develop
95	no
96	Saanich is huge. This effort to build high-rises in little Cadboro bay is wrong headed-should be used for more park land, ball fields and dog walking spaces, bike trails etc. Small occasional 4 home townhouse developments two stories high might be ok
97	This is the most bungled "planning" process I have had the misfortune to experience in 50 years of planning processes and workshops. You ambushed the taxpayers/residents of Cadboro Bay at the June 11 meetings. It is impossible to trust any of the planning staff who brought this forward.
98	I support increased densification in Cadboro Bay. The reasons provided by Saanich are valid reasons for increasing our housing capacity.
99	Yes.If UVic with huge land holdings had adequate student housing the duburbs around it could accommodate those needing rental suites etc . We have 2 duplexes on Scolton road and there are 4 fsmilies with little ones, <6 years living next to my house ■ Scolton Rd. so we have a mix herd slready and have issues with parking and traffic slready with the current populstion density,
100	look to gordon head road, mckenzie or cedar hill cross for high rise developments. even the commercial and light retail development will take away from the character that is cadboro bay.

101	You are destroying the financial security of the dozens of homeowners who live in the proposed area. Our homes are the greatest investment we have ever made. This will not provide ANY affordable housing and will only line the pockets of developers. So you aren't solving the problem you claim to be. You are lining the developers pockets at our expense. Furthermore this survey is USELESS. Any Joe Schmo can fill it out as many times as they want. Funny how you ignore the opinions of hundreds of humans that attend the actual meetings.
102	1. Time to go back to the drawing board. The people that LIVE in these areas have spoken and do not want these options. People want to live in Cadboro Bay because it's less dense. There is a ton of people that already rent out their basements to students. Lam Circle provides lower income rentals for uvic students/families. Camelot has 100's of children that walk up and down it every day. We don't need more density here!! Lots of other areas in Saanich that would be more suitable for what you are proposing.
103	I am in favour of modernizing the stores on Cadboro Bay. That building is outdated. Could build there with commercial and residential
104	How are you planning on increasing essential services if you intend to densify?
105	Previous page is not possible to answer. Telegraph Bay Road does not appear on the map. How can we make decisions without the correct information?
106	This is a very unique area that simply does not allow for apartment buildings or low income housing. Land costs make that prohibited. Subsidized housing does not work in Cadboro Bay. Council was quite clear on this at the meeting on June 11th.
107	Clearly after last nights information session, there needs to be more open communication with the residents of Cadboro Bay
108	This is a "village" area. We don't want to see it turned into an urban high rise area. There is land at Queen Alexandra, the old Nun's residence - use that land for buildings over 3 stories. I have seen lots of younger families buying homes in Cadboro Bay area. But, they are families who have good jobs. My daughter and her husband bought a house in Cadboro Bay but they spent many years at university to train as doctors. People can't just do an average job and expect to live in an above average area. That's not how life works. For Cadboro Bay to have to start building high rise rentals or provide low income housing just to accommodate people who don't push themselves to get ahead, is ridiculous. I would like to see some townhouses so people can downsize and stay in the area or detached bungalow style strata homes for retirees. Please do not ruin this area we have here by forcing unwanted development.
109	It would make most sense to expand upon the existing commercial properties along Cadboro Bay Road, Sinclair and perhaps Penrhyn. Converting the land from being used as a two story commercial property to a higher density condo and / or apartment building with commercial on the main floor could be an amazing option. It does not make sense to take the little green space we have left in the area (the Church sites for example) and slap a high density apartment block in the middle of the residential neighbourhood. The organizers repeatedly mentioned "expanding" the green space at Maynard Park. I don't see how this is possible especially considering that one of the mandates of the project is to remove the green space across the street and turn it into high density high rise housing. The character of Cadboro Village is not only along Cadboro Bay Road. It's all throughout the area. The focus should be on rezoning and densifying the existing commercially used land. The residents would lose very little with my proposed option and it could create a lovely Village Core surrounded by family homes with options of suites and / or garden suites and townhomes. The existing green spaces should be kept intact while the commercially used

	land should be used more efficiently. Other than the existing commercial land, the only other area that might make any sense for any type of high rise development would be UVIC Edge in my opinion. I live on Maynard Street.
110	A shortage of ‘affordable’ rental housing in these long-established areas is not a ‘Saanich problem’.. it’s a problem for individuals and families who have not trained for and pursued careers providing the income required to afford homes in one of Canada’s most attractive neighbourhoods. As for many other premium locations across the country, there is a practical and aesthetic limit to the ‘carrying capacity’ of these properties. Trying to buy-out and tear down well-built, long established neighbourhoods is not the way to accommodate the relentless housing demand on a limited land base enclosed on three sides by ocean. The only sensible direction to establish new housing options is west from Victoria, as is properly proceeding.
111	We need to explore other potential community areas for higher density development. The Queen Alexandra site seems wholly under utilized. The areas around Hobbs street, a major thorough fare would lend itself to 4 story growth. Making Sinclair road a wall of Six storey buildings, worse than South Granville in Vancouver will destroy the character of this area of Saanich.
112	There is an old joke: a man is trying for months to get a flat in Mumbai. He finds a coconut, cuts the top off, and out pops a genie. "I will grant you a wish", he says. "Great!" says the man. "I want a flat in Mumbai!" "Hell", says the genie, "if I could get a flat in Mumbai, do you think I'd be living in this lousy coconut?" The point is, not everyone can live exactly where they want. The residents of Mount Royal in Calgary (one of the most expensive neighbourhoods in Canada) are not currently being asked if they would allow 6-storey blocks to be dropped into their neighbourhood so that affordable flats could be had, so why is that occurring in Cadboro Bay? We had a plan three years ago for moderate improvements and densification. Then suddenly there's this push for height and affordability, which seems motivate by politics and developer greed, rather than by a bona fide wish to create accessible, affordable housing for everyone. Everyplace is affordable for some and not affordable for others. Cadboro Bay can evolve and improve, sure, but not at the cost of changing its fundamental character. There are loads of places in greater Victoria where the land is cheaper and where the margins for profit on a 6-storey apartment block are more reasonable. Those should be what you are considering.
113	I am highly alarmed by both the draft plans to rezone Cadboro Bay, one of the nicest pocket communities in the South Island, as well as the manner in which it is being done. 1) I’m a homeowner in Cadboro Bay who just heard about the city plans on June 22 2) The engagements, community dialogues were not well designed and are including people who don’t own property or necessarily live in the area. UVIC students from Edmonton or curious parties from outside the area are given equal voice to those who own property and pay property taxes to the city. This practice of allowing non property owners to vote, gives a false narrative of some level of support that actually doesn’t exist. 3) All options provided are for a high degree of development for Cadboro Bay and a total transformation of all that is great about this sleepy quaint beach village. There is no option provided for small purposeful development and modest growth, leaving residents with only the choice to vote for an option that least impacts their particular street.4) There is no information provided stating the total population increase to the community with each scenario. That population impact needs to be shared and impacted areas need to be tested including traffic pressure at key intersections, beach traffic, parking, pressure on parks, schools etc.. Cadboro Bay already gets swamped with traffic on sunny beach days and simply wasn’t built to handle a

	significant rise in population proposed by the draft plans. This commentary will likely bring comments about Nimbyism. However, it's really about due process and respecting all that is special about this tiny pocket community. There are many great opportunities to add density within Cadboro Bay without a total resign of the community. If the city does not take the opportunity to hit the pause button and seek more engagement from the property owners, then inevitably this will end up being fought in the courts, press and political arena.
114	I don't believe Cadboro Bay is an area Saanich should be trying DEVELOP we are NOT an urban centre. If my grown children have to live in a
115	Keep Cadboro bay special. Small density increases, more townhouses and a few more 3 or 4 story buildings very close to the Cadboro bay core around peppers.
116	The planning process and information has not been transparent We only heard about this planning a week ago and to be thrown into decision making and answering surveys with such a short timeline is not acceptable. The university edge : We are asked to comment on a proposal that is a week or two old. The explanation given regarding the origin of this plan was not clear.
117	More walk in clinic
118	I think a Sinclair Road, Cadboro Bay Road and Arbutus Road Corridor approach to increasing density is another viable option. I think the village centre needs to be six-storeys.
119	I appreciate the survey, if only to reinforce what I am sure Saanich has already heard -- that this new proposal is ad hoc and seems at the whim of a politician (mayor), and it not in the best interests of the community of Cadboro Bay or Saanich. Please stick with the existing Cadboro Bay Plan, which was developed over years with good community input, and plans to address some outstanding issues, such as infrastructure and walkability (e.g. need crosswalk at Cadboro Bay/Tudor/Seaview confluence. Large 4-6 or more story buildings will destroy this area, and are not appropriate. There are quite a few rentals in the area. Saanich needs to review the effectiveness of its existing policies - e.g. allowing granny suites, legal rentals in house -- what is the status, were these policy changes effective? does Sannich even know?? If Saanich's concern is affordable housing eliminate short term rentals, which are taking up a portion of the rental market. Please still with existing Cadboro Bay Local Area Plan.
120	You are not hearing the actual owners of property. I have attended both the in person and the online in the last weeks.
121	Unless you create more green spaces/park areas - Gyro Beach will become too crowded and lose it's charm for small family groups and UVic students and older people strolling the seawall.
122	3+ stories only between Haro & Finnerty Roads.
123	No
124	4 and 6 story buildings would destroy the character of the area
125	Saanich munipality and Saanich councilors need to start acting in the best interests of it's citizens and not focus on the needs or wants of developers, corporations and other levels of government. The residents of Saanich want to live in an environment that is livable, sustainable and where quality of life can be enjoyed. Take a look at what you are proposing and ask yourselves if that is an improvement on what we have or are we going look forward to living stacked on top of each other, all in the name of progress?
126	Please do not go a
127	Saanich needs to do a better job of informing or notifying residents in affected areas that something of this importance is happening. Very disappointing!!

128	The 3 story condos on the beach side of Penryn are tasteful and in the right place acceptable. But nothing higher than 3 stories, very few of them and don't ruin the area. We live here for a reason.
129	Density is a deceptive argument for damaging our neighborhood. With density comes more community service needs. I cannot see how our current roads will sustain further development. And where would there be parking. there is no viable public transit serving this community. with more population comes more children. will you be building more schools and a community centre?
130	Increased density will not work.
131	the height of these proposed building types is too high
132	UVic should be building much more of its own housing.
133	Please leave us alone! Put your condos and apartments where there is already densification going on. We all have the feeling that council, mayor and planning department are targeting us for nefarious reasons or that the pockets of council are being lined by developers. Come clean about what is really going on! You know as well as we do that this area is totally inappropriate for further development on the scale that you are presenting. Someone has it out for us.
134	Yes, none of the destructive processes put forward by Saanich are acceptable, stick with the plan developed by the neighbourhood. Stop imposing destructive ideas on people in this UN democratic way,
135	Please put density at UVIC Edge. Please consider modernist heritage designation (a Heritage Conservation District) of the 1950s and 1960s housing around the streets of Cherrilee, Lauder and Dawe and do NOT increase density here. Thank you!
136	Stay out of our community with continual pressure to increase density and height.
137	I am so against high rises in this corner of Saanich for all of my above reasons. I appreciated that the staff of Saanich did a good job on the Zoom meeting, and people were respectful. But to make such a drastic change on a very unique and special corner of Saanich is frankly not acceptable nor wise. In our current heat wave (finally, love it!) have you stood under a tree? How did that feel? Remove the trees and the soil will be washed away and Saanich will have lost the gem that it should be protecting. Really people, think about this. Your legacy is to ruin what we have or to save it?? Please opt for saving it. Please Please.
138	This area is one small joyful place with the beach and small village feel. To take on the job of creating housing when there are so many apartments both legal and unregistered seems to me over reactive and doesn't address UVic's role in taking units away from our locality.
139	Cadboro Bay is a gem, that is agreed by residents, visitors and even the outside expert hired to help Sylvia. It is a semi rural destination for people in the Greater Victoria Area. To change this is a sin, what is more an unwanted and preventable one. Two LAPs 200 and 2021 have given you what the residents and many others want and nature of what and where density could be improved.
140	Please keep the character of the village and encourage foot traffic and not cars or the exhaust will be too much. can they drive around the village and not through with the new plan?? Can you increase stores and services in the village so people don't have to go further and can go by bike or foot ideally. I would rather see stores and services in the village for all to use rather than housing for a few wealthy people. If there is housing it should be affordable and for families and those with disabilities etc., and not just those from out of the province and out of the country that are buying up Victoria and displacing locals

	who have kids, are senior or have a disability. Cadboro Bay should not turn into a vacation destination only for the rich!!!! And for companies to make big profits. Please keep it a lovely place to be. I raised 4 children here and they can't afford to live where they were born and raised. Yet, retirees from Alberta and those from others countries can buy properties here and investors also buy and rent properties to make money. I know it is happening everywhere but it is particularly bad in Victoria. Thank you for reading this. I appreciate you are looking for input and I believe there needs to be some development but it should add to the area and not take away from it and it should be designed by the people who live here and not those who simply want to invest here. .
141	My main concern is that there must be NO EXCEPTIONS that ALL PARKING fir ANY new construction of ANY kind be TOTALLY off street! Tuning the area into a parking ghetto would be the worst thing that could happen. No "green economy" transition bullcrsp!. People will have cars, and they are lying if they say they eon't. Massive fines and draconian enforcement fir on street parking and for developers who fail to provide off street parking!
142	no
143	The university should be responsible for its students. There is university land where they could build 10 story student accommodation blocks. Neither Saanich nor the Cadboro Bay population has the responsibility for providing accommodation for students.
144	No further development
145	The workshops were not well advertised and speed at which the Planning department went from discussion to recommendation was not appropriate. I own a house in the Village, but have it currently rented out and still to this day have not received any notice from the City of Saanich of these plans. Cadboro Bay Village is small pocket community that was not well suited for the type of complete overhaul contemplated in the plans. The plans also completely ignore the guidance given by participants of workshops. Everything that the community said shouldn't happen has been ignored and included in the plan. The only feedback the City has taken is on where to put the development, and ignored feedback on the amount of rezoning and the scale of the buildings. If the full scale of the plans come to pass, it will be a disaster for the community and the traffic situation will unbearable for adjacent communities. There are plenty of opportunities for further development by increasing the hight of existing commercial spaces in the village, utilizing church lands, developing the QA lands and UBC properties without needing to rezone quite tree lined streets and replacing with 6 story buildings. Once the existing options are fully utilized then the City could discuss new ones, but not before. Allowing easier permitting for garden suites/coach houses would also be an easy solution to adding more affordable housing without the construction of condos or apartment buildings. The plans as they stand are so destructive to the community that I'm seriously considering moving.
146	I am so glad to see Saanich planning for a diversity of people and not just the "right kind" of people. Pleasant places like Cadboro Bay and Gorge Tillicum need a diversity of housing, shops and amenities that can provide nice places for people to live and support enhanced transit.
147	Listen to the residents & not the developers
148	No
149	Don't be bought by developers. Go back to the first community approved lap!!
150	Please keep the traditional atmosphere of Cadboro Bay Village.....look to Canmore, Alberta. (Not Cordova Bay).
151	yes, the questions that ask 2 different things in one questions will mess up the value of this

	<p>survey. rental housing is not below market housing and should not be blended in one questions and my answer had to adjust to that. The addition of density is how we need to effect the market concerns right but (and you'll understand my politics here) you don;t get a subsidized house in the best enighborhood in the world until you have worked for it. You liove somewhere else for a while until you've saved and got a couple promotions then you move. The neighborhood of Caddy Bay doesn't need to look at housing market like a CRD does and ask where will our minimum wage workers live so that we can have staff to work for us. We just don't have that urban concern to address in this little hood. Rental Housing is a good idea for all 3 areas: rental low-rises in the Village and townhomes with suites in the other 2</p>
152	<p>The unique beauty of Cadboro bay would be sacrificed if it was made to look like English bay in Vancouver.</p>
153	<p>I know that we're focusing on housing inventory, but I need to keep the need for active transportation connected. Adding 5,000 people to the community will have huge implications if the cycling, walking, and public transportation options aren't there.</p>
154	<p>The answers to the previous questions relate to my understanding that this plan is to direct development for the next twenty years. I'm not opposed to mixed use-developments, but I don't want to see all of what exists wiped out. I'm in support of affordable rental housing, but there would need to be considerable study to find a suitable location for an 8 to 10 story building. The trouble with these surveys is that there is a big difference between accommodating one or two taller buildings and an entire block of them. Essentially, I am in favour of variety - variety of demographics (income, ages, ethnicities) and forms of buildings (building types, densities, etc.) We have to get creative at solving the housing crisis in ways that respect the unique character and human scale of Cadboro Bay and not accept a developer's cookie cutter approach.</p>
155	<p>It is important to retain the village feel, and sense of community, that makes Cadboro Bay unique. 5+ store buildings would overshadow the neighbourhood. I support 4 stories or less. It feels like Saanich is more interested in appeasing developers than developing a plan that residents of the area support (why the sudden shift after more than 2 years developing the LAP that the community did support?) Also - why are Ten Mile Point and Queenswood exempt from any increase in density/development? The lots in those areas could easily be subdivided and still retain large lot sizes/the rural feel, or rezoned to allow garden suites/suites. That would also help improve density, but spread it over a larger area.</p>
156	<p>traffic management needs to be considered when increasing density. Traffic flow through Cad Bay is a constant problem because this is an "end of the road" community. Also, Uvic's plans need to be considered. Uvic family housing should be considered a part of our community when considering demographics. UVic kids attend Frank Hobbs. Uvic family housing is much more a part of Cad Bay than a part of Gordon Head. As well, Uvic's plans for the queenswood property need to be considered. If they plan to put high density student residences there, then that will impact density and demographics of Cad Bay. I would have agreed to some of the apartment options you listed above if the areas for your three zones were not so large. For example, I could picture affordable housing at the edge of Uvic family housing, but not through the whole Uvic Edge as defined by your map.</p>
157	<p>Cadboro Bay is not the area to increase affordable housing. Look to the Uptown area.</p>
158	<p>Townhouses are less ideal compared to other denser properties, and below market housing, at 8-10 storeys is the best possible thing. I would be fully supportive of any initiative for higher buildings so long as it helped reduce rent for its tenants and improved availability of housing.</p>



159	Please return to the originally approved LAP which accurately captures the interests of the community. These other options above four stories are insulting after such community consultation arrived at four stories
160	The fact that council is trying to force through a density housing agenda after planning has already approved the LAP with two years of community input is incredibly disrespectful. We moved here to get away from the density of Vancouver and to own a home with our kids in a walkable neighbourhood that didn't have huge buildings taking over the green space and natural light. Saanich Council is not listening to the community here and forcing through an agenda that nobody wants
161	Saanich Council is trying to ram a density agenda into a community that doesn't support it and already created a viable Local Area Plan. As a young family that owns our house in the community we do not support density beyond the village.
162	Saanich Council needs to hear that the community only wants the originally proposed LAP. Forcing increased density on the community will not solve the housing crisis in Victoria. The land is too expensive for units to be sold at affordable prices. The local elementary school is already at capacity. Residents want to preserve the special nature of the village and community and anything above four stories will destroy the feel of this community.
163	The beauty and charm of Cadboro bay should not be decided by politicians in cahoots with property developers. I would not be supportive of having a gas station either. Leave Cadboro bay as it is.
164	Why have you framed this survey such that below market / affordable units are not considered for lower height/lower density developments? Why not offer respondents the opportunity to provide feedback on potential for lower cost/affordable units in lower-density developments? The way you've framed the survey questions is problematic and could adversely impact community support for below market / affordable housing developments in Cadboro Bay. Do better.
165	The original plan for the Village in the Draft Oct 2021 plan was ok. We are after all a village and do not want to be made into a town.
166	I'm all for greater density, but why push it all into the village area, and protect massive lot sizes in Queenswood and Ten Mile Point? Doing so will only further stratify the neighbourhood. Allow duplexes/tri-plexes/multi-plexes and subdivisions with appropriate lot sizes THROUGHOUT Cadboro Bay, including Queenswood/Ten Mile, before entertaining apartment buildings taller than 4 storeys in the village area. I live in Ten Mile on a 9500sqft lot. Yet, the new plan proposes minimum lot sizes of 40,000+sqft! It doesn't make any sense. You need to distribute the density evenly, or there will be too much inequality and resentment in our community. It's obvious you're pandering to the loud, wealthy voices in these enclaves if you do not. Allowing duplexes/triplexes/subdivisions in Queenswood and Ten Mile could also help improve rental stock, as many new homes built could include secondary suites. That said, I'm in support of rental/affordable/condo buildings up to 4 storeys, including mixed use, on main roads. Townhouses should be approved everywhere.
167	Cadboro Bay is a small area and not the appropriate location for higher density housing - ideally this housing should be placed near Shelbourne or along Arbutus/Gordon Head
168	Cadboro Bay's small village environment does not hold the infrastructure to support such an increase in population. The traffic at Cadboro Bay Road and Sinclair is often backed up in busy times and the parking lot at Peppers is often full with cars circling to look for parking spots.
169	The public engagement process has been abismal. The LAP that community engaged in was ignored. Density yes, but in moderation, and in areas suitable, in particular considering

	transportation constraints and land costs. We cannot just satisfy developer profits, or totally destroy neighborhood character
170	Village centre should also expand further south along Cadboro Bay Rd along bus route
171	It is actually possible to build 3 storey rental buildings.
172	I think we really need to think about the next generation in thread plans. I am worried for my children and their futures here. I don't want them to move away because of housing costs when the opportunities are here.
173	I do not see any plans for new schools or community recreation, which will be needed with more density. I do not see plans for roads or parking, which will be needed with more density.
174	Mixed use is a great idea. Attending a lecture at uvic last week, there was no place to grab dinner if we're walking. More restaurants, shops, coffee could mean people stay in the area and walk more. What is happening in Victoria is making most residents frustrated. Worst of all it has made the neighbourhood divisive. There are those who agree pitted against the ones who disagree. There is fighting, people demanding more and more rules and signs everywhere telling you what you can and can't do. Council is pushing an agenda and not listening to feedback about changes. Please tread gently!!
175	Where are the projections for the population increases associated with draft plans? Saanich should have provided population estimates with each of the options for proper assessment by the community.
176	The quaint and charming nature of the Cadboro Bay area should only be cautiously expanded by increments only.
177	I am supportive of as much housing as can be built
178	Hopefully you're listening to all the people currently priced out of this area, rather than only listening to the preferences of the overhoused people who are already wealthy enough (or with enough longevity and luck) to live in this area.
179	Keep green character of the area: if building a condo, add some fir and maples back in the mix (we need tall trees for shade and beauty), and create safe bicycle paths and bike parking to encourage biking rather than taking the car to the village.
180	We live in the area because it is NOT like downtown streets. Adding some, but not a lot, of new density is fine, but I would hate to have this neighbourhood's relaxed atmosphere impacted.
181	10 mile and queenswood could easily handle smaller lot sizes if trees are maintained and architectural standards are strict.
182	There is lots of space in Saanich that has great access to amenities and transportation and is well suited for below market rentals. Cadboro Bay is a unique area. Leave the green spaces alone and rely on replacement to meet needs of housing expansion.
183	I have lived here since 89 and fought for Haro Woods to become a park. In past there were plans to put a housing developmentment woment in Haro Woods, trees were cut down and then had to be reseeded . Also sewage treatment plant was planned then stopped. This area on Sutton has put up with 2 yr of attenuation tanks. Now we are informed that our single family properties on Sutton may sold and turned into 3 to 6 stories of LOW rise buildings. I have heard owners will have some jurisdiction but will owners be pressured to do these blockbusting techniques. My 8 yr old grand dtr. is sad that this beautiful backyard could be ruined by overdevelopment. I went to U of A and there were high rises on campus but houses in neighbourhood were just redesigned to hold more students but kept their original design. High density would ruin this area It is also very costly property making it

	prohibative toc
184	Cadboro Bay is a lovely quiet neighbourhood with a unique character and should not be turned over to developers. Community health care would be an asset, safe pedestrian walking, measures to control the drag racing and excessive speeding on eg Sinclair and Cadboro Bay Road. Support local family owned businesses, enhance protection for the natural areas and plant native species. Reduce reliance on cars. Introduce noise bylaws and minimize night lighting on new buildings to support Dark Sky initiatives.
185	expansion in NE area ie church sites is valid BUT no 3 story east of Cherilee
186	Cadboro Bay is an expensive area. It defies logic that rental or condominium suites will be affordable in this area. Property values are high. Also, the infrastructure for people to shop for groceries is not developed enough to support significant population growth. There is traffic congestion on McKenzie between CARSA and Shelbourne Street.
187	no NIMBYs allowed.
188	people also need to hear about the provincial 25% reduction in Vehicle Kilometers Traveled and how the new LAP will help achieve that goal (e.g. mixed use development that encourages/enables walking/transit/cycling). We should also be thinking about a streetcar/tram line from Cadboro Bay to Downtown. What's old is new again, and there's lots of love for riding the rails. Something like this would help alleviate fears of too much car congestion.
189	Why are we supporting developers, who seem to be in cahoots with Saanich counsel, to profit? We have all the amenities we need in Cadboro Bay and I am totally against any further development. We like our village the way it currently is...peaceful, simple, friendly and safe.
190	What happened to the Local Area Plan? This survey feels like a con job by politicians on behalf of developers. It's going to create a lot of stress between residents. Some will profit, others will see their familiar neighbourhood disappear forever. PS I vote.
191	We need more middle housing options, to keep neighborhoods vibrant and useful, and welcoming!
192	More rentals would make the family beach less family friendly/more of a party stop
193	My perception is the planners have 'jumped' well past what the approved community plan was. I am ok with densification and different zoning but to suggest 6 and 8 story buildings is wrong. This is Cadboro Bay, not Shelbourne and Mackenzie.
194	Saanich is hell bent on cramming more housing into the already congested, tightly packed Cadboro Bay. Saanich is the second largest municipality in BC (Area-wise). Create more housing/a new village on open space in Saanich where you can provide parks and adequate access and amenities.
195	Don't ruin cadboro bay village- this is not an area that should be considered at all for massive tall condo and apartment buildings -once this streets it doesn't stop- keep our small villages as is
196	The shopping village itself needs upgrading. I support the development already approved on Penryhn St
197	We like things as they are. Leave us alone.
198	I am supportive of 4 to 6 storey residential, preferably with ground level retail, in the village centre. Strata condos (without rental restrictions) would be much more preferable than purpose built rentals. I am strongly opposed to non-market/below market rentals anywhere. The plan as presented seems to group options without considering in-between alternatives. For example, three storey townhouses in the NE and UVIC areas would drastically alter

	most of Cadboro Bay. Rezoning for duplex/triplex/coachhouses would be more in character with the neighbourhood. This is what Vancouver has done and it does retain the character of the neighbourhoods. There need to be better consideration of transit upgrades with the plan and higher density population. Sinclair Road is too steep at a 15% grade for transit busses (12% max), so any route for busses is a milk-run. Increased traffic will be particularly noisy going up the hill. This will certainly be noticeable. Has a noise study (future prediction) been performed??
199	Why are we not planning for increased density in the Wedgewood area? Why not in the 10 Mile point area away from water? This survey seems stacked, we want to maintain a village atmosphere in Cadboro Bay. Many of us moved here just for that atmosphere. As the noise level increases this degrades that atmosphere. I see most of these proposals degrading the village.
200	I don't think there should be buildings higher than 3 stories, but there should be a mix of rental and owned spaces.
201	Affordable housing is achieved historically through regulation. See "An Analysis of Manitoba's Rent Regulation Program and the Impact on the Rental Housing Market," Hugh Grant, Department of Economics, Faculty of Business and Economics, The University of Winnipeg, 31 January 2011, <a href="https://www.gov.mb.ca/cca/pubs/rental_report.pdf">https://www.gov.mb.ca/cca/pubs/rental_report.pdf</a> .
202	This agenda is being driven by the development community and by UVIC, not by the Cadboro Bay residents.
203	All the options have too many storeys
204	Higher buildings are not appropriate in this area.
205	It appears that I could live on another continent and fill out this form. If this is true expect a riot by local residents
206	Go back to the original LAP you are wasting time and money
207	Keep density in Village Centre
208	I would be supportive of below market three story developments in all areas.
209	cadboro bay residents have had this imposed on them by developers and in general are opposed to current plans. why not look more at rental suites in and around existing homes which would not alter the character of the neighborhood forever
210	The conclusion appears to be predetermined by the planning dept. Their objective is to steer a process that can claim public input, but just let's them change the community in a fashion that many residents do not want. Just look at how some of the questions are structured in this survey; combining the support of a 10 storey structure with the bribe of more pathways and improved parks.
211	<b>DO NOT BUILD ANYTHING HIGHER THAN 3 STOREYS IN OUR VILLAGE OR THE AREAS AROUND!!!!!! THIS IS A VILLAGE NOT DOWNTOWN VICTORIA!!!</b> We moved here for the village atmosphere. To build townhouses and duplexes was what I heard people wanted at the meetings I attended. Also the option of garden suites. Never have I understood that apartment buildings or condos higher than 3 storeys were being discussed. I find this survey manipulative. We do not want our small village atmosphere to be ruined by big and high rise development <b>DOWNTOWN VICTORIA OR TORONTO!!!!</b>
212	The LAP which was developed over years with community input did consider more housing through ground-orientated options. Suddenly Saanich presented a Hobbesian choice of 10 story buildings in three options. This "tall" option cannot be supported. Townhouses could be supported and perhaps mixed use of MAXIMUM 4 story could be supported in the

	Village core. Cadboro Bay is already full of rentals and a variety of incomes. IF Saanich really intends to jam more people into Cadboro Bay, this could be done quickly by ELIMINATING short term rentals which would immediately free up rentals.
213	This is the wrong area for development of any kind, beside garden homes and some condos in the village
214	Yes, do not develop this area. Period.
215	I do not understand why Saanich Planning is coming after our tiny village. It's as if there is a revenge towards us. There are many, many other places in Saanich where development could take place that would have proximity to shopping, university, bus lines, etc. Saanich knows exactly where that is. LEAVE US ALONE!
216	Non elected officials are pushing an outside agenda on this area. Gordon Head is a much better candidate.
217	The process here has been abundantly flawed. This area doesn't have the services to support increased density and the environmental impact should be evaluated first. As Council has waived community contributions for purpose built rental housing how would this improve the community at all. This is a refuge area for all of Greater Victoria. Why when the urban corridors are not maximized are we looking at urbanized natural areas.
218	I don't favour significant development that diminishes the current "village feel" of Cadboro Bay.
219	I am very concerned by the forces behind this sudden departure from the Draft Local Area Plan. With a Community Survey open to everyone, I fear that the responses may be skewed by those with a particular agenda, and that the opinions of residents, who are busy with their lives and not always involved, will be overridden. I hope there is some way to be sure that this survey is not hijacked by special interest groups or those who will benefit from development. There is nothing to be gained by residents from the proposed high density options as the Council has waived community contributions for Purpose-built rental housing applications. These three options represent nothing but heartbreak for the current residents of Cadboro Bay.
220	Who are the real drivers of this? It is not those living here.
221	Why change any of the current situation ?. Any change results in degrading the quality of life here.
222	The village occupies a small area—roads in and out are narrow- densificación there will destroy the character of the village and create a degree of congestion that will destroy the reasons why people like to live in and visit the area of
223	I find it offensive and extremely disrespectful to have municipal bureaucrats from Saanich refer to my home as old and at the end of it's life as they did in the online event. Shameful!!!
224	I think Saanich council has forgotten whom they have been elected to represent!!!! ill-conceived! ill-presented! ill-planned!!!
225	What a waste of Saanich taxpayers money!!! Council cant be this out of touch with their voting taxpayers can they???
226	It angers me to read of 4-6 stories near the village. The. It's not a village and it's unlivable for the whole neighborhood. There is already a traffic problem. Cars race down Sinclair and Cadboro Bay. There is no traffic enforcement. The traffic backs up Sinclair Road to the Uplands. People are moving in and don't share values of those who live here. There is no place for housing in the village unless people do so with green development, values . It must be electric small cars or walking. No expensive housing please.
227	i don't want to see the character of cadboro bay to be changed so drastically with high

	density. I am okay with 3 floor units in the core village.
228	I would at UVic and some of our staff have left because of a lack of housing. We need this now
229	Cadboro Bay is a beautiful family oriented community. Please don't destroy our home. There are plenty of other, more appropriate locations in Saanich to accommodate more density.
230	I have lived in Cadboro Bay for over 20 years. It is a beautiful community, but has increasingly become unaffordable. It would be great to see options for affordable housing so that it doesn't just become a playground for the rich.
231	Stop destroying neighbourhoods with huge buildings. Put them on busy streets like shelbourne if you have to but stay away from areas that make Saanich the beautiful place it is.
232	Saanich's philosophy of increasing housing in the municipality is not shared by all of it's long-time residents.
233	The lots in Queenswood and 10 mile Point should not be preserved at 40,000 square feet. Lots in that area should be allowed in the 12,000 to 20,000 square foot range. No idea why we are building a preserve for the wealthy.
234	Provincial government mandates and threats of manipulative interference should not sway our Saanich Council.
235	You are trying to ruin what is a seaside village ambience. Slow, cautious development of townhomes and perhaps some low storey condominiums behind the village or even close to UVic might be ok. Your suggestions of massive high-rise development are totally unacceptable and would ruin the current environment increasing congestion, traffic etc etc. Whatever happened to the LAP plan? It seems to me that Saanich has caught the make money fever from Langford and look how that community has been ruined by unfettered development - bare, ravaged hillsides, no green spaces, traffic +++. We do not want that in Saanich.
236	As fairly new to the area, would like to understand more about how these options came to be and why expanding housing around Uvic itself hasn't been considered given the additional/land that could be used and turned into more vertical structures. I'd also like to know what the process is once the option is passed - i.e. what is the consultation process for repurposing existing homes/land for development??
237	Modest densification in existing neighbourhoods (rather than Langford-style expansion) is the sustainable solution to our livability and affordability crises. 3 and 4 bedroom units should also be prioritized to keep families in the region and increase vibrancy. Do do like Oak Bay please!.
238	We want to maintain the existing character of Cadboro Bay, not destroy it. As Consultant Michael von Hausen himself said: "Don't change Cadboro Bay: Let Cadboro Bay change you."
239	More townhome and co op rental options please!
240	I support gentle infill, where higher densities are gradually permitted over time. Ie. allow townhouses first, reconsider higher densities over time.
241	The majority of people choose to live in Cadboro Bay for its rurality and low density. If council moves forward with aggressive densification of Cadboro Bay, many residents will not be happy. I am one of those residents and will be seeking ways to make my dissatisfaction known. My partner and I have worked hard and made tremendous sacrifices in our lives to be able to afford a quiet home in Cadboro Bay. It is not my responsibility to

	provide housing for entitled people who want to live here but cannot afford to.
242	A stepped back Design if redoing the shops across from Peppe's. Retail on ground level with stepped back 2 storey condos or townhouses in the back.
243	The workshops from the spring considered the housing in these areas. Do not change that. 8-10 story buildings are unacceptable.
244	I think that we have to be convinced of the necessity of development, clearly and factually describing why. We have to know how this would fit in re environmental and climate concerns, poverty, avoidance of urban sprawl and whatever more. We need to know that change, possibly uncomfortable change, is necessary and why.
245	I could see higher density in the existing commercial area to expand that and offer more commercial space as well as a community square as presented in the village design concept on slide 33. However, this will never be low income housing even if that is the intent as the real estate values close to Gyro Beach and in Cadboro Bay generally simply don't suit for that. Lower rent housing by nature needs to be in areas with lower housing/land costs. UVic edge makes some sense, but not on Hobbs of against Maynard Park. Only North-West of Frank Hobbs Elementary, closest to UVic.
246	This is a very stupid plan. You can't build low cost house in this area it's too expensive. Not everyone can live by the beach.
247	Don't allow the proposed higher density housing in the University district as it is not required. UVic has plenty of their own land for housing needs.
248	Absolutely in favour of more and denser housing in this area. It is desperately needed for students, families, and ANYONE renting. I am a working professional making \$60k+ and cannot afford home ownership in Victoria/Saanich, so a wide variety of rental options is necessary for me to continue living, working, and spending here.
249	High buildings will decrease the village atmosphere of Cadboro Bay
250	High land costs require higher density
251	There are areas of Victoria that are more conducive to higher densities and taller buildings. Destroying what makes Cadboro Bay special serves no one. Instead you will force lifelong residents from their homes to make way for townhouses or condos to be purchased by folks retiring from elsewhere. Bigger is not better, shoe-horning more people into the area is not the solution anyone needs to improve quality of life for folks. Focus high density and tall buildings along main transportation corridors rather than into areas not suitable to the noise and congestion that it will undoubtedly bring. Encourage multi-family/ generational options by allowing garden suites or large lots (eg Queenswood, Arbutus) to subdivided to allow a second home if lot size is amenable. Don't turn the lovely Cadboro Bay into a metropolis. Not everyone can live in all parts of Victoria.
252	Climate change, rising sea levels, costs of insurance
253	Village Centre area defined is too large. Townhouses a good idea close to village but not entire Village Centre as in map. Townhouses may be appropriate at United Church site. Cadboro Bay is not a place to create an urban hub. It is a village and should be celebrated for that. Not threatened by biased planners who are in cahoots with developers.
254	Can density be increased with smaller lots ?
255	Can't be a village with 6 storey buildings.
256	It's still called Cadboro Bay village..not town, not city. All of these plans would change the character of the village. If you want density, go up to the University Heights.
257	Three story builds mixed use are financially impossible. Any village core building should be

	5 stories if the municipality wants to see any meaningful revitalization of the core
258	Note -- responses to questions 11 - 19 are ALL modified by prior comments. Areas are drawn too broadly for meaningful responses. And definition of "village center" is strange and troublesome -- in particular its extension more than 1 or 2 lots onto the small streets west of Hobbs.
259	We have only to look to Vancouver to see your plans for Cadboro Bay. No thanks.
260	I think if Cadboro Bay is going to have changes then the whole area should benefit and or accept that we must change to improve moving forward. Do not Segregate to one area only.
261	do not see that the areas described have the available land to build large complexes; look to other areas close to U Vic
262	While I appreciate the opportunity for comment, I suspect from attending some of your "community consultation" events that you have already made up your minds. Also why is the survey not limited to the people that live in Cadboro Bay?
263	Please keep the integrity of the area especially the village core
264	UVic Edge is the best option for increasing density in Cadboro Bay.
265	The "Village" feel needs to be kept for all to enjoy in a healthy way. It is a place where people love to walk and meet up and enjoy community living. Densification can occur but not with tall builds of 4 storeys. Using the hill to hide the size might be effective? Densifying townhomes would help. Where I live was supposed to be 16 or so townhomes but was not passed and 5 homes now exist.
266	these plans do not consider the impact of increased density: the need to improve roads, arrange for parking, build more schools, build community facilities such as community centres and libraries. it is simple not enough to add more houses small or large, expensive or affordable. people come with needs.
267	Buildings that are 6 to 10 stories will change the character of the area considerably and potentially blot out water and other landscapes that residents value.
268	I have been a part of the Cadboro Bay community for many years. I began taking part in the planning exercise in good faith and in the hopes of looking at the community as a whole, including growth over the years in a way that maintains the uniqueness of the village and community. I have come to believe that while the images surrounding the planning process look friendly and community focussed, it really is not. I wonder the proportion of single home owners versus commercial interests that have contributed to the plan development. I am disappointed at the direction that is being contemplated as it will transform the community for the worse, making it a concrete city that could be found anywhere.
269	Leery of anything higher than 5 stories as I believe anonymity sets in beyond 5 stories.
270	There must be other areas far more suited to density increase than what must one of the last true villages in the Greater Victoria area. These should be considered first. I feel sure that this is the opinion of the vast majority of people who live in the area in question. Please heed our voice!
271	As a homeowner and resident of the so-called 'UVic Edge', I was shocked and angry to learn that the community-approved Cadboro Bay local area plan from October 2021 had been tossed out by Saanich and replaced with plans to destroy the entire area with 4-6 and even 8-10 storey buildings. These actions are reprehensible. Then, for Saanich to try and ram the changes through in a 7n 'open' workshop that did not invite any residents from the area being most greatly affected (the 'UVic Edge') using outdated information on the make-up and density of our neighbourhood. Our neighbourhood is full of young families, student and seniors. The houses have been renovated to add suited for student rentals. Our



	neighbourhood is quiet family area including increasing numbers of young families with children, older adults and seniors as well as students who occupy suites. Commercial mixed use 4-6 and 8-10 storey housing would destroy our peace, safety and beauty of our neighbourhood. The Cadboro Bay is unique and special from other areas in Saanich and the CRD and this would be gone forever. These proposed zoning changes have caused the residents of the 'UVic Edge' undue stress and many of the seniors and young families in the neighbourhood are deeply upset and frightened that this beautiful area will be bulldozed for the sake of developer profits and nowhere in the new plan is there true affordable housing. I am vehemently opposed to Option 3, the re-zoning of this area to 4-6 storey commercial mixed-use housing. Go back to community-approved Cadboro Bay local area plan from October 2021.
272	The after the fact density conversation was out of scope given the final public consultation agreed to Gentle density as the option wanted for the future of our community. I have heard the feedback there was the same push back as when NEW density maps that were put in front of the 1st group of 120 at the first workshop. Such manipulation hasn't been seen since the sewage treatment workshops that were set up to divide and conquer-pitting neighbour against neighbour. Staff did nothing but created panic. Rushed decisions, premature process. The concerns about the environment, safety and traffic were loud and clear at all workshops. Most important was attendees did not want to see the natural assets in their neighbourhoods disappear. No Legacy of Green. Land values are central to passing a home on to family members, or Aging in Place. At the end of the day, Cadboro Bay Village is not a good fit for the density plans that staff worked on. For all the reasons stated at the workshops. to preserve our identity instead of pushing people out of their homes and into the real estate market won't solve any issues. The IUCN recently stated, "... Soil biodiversity represents one of the largest carbon stocks on Earth and plays a major role in Climate Change." Cadboro Bay contributes to a Global solution, as well as Saanich's Climate Action Plan policy. IS IT ETHICAL to purposefully overdeveloped & destroy areas that are rich in biodiversity? Those areas that connect the land to the Salish Sea are fragile, and need to be preserved, not developed. Now that rezoning is being fast-tracked and the public hearing stage is being skipped. HOW do we protect our neighbourhoods from disappearing by pressures put on by developer\$ and Institutions, including BC Transit. Protected trees continue to be at risk and land covenants are disappearing QA land, Queenswoods Campus, Mystic Vale. UVic is treating taxpayers with zero respect or regard. This is not acceptable for a public universit
273	Population growth is inevitable. Density in areas like U of Vic is inevitable. It's time for "locals" to think about the future and forget about NIMBY
274	Anything to get more affordable housing on the market is critically important
275	A village doesn't have 10 story buildings or anything close to it.
276	no. no condos . this is not Manhattan island.
277	Where is the feasibility study I can read? What is the environmental impact study as well?
278	It is important to maintain a country village ambiance for the Village Centre with adjacent gyro park area maintained a7s a large green/ocean space that is uncluttered by tall adjacent buildings.
279	It would be great to improve/update the aesthetic of the current Village buildings to more of a west coast vibe, and tie everything together with the surrounding parks and beach; boardwalks and patio areas with covered outdoor seating to be used year-round and make the Village more of a gathering place than just shopping and services.

280	change should be careful phased in and drastic changes avoided... these changes are both important but irreversible
281	we need to increase density, affordability and diversity in our community. Cadboro Village is the perfect spot for this to occur
282	No buildings higher than 3 storeys, please. There are other, gentler ways of densifying modestly without radically changing the character of Cadboro Bay.
283	Any development has to be attractive for people to want to live in. Have lots of green spaces. Have spaces for kids to play in. Make commercial spaces attractive for adults to gather in & socialize together. Don't cram units in that we will regret in a few years b/c they are ugly and too close together.
284	How many of your planners live and/or have experienced the sense of community in this area? Don't make this area another museum fiasco!
285	Why is the Cadboro Bay Local Area Plan is being largely reconsidered after the major consultation effort to draft it? Saanich Council does not seem to be acting in a democratic manner, even if they state that they consider the 'democratic' input of other opinions such as commercial developers. While i support the need for higher density housing in general, the underlying problem with introducing such in the Cadboro Bay area is the extremely high value of the land and the endless demand from purchasers from all across Canada and the rest of the world who can afford this price range. Higher density housing in this area will not likely be affordable to many UVic students or even people with reasonable incomes. Public transit from anywhere that is not in walking distance of the UVic bus loop quite minimal.
286	I'd like to see the area cohesively developed with the UVIC edge having more student housing, more mixed use in the centre and more family centred housing in the expansion. If the UVIC edge and centre are more walkable and have good transit built in I think it would be worth considering a more transit/less car oriented focus to prevent heavy traffic. Keeping tree cover is also a priority for me.
287	Please don't ruin this wonderful neighborhood! Allow backyard suites to increase density and maybe some townhouses in the Village Centre.
288	Adding higher density in the Cadboro Bay Village area should be restricted to Garden/Laneway homes and duplex/fourplex homes. No buildings greater than 3 stories should be allowed in the one block radius from Penrhyn/Cadboro Bay roads intersection. With stores/businesses on ground level and 2 story apartments above. Anything more would change the character of the entire neighbourhood. This small Village Core is NOT the place to add large density.
289	Any new development (residential or commercial), please allow as much set back from set as possible or if multi-story consider having the second floor and higher set back or tiered back from the street so their height is less imposing.
290	8-10 stories??? We were Ok with three story buildings in the village centre then four stories after pushing but now 8-10 story buildings??? No way! It's time for Cadboro Bay to once again proceed with long established plans to break off from Saanich and join Oak Bay if they try to force 6 -10 story buildings through.
291	Trying to think about not just myself here, I'm really trying to think about my kids need
292	The future is condo living & If done tastefully it would be a wonderful improvement....
293	These type of developments should be placed in the "Shelbourne corridor" between McKenzie and Hillside; and around Uptown.
294	Parking would be a major concern if developing the Cadboro Bay core. If condo or apartments are approved for the Village core the developer must include underground

	parking. It must be assumed people will still drive and have cars to par.
295	Please think about young people. I want to see this area remain interesting and exciting
296	This needs to be a visionary plan; looking for more vibrancy here
297	Keep to 2 story homes, garden suites
298	After participating in the workshops for the LAP several years ago and like many residents devoting a good deal of community time to see these through, it is very disappointing to not have the original LAP proposal as part of this process. None of these options accurately reflect what the majority of the community is ideally looking for. These are options that are not the first choice, and do not necessarily reflect the reason that many residents chose to move here. Cadboro Bay is a unique hamlet, and people live here because of it. Sure add some 2-3 story mixed use buildings in or close of the village core, but no we do not want anything taller than 3 stories and we do not wish to see the village core expanded to any large degree. Queenswood should be off limits as this is an Urban forest and the lots should remain as is. Diversity should be where it makes more sense: McKenzie, Shelbourne, etc, not in Caddie Bay. Please leave our Beach community as the special place it is.
299	As home owners and tax payers we have all bought here, at great expense, because it is so important to us to have a quiet, safe, peaceful life surrounded by nature. Many of us just feel heartbroken that you are trying to impose the same damage on our lovely Cadboro Bay area as has been done already to so many areas of Greater Victoria. We beg you to reconsider these destructive plans...Thank you.
300	There is absolutely NOTHING that needs to be fixed in cadboro bay. Changes happen organically. Not by pressure from developers.
301	Leave well enough alone-no one who owns their own house and lives in this neighbourhood wants this type of development or housing form. We pay a very large property tax bill happily to maintain what we have currently. Do not change this.
302	The last group of questions are too broad in scope. I do support some densification but I cannot support it in the way it is suggested in that last question grouping.
303	If 3-storey multiple dwelling units are allowed in areas of smaller lots having small building setbacks, those buildings would over-look what are now private yards, and so diminish the valuable privacy features of those properties. Why should the owners of those properties have to accept this reduction in quality of living? There are already too many people moving to this part of BC - increased road traffic and demand for health care services has already diminished our quality of life - why worsen the situation? We should be resisting 'growth', not supporting it. Regarding this questionnaire, although I find the topic unsettling because it looks like decisions have already been made to accommodate 'growth', I find questionnaire itself is very good and easy to use.
304	Why destroy the appeal and attractiveness of a good neighborhood?????
305	This cant really be the vision of mayor and council can it?? Extremely disappointing
306	If density is to increase, I believe it to be imperative for public amenities to increase in parallel: a new library branch (similar to those built in James Bay and Langford in the last ten years); electric car charging stations; a small community centre or at least a covered meeting area in Maynard Park (potentially with a wading pool similar to those scattered in community parks in Vancouver and a skate board/roller skate park).
307	It is shocking that the beauty of Victoria and this vibrant neighbourhood would be turned in to large height homes. This is not anti low income housing. That is welcomed. We do not need height in a beloved neighbourhood. This will destroy the area. What is needed is more businesses in the village centre to keep people walking. We need sidewalks. The Eastern

	Village should not have anything higher than a townhouse.
308	Additional housing gained through garden and in-house suites would provide a fluid, organic process per the October 2021 draft LAP.
309	This is a precious place to live as it is and no change to make it bigger will make it more an area of HOMES. So many people have lived here for a long time and treasure the whole area of Cadboro Bay! If YOU decide to make the changes, you change our joy to lowering the beauty and comfort of the area we have known as home for years. Please leave it as it is.
310	Keep the quiet, peaceful residential areas as they are!
311	I do not agree with the project
312	Further construction of condominiums will perpetuate the inequities of the system in which corporate and private owners exploit low income people and families for profit. The area does not need any further condominiums but apartment complexes are much needed. Corporations owning apartment complexes offer reduced rental prices due to the economy of scale.
313	I do not support the densification of the Cadboro Bay Village and surrounding areas.
314	Dont add more housing
315	Cadboro bay is not aiming for affordability, part of the charm of this area is just that. Less ppl, Less cars. I see no need for accommodating an affordable market. Other areas of saanich are easily accessible.
316	There is evidence from recent developments that below market units are not on the table. The demographics for my street are wildly out of date. The plots in the area are expensive and would not provide affordable housing for anyone. The wording in the survey is misleading.
317	Cadboro Bay cannot support more traffic. 3 roads out of Cadboro Bay. Even UVIC can not support more traffic with 2 roads leading out of the area. Higher buildings near the transportation Hub hopefully would encourage residents to use the buses. s leading away from UVIC. I can see UVIC edge having more density as UVIC grows with g
318	More people +,more vehicles + more pollution = down grading the living/working environment we now enjoy there is NO benefit to the existing tax payer/residents
319	Housing is an essential good, it sits at the bottom along with food on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. That we have an insufficient amount of it is an issue that all neighbourhoods are responsible for helping solve. Cadboro Bay and particularly the village areas can be a well fit part of the solution. Not shadows nor heights nor views nor aesthetics should come BEFORE ensuring that all members of the community have a home, those can be dealt with after everyone is looked after. Until then, build away, please
320	We need more housing options and commercial amenities
321	Clearly not in favour of this initiative .
322	We should stay out of designating buildings as rental or not. We just need more units and the market will solve the rest.
323	The village is too small for expansion. It's quaint and lovely the way it is. Traffic is still manageable but to increase any housing density there is not a good idea.
324	Cadboro is one of the last places to building 4+ stories. Giving developers profits is not a reasonable reason for destroying a community when there is so much nearby land for lower cost densification along McKenzie and with proper transport links and shops.
325	Even three storey structures are too immense in size for the Cadboro Bay Village area.

	<p>Purpose built housing, apartments and condominiums are not suitable for Cadboro Bay which is described in the previous Local Area Plan as "semi rural". Do not expand the commercial area to any area near Maynard, Hobbs or Haro Streets where there is a school, daycares etc and therefore many children. At the workshop and on this survey we should be given the choice of "none of the options" we want the draft LAP to be accepted albeit with some adjustments as per the feedback given at that time. Ms. Exposito and the team did splendid work in engaging the community in the Draft LAP (Oct 2021), and now this new initiative is thrust upon us in the last few months of the process. The land being discussed is above market average and will never be "affordable" for lower incomes. The 2 churches in Cadboro Bay have been discussed during this new initiative but they seem to be absent in the process. I suggest you contact them directly to determine if they may have ideas. Keep in mind that Cadboro Bay as a village and not a town - keep it that a way.</p>
326	<p>Large multi story building would detract from the character of the village area</p>
327	<p>I attended the Zoom that Saanich recently held on the LAP - I would have come to the workshop but unfortunately was away. I was struck in the Zoom by the two young university students who felt that housing should be available that they could afford as soon as they graduated as they would like to stay in the area. I feel they were utterly unrealistic in their expectations. How many of the people currently living here could have afforded to live here when they were that young? Did we not all start out in basement suites and move into nicer areas as increases in income and savings allowed? There is no realistic way in which low income housing can be built in Cadboro Bay given current land prices. A builder on the Zoom said it was not possible. There was a suggestion earlier in this survey asking if one would be prepared to increase density in exchange for money being available to improve public services such as Giro Park. Leave the park alone - no more concrete! Before long Cadboro Bay will lose it's rural character and be like the centre of the city. The only way low cost housing can be built is to be built on land owned by the city or province or by renovating existing city owned buildings.</p>
328	<p>The village needs more housing options but can't accommodate 6 stories</p>
329	<p>Please respect the original LAP (low density, no high-rises) our community agreed to.</p>
330	<p>we object having Saanich imposing zoning contrary to the local area plan and the wishes of the neighbourhood</p>
331	<p>More rental housing is essential and apartment with 5 or 6 storey need less cutting trees</p>
332	<p>This area is totally not suitable to increased height or density. The focus of any increase in either height allowances or density increases should be in the core area, incorporated into the shopping complex of stores. The surrounding areas provide a relatively affordable housing option to the extremely expensive Queenswood and Ten Mile Point areas, and so should be preserved as such. This area currently provides numerous rental suites, which is supportive to the core area . The core area should be limited to 3 storey ( 2 level living over ground level retail ) buildings.</p>
333	<p>Let's fill up all the institutional lands before we mess with the village.</p>
334	<p>Have to be a BC or better yet a Vancouver Islander for 2 years prior to first round of residents being offered housing. Too often we are looking after residents needs from other parts of Canada.</p>
335	<p>This public consultation process needs to be wrapped up. Write the plan with some flexibility for Saanich to accommodate a changing real estate landscape.</p>
336	<p>Leave our community alone</p>

337	I only support heights higher than 4 stories in the UVic area along Sinclair and areas nearest to UVic. Also, trees will become more and more important to our future sustainability and enjoyment of areas. Development must work around established trees and many more planted that take into account climate change, drought and fires.
338	The pedestrian crossing at the curved road, where Cad. Bay turns into Telegraph Bay is so dangerous! There should be either a straight road, getting the traffic to really look! Or a raised crossing, as for the preschool at UVic. I raised this with your engineer and she retorted that will never happen because it is a major road! Now, tell me how do other municipalities deal with this? They put slow down signs up and also the speed is reduced. please, let's not invite a terrible accident.
339	Parking to shop in the Village Centre is currently at capacity on many days. Any increase in density needs to ensure access to businesses in the core.
340	Should work with Oak Bay to encourage them to allow students to live in rented accomodation; from more than 2 families
341	Land too expensive to make it attractive for developers to build affordable housing
342	Greater density should be achieved more with things like townhomes instead of apartment buildings outside of the immediate are of the central shopping area.
343	While the village core could in places benefit from a face lift, it is objectionable to create a semi-urban ambiance and functionality to this quaint village area. There is no going back on that progression, and it is regrettable. I'm not sure who decided the affordable housing in this area needs to be in proximity to the village in the first place, but I disagree with that basic premise. To take that premise as a given, and to force poor choices on the community as a result is dubious. To be clear, I do not live in the village area, and so this is not a "not in my backyard" stance. Nor should anti-highrise opinions here be setup as being anti-low-income-housing. Satisfying a need for low income and other dense housing options should not necessitate those options be in prime shared locations. All greater community members - at any income level - benefit from guarding the charm and resisting West-Van-gentrification of the Cadboro Bay Village.
344	Bottom rate or affordable housing is an oxymoron for Cadboro Bay. It has already defined itself in terms of socioeconomic structure. Why waste time to restructure Cadboro Bay. Is this the case of low hanging fruit by the Council to pursue an objective that they don't have to leave their chairs, similiar to the rate of speed adjustments where they can appear to be doing something without having to do due diligence.
345	I feel there is a predetermined plan that was not part of the original area plan. Listen to current tax payers
346	This work must be accelerated, families and people are struggling to live in the City. Our housing costs are astronomical, and as a young professional, I am considering leaving the city as a result of the housing challenges and incredible costs that are levied on a basic human right such as housing. With every day that passes, more and more people are in precarious positions. The time to act was yesterday...
347	Saanich has identified areas for high-density development including the Shelbourne corridor and Uptown. Cadboro Bay is an area of long-established "single-family" homes that, despite assertions to the contrary, already provide a variety of housing options within those homes. I am a homeowner in Cadboro Bay, and at one time there were four generations living under one roof. At various other times, I have also shared my home with UVic students on a cost-sharing basis, which works out to about 25% of what a one-bedroom apartment would have cost. Talk about affordable housing! Many homes also have mature fruit trees and food gardens that help feed us and our community. Cadboro Bay is also an

	<p>area of significant ecological value in Saanich, containing mature near-shore Coastal Douglas Fir forest that "houses" protected plant and animal species, and provides all the myriad of other "free" services that a forest offers. So, why on Earth would Cadboro Bay, of all places, be nominated by Saanich as an area for increased density of such magnitude? Unless new housing is co-op or non-profit, it will be no more affordable than the old houses it replaces. In fact, by zoning for higher buildings of multi-family units on formerly single-family lots, it will further inflate the value of that land. What happens when the land base moves increasingly from single homeownership to corporate ownership? Increasing affordability? I think not. I urge Saanich council to serve their constituents and steward the land by wise development, and live up to "sustainable Saanich". We are all sympathetic to the need for more affordable housing, but must also preserve our natural capital. Really investigate the best way to supply affordable housing. We do not need more "housing as commodity" in someone's REIT. Please read 'Push': How Big Finance Is Driving Up Housing Costs at <a href="https://make-the-shift.org">https://make-the-shift.org</a> and there are many relevant articles on the <a href="http://betterdwelling.com">betterdwelling.com</a> website.</p>
348	<p>I am extremely concerned about the lack of information that the planning team and council seem to be basing their decisions on. There are no population projections for the areas that are being presented for increased population density. The difference between several hundred and several thousand will be significant on the services required for the district of Cadboro Bay. In particular the latest iteration for Sinclair Road will be unable to manage the traffic if the University Edge district grew to 5000 or 8000 people. There cannot be assumptions about the densification of the neighbourhood without consideration of the long term impact. Consideration needs to be made about parking throughout the area unless they are choosing to have no parking available for guests or visitors. The foot traffic on the Haro Woods park will dramatically increase, as will, bike and electric bike usage of what is now considered a "natural area." More crosswalks and/or traffic lights may be needed on Sinclair as well. This proposal lacks considerable depth on impact while expecting the community to make commitments about a future could be filled with problems. There needs to be much more work on the impact of such proposals before barging on ahead with commitments to significant population increases. Finally, the council should be held to task for dropping this significant decision into the area plan on such short notice after years of positive discussions with the community. Decisions of this scale shouldn't be rushed without considerably more forethought and discussion.</p>
349	<p>3stories should be limit, 2 on residential streets. Main arteries could have any housing option, subsidized , rental, condo, townhouse, granny flat. Numerous rental units already exist, with basement apts. and UVic residences. This is part of area density and it is part of the present neighbourhood that Saanich is ignoring in this plan. UVic needs to take some responsibility to build more residences on their property rather than expecting the community to sacrifice quality of life to build 8 story apartments in residential areas of one story houses. Most neighbours here are in favour of adding rental stock on a small scale, and we appreciate that the entire city needs to have increased housing. However we have zero faith that Saanich will control this process, given their track record of ignoring existing area plans for every proposal that developers propose for housing. The chance that developers would build affordable rental rather than condos, once height limits are raised is very limited. Ruining our quality of life to build more expensive vacation condos for absent owners is not acceptable. Allowing the existing process of densifying by adding granny flats and basement apartments , with higher 3 story condos and townhouses on main streets. Simplifying regulations for homeowners to renovate legal apartments would encourage</p>

	more older homeowners to convert basements.
350	It is recognised that city representatives are under pressure to increase densification and to provide more affordable housing and there are locations well suited to this type of development within Saanich and the CRD, but Cadboro Bay is not one of them. People choose to live and buy in different areas and greater Victoria region is blessed with many different neighbourhoods for people to choose from. Cadboro Bay is defined by its semi-rural character and its small village core that is in keeping with the remainder of the area. It is not downtown Victoria nor a highly developed and dense commercial area. Adding such infrastructure would only serve to diminish an attractive and desirable area, making it just like every other urban centre.
351	Why has Saanich chosen to spoil our community for the benefit of developers? We have seniors who would no longer be able to safely walk through the area. We already have parking problems for beach access. Our children would be vulnerable from increased road traffic. This whole idea is in the WRONG area.
352	Re # 16. Village Centre as drawn is way too big. West of Hobbs is not suitable for multi story with commercial ground floor. Similarly north of Maynard and the park.
353	Are there plans to widen roads? build social service buildings and bring in community facilities? I do not see any suggestions for more school buildings? Will there be more public transportation?
354	See previous comments. Cadboro Bay is completely unsuitable for subsidized/lower income or higher density/higher elevation housing. It is very expensive waterfront. All that will result is unaffordable, high density, undesirable housing that devalues the community and ruins the unique character of Cadboro Bay. Townhouses could be incorporated and be sustainable. The contemplation of 4 and particularly 6 or 8 storey developments is absurd. I am fully supportive of development of higher density, higher elevation, more affordable housing in more suitable areas of Saanich where the property values are not as high as Cadboro Bay. Saanich should be focusing efforts on more communities where real estate and developments are less expensive and therefore will be more suitable to meeting the goals of affordable housing. I find it amazing that this plan has got this far when the fundamental economics of this plan are so fundamentally flawed.
355	Seems like I've already completed a similar research a few weeks ago
356	I am not sure why Cadboro Bay is viewed as a favourable area for denser housing. The land is expensive and the unique character of the community draws people here. Increased traffic and blocked site lines will reduce the appeal. Rather than apartment buildings and condos, options like duplexes would maintain the appeal of the community, maintain the family friendly community feel, and address the need for missing-middle housing. Apartment blocks and townhouses are better suited to Victoria, Oak Bay, Esquimalt.
357	I would be highly supportive of high density development of just about any kind in the areas already purposed for commercial. This survey does not appear to have this as an option. It is the first option that makes sense. Develop the areas further that are already developed commercially. Dropping an apartment block in the middle of there neighbourhood on one of the church sites does not make any sense for long term community planning.
358	The options do not allow for other possibilities such as other corridors close by which may be more suitable. Legal suites and carriage houses also not included which could address some of these issues without going so vertical. The village center is not well named and includes many residential streets.
359	No



360	Cadboro Bay has a unique Village atmosphere which most people that live here moved here for that reason! Other than the idea of a mixed use 3-4 storey building to replace the shops on the NE side of Cadboro Bay Rd. I think this area would be completely ruined by adding 4-10 storey buildings. I'm sure there are many other areas within Saanich that are much better suited for that kind of endeavour. Please do not ruin a unique and special area to make more money through constant growth and development. I feel very strongly that AirBnB's in the area should be limited or not allowed in Saanich so that these spaces could be rented out for more long term rentals which are hugely lacking in our city! Please consider this as other municipalities have.
361	I would be in favour of low income/mixed housing 3-4 levels high . I don't think that option was offered
362	Growing up in Cadboro Bay in the 70's/80's was great. Not so nice here now. If any of this so called planning goes through it will be awful living here.
363	As noted, we feel that this plan is actually being driven by developers or those who will gain by having a free for all on building. Please listen to those of us who have chosen and live in this community. The size and scope of the villiage and existing development is what we like. I have been a oart if this community for over 40 years and am very unhappy about a plan that would see this area turn from unique and right sized to a city development
364	The community plan that is currently envisaged would irrevocably change what is a charming sea side community. All it would do is aid some developers - who by the way are generally required to have affordable housing units in their plans and are not doing it for reasons of altruism. We do not support the community plan.
365	Please revisit the Design Charrette which ocured in June 2018, culminating in a 2019 report which did not indicate drastic changes to the LAP shown in this questionnaire
366	I had to get this questionnaire from a neighbour and am wondering why I did not receive if from Saanich directly.
367	I hope you are thinking about the young people. I worry for my children and their future here.
368	Please respect the unique, low density, single family nature of the Village and its surrounding homes.
369	10 stories. Really! That is only okay on current major corridors as are currently being done. I can't even imagine the effects of even 4 or more on the local area! I am in full support of expanding "livable" areas but NOT by large blocks of buildings. That is not the way to plan out of the current housing issues. Saanich can't come in now, decade's after housing and a community has been established and completely change it for people that worked hard and sacrificed, like me, to be here. CB is one of the only "villages " left in the CRD. Don't take it away. If you reduce the barrier to change a community it will never return again. I commend Saanich to allow larger housing in Uptown and at Shelbourne and Mackenzie. It's that sort of new rentals and housing. Look at Langford. Let them build it out. Let us add suites etc and keep the vary nature we spent a vast amount of our capital on to be here. Perhaps think outside the box. Give us a rebate on property tax to assist in rentals? My property tax has gone up 15% each of the last two years net. Attract better paying jobs. Properties will come down in value slowly with interest rates going up. Investors will sell or think more now. Developer have to come up with more capital to make the math work. Don't change the way Cadboro Bay in one or two years for events that take decades to play out.
370	Cadboro Bay Village is special to keep as a quaint village by the sea. Don't ruin it with High buildings please.

371	Typically, development occurs as properties come up for sale: if a developer buys the property, a proposal is submitted for the maximum allowable density/height, and permission is given on an ad hoc basis. It would be much more responsible if zoning were revisited to take care in determining which specific lots, relative to their surroundings (trees, geography, sight lines), would be suitable for which type of housing.
372	I have heard that there is some discussion about increasing rental housing on the queen Alexandra site. I have tried to find more information about this. I am very against such a proposal as that land is meant to be used to serve a specific community need. If it is taken out of that covenant, it will be gone forever, swallowed up for further development. If density can be increased elsewhere it will become an important Pok area.
373	The law of Supply and Demand, indicates that unless heavily subsidized , affordable housing is not possible
374	Us neighbourhood residents are still confounded about why Saanich Planning is going after us when there are SO many areas of Saanich that are better suited for density. It seems like this is being pushed on us, and we have paid for our homes and pay very high taxes! Why do we not get to say NO?? Please leave us alone.
375	Very important to protect the ocean shoreline ecosystem so that high - use does not destroy bird and ocean habitat and cause erosion. NO high density deveoopomeht should occur below the elevation of Cadboro Bay road!!!!!! VERY IMPORTANT. Sea levels will be rising at least 1 metre in the next decades
376	Increasing density in areas where people have paid high housing values to live in a low density environment violates their rights. There is no end to the densification issue. Housing problems will not be solved by expanding housing in Cadboro Bay. The neighbourhood is well established and has its own character. It should be left alone.
377	Sinclair Road hill is way overdue to be fixed up, regardless of whether or not housing options have been fully decided. Bike lanes along Telegraph Bay road and Arbutus Road are absolutely necessary sooner rather than later. Please do more investigation into current speed limits. There are areas where the limit is simply too high: all of Arbutus Road, Telegraph Bay Road in particular. Please do not ever consider draining or developing the wet area of Gyro Park next to the new cement path. Leaving it permanently as wetland is absolutely important.
378	sanitary sewers should be available to all properties
379	I think Saanich needs to focus on habitat protection in this area. That is what they are already purporting to do through bylaws limiting dogs. People create noise, light, and air pollution. Highrise developments and a denser population in this area will without a doubt affect the waterways, oceanside, and ecological networks.
380	Don't destroy Cadboro Bay - only make minimal improvements that are supported by owners and residents
381	We feel stongly that any multiple housing buildings above 3 stories is not suitable for Cadboro Bay.
382	supportive of higher density housing in village core but should be no higher than 3 to 4 stories and should be built in areas that cause minimal transformation of existing neighbourhoods. Okay to build up on existing commercial sites and east of existing commercial sites but changing zoning in existing sf family neighbourhoods would be very disruptive. Better off adding higher density in downtown victoria building on top of commercial sites and areas such as University heights (tuscan village is a good project) where you are not bulldozing existing healthy neighbourhoods.

383	Why are you targetting Cadboro Bay. This is a low-rise beach neighbourhood. That's what the residents AND visitors appreciate. Once Cadboro Bay is ruined there'll be no going back. So, with respect, fuck off and leave us alone.
384	Although the Provincial govt wants Victorians to increase the population density in Victoria it is a misguided policy. When will the policy end ? 6 story buildings in Cadboro bay is madness. The suggesstion that mindlessly building 6 story buildings will solve housing is a knee jerk reaction. We needto preserve this city not destroy its very essence by building triple a infrastructure to accommodate all those who wish to move here. The governetna at all three levels should fix island transportation and change landuse polict to allow for communities up island to grow rather than expect Victoria to absorb all the population influx. Victoria is Big enough.! her.
385	Don't ruin Caddy Bay with tall buildings and increased density. The area is nice with a lot of mature trees that would be cut down to make way for construction. We moved to this area because we like how it was. Don't change it.
386	The church/institutional properties in the area might be able to support 6 stories with good design.
387	Gyro Park and the village area are unique . Many people outside of the village core come to this place to enjoy the park, beach, and amenities of the Village. Where will peiple living in crowded spaces gp for fresh air and the seaside for outdoors enjoyment?
388	Focus on subdivision of lots and building small houses. Too few people living in too big houses on too bug lots. Provide sewage and infrastructure to Queenswood area...this should be allowed to subdivide and should NOT be on septic systems!. Tax properties at \$1 per sqaure foot of property...so and 8000 sq ft property tax would be \$8000, a 50,000 sq ft Queenswood Property would be \$50,000. Then allow subdivision to encourage small houses and properties to be split up. NO ON STREET PARKING ANYWHERE FOR RESIDENTS! ...this "ghetto-izes" the neighborhood and creates safety risks.
389	The areas outlined are much too large for a reasonable and adaptable increase in density. You are not providing any real choices - the real question is whether the local community will support increases in density in focused areas, where it makes sense, not the entire neighborhood. A survey is not a survey without real options.
390	Please, no high rises. Cadboro Bay is nver going to be a cheap area to live in, so it is not clear why these optiond are being pushed through dedpite prebious area plan. And don't over develop the beach! Thete are many nice small beaches in Gordon H
391	No high buildings that go right to the sidewalk like the one at Sinclair and Shelbourne. University Heights planning is just awful. And what about Gordon zHead with its many inaccessible beaches (no parking anywhere near them). Gordon Head, a dull area with no centre or amenities is what needs this plan. Don't let developers overbuild Cadboro Bay. It is never going to be a cheap area. And don't jam buildings around the beach (it is not an amusement park .) Saanich - please, more sensible, sensitive development. You need need planners!
392	Please increase housing options and building heights to enable more affordable housing supply
393	Social engineering has always failed, read about it.
394	The City has not provided population density estimates for any of the options and associated impact on local infrastructure.
395	I didn't finish this survey as it makes no sense whatsoever. Why are you splitting apart this area and leaving aside the beach properties and properties towards Uplands?

396	see previous comments. townhouses can fit in to these areas, but limit it to 2 stories
397	I think the options are very limited by the space. Very high end properties. I think those homeowners would like to keep the quiet of the area and privacy. It would also require redirection of a LOT of traffic which isn't feasible for the space. No parks should be taken away, rather more created if more people living in this neighbourhood.
398	Development would make more sense from the top of Sinclair Hill towards UVic and along McKenzie corridor where there are established transit routes and shops and amenities that can cater to more people. The Village shops are already packed and transit is extremely limited. Packing more people into this area does not make sense - specially given that Gyro Park draws many folks on a daily basis, year round, from outside the community to visit, use the shops etc.
399	Three stories is the absolute maximum that should be considered in the main centre area only. This is a village.
400	I am adamantly opposed to any building over 3 levels/storeys.
401	I support more affordable rentals but the workshop stats showed that they won't be pursued by developers in Cadboro bay. Instead affordable older properties with suites will be torn down to build luxury condos. Cadboro bay is also an "end of the road" community with topography (Sinclair hill) that deters adequate transit and active transportation. So it's highly misleading to propose Cadboro bay as an area for affordable densification. Furthermore the ditching of community feedback from the last 4 years and the November draft vision of a low scale village and introducing these new options with minimal discussion is an abuse of process
402	i do not support any more development in the village
403	Has anyone considered Cedar Hill Corner for some housing to spread it out a bit.
404	I would like to see a variety of businesses and services provided in the Village core.
405	Many elderly people live in this area. Their safety and security should be a consideration.
406	I think that the developers that are proposing/supportive of these proposals need to reviewed very closing for their goals and connections to the community
407	While I understand the need for a variety of housing options, one needs to balance that with a desire to preserve the special seaside village character of Cadboro Bay. The same guidelines for density, design and structure applied to McKenzie Avenue and Shelbourne Street cannot be applied in Cadboro Bay without destroying this vibrant community that we cherish so. To let developers dictate the outcome of community planning based on their profit margin is folly. Saanich should recognize the special character of Cadboro Bay as captured in the Local Area Plan, and focus on more suitable areas for 6- to 8-story accommodation.
408	One of the major reasons why property owners are drawn to this area/ neighbourhood, & pay high property taxes, is because of the tall trees, as opposed to excessively tall buildings. As well as the large tracts of forested areas, as opposed to high population density. Very tall buildings in a geographical/topographical area such as Cadboro Bay, would have an overwhelming & dominating impact on the viewscape & small village Seaside feel . An 8 storey building, such as the new construction on the corner of McKenzie & Shelbourne, would be visually & physically overpowering! Developers do not have the right to determine the character of our community, based solely on their profit margin. Where is our LAP, worked on by the stakeholders in this community, with the suggestions of densification through laneway houses, garden suites, basement suites, which all provide increased diversity of rental units in low density neighbourhoods, doing so with a much

	lower impact on the community & without destroying its character.
409	Have to look at what group buildings are designed for; again, costs would make only those with high incomes able to afford units.
410	Instead of trying to convert CB to a downtown area these housing options are more suited for Mckenzie between Shelbourne and Gordon Head Road.
411	I would love Saanich planning to be creative in helping to provide other housing options: how can homeowners convert their houses to create rental units and make the construction affordable (we would do this if it wasn't so costly to create a seperate living space - basement is finished)? How can Saanich change the application making it easier for homeowners to build carriage houses in the yard? And most importantly, has Saanich looked at AirBnB and VRBO to see how many rental units actually exist and wonder why homeowners choose this route? What can Saanich do to allow a middle ground between tenant rights and homeowner rights? This is provincially regulated, but acknowledgment of this issue and discussion with provincial leaders might make headway. Tenants need rights but so do homeowners. AirBnB and VRBO allow homeowners to retain more rights over their property. It would be great to brainstorm ways in which Saanich could address this, as building high-rises everywhere will not provide the solution to this issue.
412	Cadboro Bay is a beautiful community. What makes it so desirable is its' quietness, natural green spaces, walking trails and natural sea air. Yes, growth is inevitable but if we "citify" it too much it just becomes tall buildings, concrete, hot pavement noisy and all that is appealing is gone. Building Town homes and condos should be limited to 4 storeys maximum.
413	Great idea! Not!!! Lets take all the things that make an area desirable and attractive and then change it!! And in the process not really involve the people that are actually affected! We didnt hear anything about this plan. Shameful
414	ill-conceived! ill-presented!!!
415	This is not where density belongs!!!
416	taxpayers/voters have good memories
417	This cant be the vision of my council and mayor can it??? Density doesn't belong in this area.
418	Mixed use would be fine in the village with no more than 2 upper stories. But let's get some retail, not just dentists and service providers. Let's encourage small business.
419	Higher density should happen in the Shelbourne and Mackenzie area not in Cadboro Bay
420	The earthquake risk information is derived from surficial geology mapping of the Victoria area vulnerabilities.
421	Developers was development, the majority of this community wants this small community to maintain the rural small center vibe..we bought here because if this not because we want to live amongst crowds and density.. please listen to us not those seeking to cash in
422	Again - please lower speed limit to 40km on cadboro bay road by gyro park to increase safely and decrease noise pollution.
423	Think traffic patterns, Village centre and Northeast extensioin are on thoroughfares. Heavy traffic would alter the essence of UVic edge.
424	I am strongly against any structure larger than 3 storeys. If 4 is in the plan, developers will be pushing for 5, 6, 7. Ten storeys were mentioned. We do not want to become another downtown Victoria or West End of Vancouver or Langford. We chose to live here because of the quiet peaceful neighbourhood. The original draft plan of October 27, 2021, was more acceptable (see Map 9.2, p. 31) as to height of potential development. Developers may say

	that they need 4+ storeys to make it feasible but why should we pander to the developers. Developers will always come in and push the limit, so 3 should be the maximum allowed by Saanich, and then they will push for 4 or more. I do not think that there will be any shortage of developers looking for projects in the area, even if the height allowance is 3 storeys, which they will then push to 4.
425	Times change, let's shape this change together. I could not believe the draft plan would require incomes of 185k or more. We need to be more open than that! Housing attainable to 150k is doable, I dont thin k we can go much farther than that sadly
426	for increased density, you must plan and FUND the increase in services associated (health care, childcare, bus...) & infrastructure (roads) required.
427	Outcomes such as the recent decision on 520 Normandy Rd. in Royal Oak casts doubt on the integrity of these processes, all the more so since the prolonged Cadboro Bay consultations have been upended by this eleventh hour push for greater densification. This raises real credibility issues for council, which most residents will likely view in a very serious light.
428	The proposed direction has the potential to make residents resentful and unhappy without achieving any of the proposed objectives. Recent experience in Royal Oak bears this out.
429	These proposed radical changes in zoning will destroy the character of Cadboro Bay. It seems like the intent is to make the community so undesirable that it drives down prices.
430	Cadboro Bay is a very small area of Saanich, surrounded by the ocean on 3 sides. It is a special neighborhood with a unique feeling of being in a rural neighborhood close to the city. Children walk and ride bikes/scooters to school, many people walk to the stores. High rise buildings need to be built along major corridors such as MacKenzie and Shelbourne Streets, not quiet neighborhoods.
431	Cadboro bay is a unique area and needs careful planning consideration. It is not suitable for low income housing
432	Cadboro Bay needs to do its part to end the housing crisis.
433	no more multi housing units without parking spaces for 1.5 cars per unit
434	there are other areas in saanich for thist ype of development
435	This is a neighbourhood walking distance to one of the biggest employers in the region. It desperately needs more housing options! The majority of staff and students there could never afford a detached house in Cadboro bay, so let's build some homes that they could afford.
436	6-8 storey buildings are not suitable for an oceanside village. Tall buildings may be more appropriate toward the top of the hill but not in the basin.
437	I would be unsupportive if large buildings were proposed accompanied by above ground parking lots of proportionate size. Land is too valuable to give over to parking. Parking in new developments should be deliberately limited to discourage car use, and that which is allowed should be underground to the greatest extent possible.
438	I think it is unfortunate and disengenuous that you have only provided options for low-cost rental and below-market housing in 6-10 story developments, essentially attempting conscript anyone who might be concerned with housing affordability into agreeing to developments that were not discussed in the previous community consultations nor included in the Local Area Draft Plan. It's sneaky and underhanded at best.
439	The Village centre should remain at 3 stories or lower. Increased density at the outer edges only.
440	considering climate change, the preservation of greenery, trees and green space is

	absolutely essential for every human being, and where to expand and to what extent needs a long-term vision and not just ad hoc placements of tall blocks when lots come up for sale; the geology of the village makes intense building precarious in case of any natural disaster (we should respect the waterways that flow down by/under the village and through the Gyro Park estuary to the sea. along Cadboro Bay Rd is also like this: the ground water level is precarious for intense building, given the risk.
441	I think saanich is looking at things through the wrong lense. Keep density in the corridors such as shelborne and major roads, ruining a small village is not the way to do it and short sited by a few people on council that think it will be affordable.. it will drive up housing costs
442	Quit trying to ram this proposal down the throats of people who have lived her for decades.
443	Maximum 4 stories throughout Cadboro Bay. Based on the information that was provided at the zoom meeting, one would still need to be rich to buy an affordable housing option. Support the development of mixed use in the village - preferably a maximum of 3 stories, garden suites, in home suites and townhomes. Nothing higher. In addition, you are playing around with people's life savings with your decisions. And you are playing around with the very fabric that makes Cadboro Bay wonderful when you propose things like 8-10 story buildings.



[saanich.ca/cadboro](https://saanich.ca/cadboro)

April 2022