

Tyndall San Juan Response Form and Workshop Results Summary

March 28, 2001

These results, as well as the full package of comments, can be viewed in the Planning Department or on the "What's New" page at the District's website: www.gov.saanich.bc.ca.

Attendance: Approximately 200 people attended the workshop
Response form: 147 comment forms received

Workshop Format: Gordon Head Resident Association Acting President Stephen Tyler introduced purpose and format of evening. Anne Topp, Manager of Planning Services, explained information about planning process, the difference between zoning and subdivision, a brief history of planning designations of the property, and what would happen with the information gathered. Dave Harper, a local resident, made a presentation on what constitutes a complete community. Darrell Wick presented information on how complete communities can aid in reducing traffic.

Following the presentations, people were invited to join one of twelve facilitated groups to discuss a series four questions. At the end of the evening the facilitators presented the small group discussion. Following that there was an opportunity for questions and answers and general comment.

Response Form Results

Question 1 - Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so, how. If not, why?

The responses were:

Yes	64 respondents	46%	
No	56 respondents	41%	
Maybe	18 respondents	13%	Total number of responses = 138

The following statements are samples of the types of comments received.

"Mixed housing but no high density apartments, etc. No commercial needed."

"Mixed use development is compulsory to maintain our goal of life and reduce environmental impacts. Complete communities are the most ethical and appropriate form of use for this and other sites in Gordon Head."

"There is no reason to change Gordon Head from a predominantly single family neighbourhood. It is unrealistic to believe that residents will become a walking to work population as it is too far from the majority of work place. Retail will only increase traffic and parking problems."

QUESTION 2 -If a mixed use village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan, what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.

Use	Yes	No	Don't Know
Village Retail			
Bakery, Coffee Shop	63%	36%	1%
Small grocer	43%	56%	1%
Pharmacy	46%	48%	6%
Bike Shop	30%	62%	8%
Video Store	17%	76%	7%

Use	Yes	No	Don't Know
Personal Care			
Dry cleaners	18%	71%	11%
Aesthetician	24%	59%	17%
Hair Salon, barber	38%	53%	9%
Offices			
Medical	39%	53%	8%
Dental	34%	58%	8%
Travel Agent	18%	68%	14%
Insurance	19%	68%	13%
Residential			
Detached Dwellings	87%	9%	4%
Townhouses	65%	28%	7%
Apartments	29%	63%	8%
Flats above shops	50%	44%	7%
Senior Citizens' Housing			
Seniors Independent Housing	69%	22%	9%
Residential Care Facility	33%	51%	16%
Park, Greenspace	90%	9%	1%
Public Plaza, meeting place	62%	53%	3%

Other Desired uses Bookshop, bank, bagel/donut shop, gifts/cards, allotment gardens, pub, professional services

Uses not wanted 7-11, McDonald's, large food store, no commercial, Pub, Walmart, Cost-co, chain stores or franchise

QUESTION 3a - What concerns would you have about mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?

Concerns noted include: more traffic, noise, dogs, drugs, teenagers, B&E's, street people, impact on property values, garbage, destruction of community, high density, economic viability, not needed, not desired, need underground parking, intrusive commercial, 7-11 type stores could attract outsiders

QUESTION 3b - What could be done to address your concerns?

Responses varied widely and included the following comments: more public involvement, no commercial, careful mix of commercial tenants, keep village small, no high density residential, need adequate parking (underground), minimize parking, denser housing, limit types of businesses and hours of operation.

Question 4 - Should more effort be directed towards preparing a mixed use village proposal?

Yes	66 respondents	50%	
No	54 respondents		41%
Maybe	11 respondents	9%	
			Total number of responses = 131

Comments included:

"The time has come for Gordon Head while land is still available. Large houses on small lots is a disturbing trend for area. Develop for the atmosphere of the future so residents can be proud of living in Gordon Head"

"Stop now. Keep RS-6 zoning."

WORKSHOP INFORMATION Ten of the following summaries were provided by the small group facilitators. Group summaries 1 and 5 were developed by Saanich Planning department.

GROUP 1 SUMMARY

1. Would like to see alternatives to the proposed subdivision - cautious consideration
2. Consider affordable seniors and compact housing and neighborhood scale commercial (two-story housing. No travel or insurance agents or "chain-type" commercial.
- 3a. Concerns regarding parking, traffic and commercial hours of operation.
- 3b. Innovative design, high quality development, special attention to traffic control and management.

GROUP 2 SUMMARY

1. Some believe Gordon Head already has the components of a complete community. It could be more pedestrian oriented with places to sit and park-like settings. Need to have an amenity (other centers have waterfront, neighbourhood ambience). However, there is a danger of increasing local traffic in the area drawing in outside traffic.
2. Specific uses supported: medical services, seniors services, small scale high tech (incubator) and local commercial: bistro, café, small grocery, bookstore, bakery, pub. Unwanted uses include highrises (more than three storeys), and convenience-oriented services 7-11, fast food, doughnut and video stores. These are places that generate traffic, generate litter, act as places where undesirables would loiter and have long hours of operation that disturb the neighbourhood.
- 3a. A mixed use development at the Tyndall-San Juan site raises concerns about increasing local traffic, traffic from outside the community, noise, kids loitering, parking and garbage.
- 3b. Need to control traffic and parking so there is enough to serve without parking on neighbouring streets but "not too much"

GROUP 3 SUMMARY

Good Idea- Complete Community

Design - Quality design/creative with lots of common sense

Property Values - Protected property values

Info - Looking forward to more info and participation

Commercial - Control types of uses in commercial / offices.

GROUP 4 SUMMARY

1. Generally yes, should try for something; include seniors; be careful of resulting parking problems.
2. Would like to see: coffee shop, mix of housing, places for people to meet. Would not like to see/

concerns about: Commercial - will there be too much? Having no control over what else will develop there; not enough schools in the area.

- 3a. Prefer parkland/open space use; need for more water; parking and traffic concerns; recreation for seniors and teenagers; concern for need of schools.
- 3b. Density housing to free up green space. Get developer to produce a good quality design/development.

GROUP 5 SUMMARY

1. Consensus - Group preferred trees and natural space. Other thoughts: purchase area for a natural park; wanted it kept residential.
2. Need places for seniors and teenagers. Don't want commercial
- 3a. Concerns: Traffic and parking problems; improve transit system; litter; need community policing; break and enters; vandalism; loss of property values; loss of control with onset of commercial land use
- 3b. Mail-out referendum; stick to local area plan; buy it for park; road improvements; traffic calming; seniors residences; control urban sprawl

GROUP 6 SUMMARY

1. Split - some prefer detached dwellings - how, already have commercial. Some prefer complete community concept - how? Live/Work units.
2. Smaller scale commercial uses - senior's housing, pedestrian oriented, Mattick's Farm boutique type design. No commercial - continual with detached.
- 3a. Opens "Commercial door" - small business won't survive. Attached / commercial generates more traffic.
- 3b. Zoning restrictions / tight (ie. make zoning restrictions tight).

GROUP 7 SUMMARY

1. 6 support urban village
4 support residential only
2 support 3rd alternative - nature sanctuary
Yes - vibrance, neighbourly, sense of community.
No - varied
2. List on response form plus no video stores, no pubs, no chain stores. Avoid problems (excessive noise, traffic, etc.)
- 3a. Traffic, derelict stores, garbage/graffiti, community wants to influence/control type of business.
- 3b. Traffic calming, local business - not regional - people living over stores would reduce risk of garbage/graffiti.

GROUP 8 SUMMARY

1. Gordon Head is already a Complete Community.
2. Residential and open space only.
Retirement townhouses - single family
Attractive and useful green space
- 3a. No Commercial Development at all
 1. Traffic
 2. Noise
 3. Loitering
 4. Viability of business
 5. No high density (i.e. large Apts)
 6. Commercial Creep
- 3b. & 4. - Votes
 1. Village Concept - 7/13 voted NO to village
 2. Current Plan (53 homes)
 - As is - 5
 - Against (modify) - 5
 - Undecided - 2
 - Abstain - 1

GROUP 9 SUMMARY

(No Consensus)

Over half the group supported the concept and want to be able to walk to a village centre to meet friends and neighbors (pub/bistro).

Want a senior-friendly community.

Want to get food in easy way

Want traffic reduced

Want rental housing located above retail (eyes and ears of community)

Some Did Not Support Concept. Feel community is adequate as is (i.e. store, church, play field; University Heights for big shopping).

Big concern about commercial zoning. Potential business failures. If not supported, what will we end up with? 7-11 hangout?

Weak bylaws re: environmental standards/cleanup.

High density / increased traffic.

GROUP 10 SUMMARY

Gordon Head is already a complete community that has amenities that meet needs.

Mixed Use is interesting concept.

Interested in more green space.

Proximity to rural - reduction of sprawl

More creativity in plan approved.

Interest in Saanich revisiting purchase of land for park.

Seniors Housing - Mixed use housing

Concerns are:

- increased traffic - infrastructure for safety
- type of commercial attracted
- Do not want to see change in character of neighborhood - retain RS-6
- Question of statistics.

GROUP 11 SUMMARY

Split support for concept.

Much opposition / preference for SF Housing.

Some like - more green space

- seniors housing and alternative and accessible housing

GROUP 12 SUMMARY

1. Opportunities for creating a more "complete community" in Gordon Head should be explored in more detail. It could provide a community focus, housing alternatives to single family dwellings, and reduce vehicle traffic in the community. Participants were however cautious, especially about the ability to reduce vehicle traffic in the community.
2. Participants were supportive of housing alternatives to single family dwellings, particularly housing for seniors, provided it was appropriately designed. Small scale retail and professional offices were supported. Uses that are typically found in auto-dependant strip malls were not supported (i.e. gas station, restaurant franchises).
- 3a. Concerns include vehicle traffic, parking in residential areas, loitering/vandalism/noise, building design/scale (i.e. height), economic viability, and long term maintenance (i.e. ownership vs. rental). Participants were cautious about future commercial zoning and the range of uses permitted (i.e. different uses could have different clientele, hours operation, and traffic patterns).
- 3b. Concerns could be addressed through underground parking, no parking after commercial businesses are closed, design to improve safety (i.e. lighting, "eyes on the street"), limited number of rental units.

Overall, 5 of the 6 participants agreed that a mixed-used development has merit and should be pursued in more detail.

For further information contact:

Manager of Planning Services
475-5494, Local 3406



Tyndall San Juan Workshop

Small Group Discussion Results

March 28, 2001

GROUP 1

Question #1- Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
What other choices do we have? Is a "Complete Community" the only choice?
Should have considered the opportunity to acquire green space before approving subdivision.
Want parks and Allotment Garden
Prefer a more dense, diversified community over perpetuating more of the same.
Currently do not have mixed use for seniors in Gordon Head.
There is an adequate supply of single family dwellings for Gordon Head considering the future demographics.
Concern about precedent being set, ie. Other multi-family and commercial uses etc. at other sites in Gordon Head.
Priority for preservation of green space.
Support higher densities in existing commercial / residential areas.
Little confidence that Saanich will control spread (of commercial/multi-family) to other areas.
Would like opportunity for community experience for retirees.
Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
Save Garry oaks.
Garden Component
Affordable seniors housing
Underground parking
Bakery and coffee shop
Concern that medical offices might bring in people from outside.
Day Care
No Travel Agents
No Insurance Agents
Open Space
Maximum Green Space
Accommodation above commercial
No Chain-type commercial, ie. McDonalds, 7-11, etc.
Bookshop
Gift shop
A range of compact housing types - attached housing

Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
Parking
Increased traffic
Need storm water controls
Impact on existing businesses.
If businesses don't succeed, what can follow?
Need more traffic calming.
Maximum 2-storey building height.
Hours of operation for businesses.
Need buffer for neighbouring homes.
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
Limit housing types and densities
Traffic Calming
Maximize Green Space
Covenants on commercial size and type.
Specific / Special Zone
Traffic Controls (lights)
On-site storm water controls - green initiatives.
Bicycle friendly design
Pedestrian friendly design
Friendly ambiance with amenities built into the site design.
Energy efficient design
Enforcement of overflow parking on the streets.
Maintenance agreement for landscaping green space.
Thorough public process before and during development of proposal.
SUMMARY
1. Would like to see alternatives to the proposed subdivision - cautious consideration
2. Consider affordable seniors and compact housing and neighborhood scale commercial (two-story housing. No travel or insurance agents or "chain-type" commercial.
3a. Concerns regarding parking, traffic and commercial hours of operation.
3b. Innovative design, high quality development, special attention to traffic control and management.

GROUP 2

Question #1- Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
A lot of elements of a complete community already exists that people walk to. Supposed to be community oriented. Mattick’s Farm is an example of a villager centre.
Referendum in the past to acquire park - what happened?
Mixed use village would have high real estate value.
Would need appeal, e.g. Cook St. (water) and Estevan (sense of neighborhood).
Already have enough traffic on Tyndall
May reduce local traffic - may have people coming from outside.
Should have limited parking
Should be walking oriented with places to sit and park like setting.
Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
Residential and services.
Some urban commercial. No high-rises, 7-11, fastfood, donut, video stores.
Possibly seniors housing, small scale income based intermediate care, bistro - coffee house, medical services, seniors services, small grocery, bookstore, high tech / think tank incubator, bakery, pub.
Just seniors oriented or maybe a little of each - seniors oriented and urban commercial don’t seem to mix well.
NO high rise (more than 3 storeys), 7-11 (high traffic) late night, video store, fast food and pizza.
Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
Traffic, parking, noise, kids loitering, people from outside, cruise cars
Noise
Depends on uses - kid oriented - fast food and candy/snacks.
Q: How many people/customers are needed to support commercial? Will there be people from elsewhere?
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
Control soccer field - traffic
Enough parking to serve, but not too much. Don’t want to see on street parking, consider underground parking.
SUMMARY
1. Some believe Gordon Head already has the components of a complete community. It could be more pedestrian oriented with places to sit and park-like settings. Need to have an amenity (other centers have waterfront, neighbourhood ambience). However, there is a danger of increasing local traffic in the area drawing in outside traffic.
2. Specific uses supported: medical services, seniors services, small scale high tech (incubator) and local commercial: bistro, café, small grocery, bookstore, bakery, pub. Unwanted uses include high rises (more than three storeys), and convenience-oriented services 7-11, fast food, doughnut and video stores. These are places that generate traffic, generate litter, act as places where undesirables would loiter and have long hours of operation that disturb the neighbourhood.
3a. A mixed use development at the Tyndall-San Juan site raises concerns about increasing local traffic, traffic from outside the community, noise, kids loitering, parking and garbage.

3b. Need to control traffic and parking so there is enough to serve without parking on neighbouring streets but "not too much"
SUMMARY
1. Some believe Gordon Head already has the components of a complete community. It could be more pedestrian oriented with places to sit and park-like settings. Need to have an amenity (other centers have waterfront, neighbourhood ambience). However, there is a danger of increasing local traffic in the area drawing in outside traffic.
2. Specific uses supported: medical services, seniors services, small scale high tech (incubator) and local commercial: bistro, café, small grocery, bookstore, bakery, pub. Unwanted uses include high rises (more than three storeys), and convenience-oriented services 7-11, fast food, doughnut and video stores. These are places that generate traffic, generate litter, act as places where undesirables would loiter and have long hours of operation that disturb the neighbourhood.
3a. A mixed use development at the Tyndall-San Juan site raises concerns about increasing local traffic, traffic from outside the community, noise, kids loitering, parking and garbage.
3b. Need to control traffic and parking so there is enough to serve without parking on neighbouring streets but "not too much"

GROUP 3

Question #1- Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
Need Parking to have commercial viability.
Commercial creates traffic.
Not realistic - Older areas of Edmonton and Saskatoon Experience <i>(maybe look at these plans? Laura added this April 6, 2001)</i>
Need size and some drive through and street parking.
Needs major commercial draws.
Cadboro Bay Village and Cook Street Village - Good Examples
Have to drive to existing amenities.
Could decrease traffic on major routes - Shelbourne
Good hang out areas - coffee, skating
Lacking character - need more Matticks, Cook Street etc.
Local destination
Benefit - promotes walking, cycling, healthy lifestyle
Plan for the future, change with the times
Great climate for concept
Subdivision proposal does not add anything to existing neighborhood.
Lot large enough for good buffer.
Roads need to be big
Control design details
Consensus for the concept.
Could result in more trucks.
Could result in more graffiti
Could result in more pedestrian traffic
Question location
Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
No 7-11 store
Coffee Shop
Bakery
Need creative architecture
No row of garage doors.
Encourage neighborhood interaction
Support parks, common areas
Support variety of housing types
Drug Store
Support Mixed Housing Prices \$\$

No medical or dental
No single family dwellings - stop the sprawl
Multi-Housing for all ages
Bookstore
Office Use doesn't add or detract
Progression of uses will evolve over time.
Allotment Gardens? Organic?
Kid Friendly uses
Cul-de-sac at the end of San Juan
Medical / Dental on micro basis
Commercial Gross floor area??
Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
Impact on property values
Hours of operation and delivery times?
Increased traffic
Quality of architecture
Service lanes
Mixed Use - if done properly
Security
Diversity - is good
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
Garry Oaks - Protect Garry oaks
Design - Quality design
Architecture - Quality architecture
ADP - Participate at ADP with design control
Covenant to control hours.
SUMMARY
Good Idea - Complete Community
Design - Quality design/creative with lots of common sense
Property Values - Protected property values
Info - Looking forward to more info and participation
Commercial - Control types of uses in commercial / offices.

GROUP 4

Question #1- Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
Should try (ex. Cadboro Bay Village) Should have something in GH.
Gordon Head needs a focal point - central meeting place.
Needs to be better catered for older people.
Needs to be better for people to walk to shops etc.
Too car oriented.
Weakness in plan. Do not have the density to support this. Not enough population to support business (a limitation). This would still increase traffic significantly.
Need more senior housing - not so frequent travel.
Bakery
Coffee House
Support senior housing compatible with village concept.
Hard to find parking sometimes (eg. to soccer); this will make it even harder. Will this increase walking?
Would like to see more affordable housing for younger families; prices are too expensive.
Good to have younger people around near seniors.
Concern for existing businesses (grocery)
Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
Would like pharmacy - good for seniors
Coffee Shop could be a local meeting point.
A gang hangout place - may be a concern for a coffee shop more of a problem with 7-11's.
Concern about where development will stop. Will other such developments take place?
Insurance shops
Medical/Dental Offices - New patients from new neighborhood.
Concern that once zoned commercial, will have no control over what else will develop there in the future.
Concern that patients for medical office will create more traffic (coming from elsewhere).
Townhouses
4-6 unit (density) apt. block (condo) well designed.
Well designed houses (appropriate for our coastal climate - not stucco).
Bakery
Coffee Shop
Newsstand
Cul-de-sac
Garden Shops - plant shops
Houses with front porches for sitting on.
Decent sized lots.
No video store (generates traffic)

Bike Shop
Like subsidized seniors housing.
Small restaurant okay - pub not really - generally not either.
Deli
Fewer parking spaces required than usual.
No Liquor Store
Like place to meet people, place to mingle.
No commercial development but yes to coffee shop.
Mix of housing - not just single family
Concern about possible need for additional schools - need to plan with school district.
Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
Concern about need for schools - would help to have some seniors housing and communicate with school district.
Only have Gordon Head Rec Centre - its too small. If additional homes with teenagers - need places for them to go. Need long term planning. Seniors Rec Centre too.
Need additional soccer fields in Saanich but are not planning or providing them.
Excessive traffic (enough now) - more buses/transit. Start educating public to change habits.
Charge for parking - especially at schools
Will need traffic lights - will create dangerous driving conditions.
Lack of parkland required by developer - have usable park space for public.
Economic viability of commercial development. Keep it small (i.e. café).
Associated with increased density, but depends on how its done. Saanich put covenants on design standards.
Need to plan for long term, not short term (and continue to sprawl).
Develop a school for now but in 25 years make it into seniors housing.
Concern that the more we build the more our houses will decrease in value.
Concern that people can't afford the new big houses being built (i.e. Have basement suites).
The need for more water.
Lack of sidewalks - safety
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
Have more green space by having denser housing.
Get developer to produce a good quality design/development.
SUMMARY
Question 1. Generally yes, should try for something; include seniors; be careful of resulting parking problems.
Question 2. Would like to see: coffee shop, mix of housing, places for people to meet. Would not like to see/ concerns about: Commercial - will there be too much? Having no control over what else will develop there; not enough schools in the area.
Question 3a. Prefer parkland/open space use; need for more water; parking and traffic concerns; recreation for seniors and teenagers; concern for need of schools.
Question 3b. Density housing to free up green space. Get developer to produce a good quality design/development.

GROUP 5

Question #1 - Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
Not viable - change zoning of Gordon Head.
Keep it as residential
Develop single family and senior housing
All amenities listed are available close by.
Home Based Businesses
Doctors and Dentists offices at the site
Not viable for commercial
Commercial would take away from the value of residences.
Approval process has gone too far already.
Adhere to Local Area Plan.
Consensus - Lots of trees and natural space. Purchase the area for a natural park - junior science centre.
Concern about water availability.
Concern about driving to these commercial areas from other areas.
Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
No space for teenagers to congregate
No commercial (most of group agreed)
Nature park - serve all of GH.
Ice Rink
Full service seniors residence/home
Seniors Centre
Higher density housing.
Higher density around large park.
With a restaurant - no parking.
Neighborhood Pub
Municipal-owned commercial space (controlled tenancy)
Mixing young people (teenagers) with seniors.
Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
Traffic and parking problems
Complaints / Issues with soccer field (lights and noise)
Speed of traffic is a concern
Need to improve transit system(gov't help to make affordable)
Litter
B & E / Vandalism
Commercial vehicles.
Exhaust - diesel
Walking circle won't support commercial

Loss of property values
Loss of control with commercial
Need more police control
Need community police station
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
Mail out referendum
Stick to the Local Area Plan
Buy it out for a park.
Road improvements
Traffic Calming
Traffic Lights
More smaller connecting streets.
Seniors residences
More control of urban sprawl
Preserve green space
SUMMARY
Question 1: Consensus - Group preferred trees and natural space. Other thoughts: purchase area for a natural park; wanted it kept residential.
Question 2: Need places for seniors and teenagers. Don't want commercial
Question 3a: Concerns: Traffic and parking problems; improve transit system; litter; need community policing; break and enters; vandalism; loss of property values; loss of control with onset of commercial land use
Question 3b: Mail-out referendum; stick to local area plan; buy it for park; road improvements; traffic calming; seniors residences; control urban sprawl

GROUP 6

Question #1- Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
Already have one - Feltham and here in this community. Transportation routes are clear.
Idea is NOT a complete community (i.e. Idea presented by speakers)
Should remain detached.
Gordon/Feltham is car oriented - take kids somewhere. .
Shelbourne/Feltham is "walkable"
No benefit if site goes detached.
Subdivision dwellings are monster houses.
Seniors Housing would be nice.
Fear of commercial
Multi-family and commercial create more traffic - 20 years prof. experience.
Those who like MF don't drive.
Peoples attitude determines if they chose to walk.
How? A village does have commercial - need a heart / Feltham and Shelbourne a scary corner.
The opportunity to make a complete community is here now and it won't come around again.
What about determining what type of store, etc. goes in?
Worry about "opening" that commercial zoning door.
Small Business would not survive here - only franchise would - e.g. Starbucks.
How can a small business compete with adjacent franchises? The proof is in the malls.
Residential/Commercial mix is not safe.
Landlords will rent to who can pay it.
No Shopping Centre
No retail
Gordon Head store too small - if he has more room he'll do better.
Single-Family statistically more traffic than other uses. -
Okay if Single Family is Single Family (i.e. NOT suite)
Problem with illegal suites
Not everyone will switch their commercial habits to local spots.
Yes, but over time it will/could.
Moved here for the quiet, didn't want to be near commercial.
Would be nice to walk down Tyndall and have access to a coffee shop.
WANT CLARIFICATION ON ZONE - "HOW" COMMERCIAL - want to know what restrictions.
Must look down the road.
Coffee Shop won't survive on pedestrian traffic alone.
Very lucky, commercial is close - don't really need anything more - don't want car traffic.
Work/Live unit (would be a good thing)
Concerns re: type of signs.

Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
Something like coffee bar in Gordon Head.
Professional Office.
Professional service type (ex. hairdresser).
NO Gas Station.
Seniors accommodation.
Concern of traffic.
Limited multi-family.
Single-Family dwellings
Bikes
Live/Work units
Mattick's Farm boutique type design
Multi-Residential / attached
Green Space
Multi-Use
No Franchises
No Gas Stations
No Parking Lots/Street Parking - already problems with Tyndall soccer fields.
Just Single family dwellings.
No Commercial
No 7-11
Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
Once one commercial comes will more come? Not static - unknown
Too much traffic
Commercial - turn into a hang-out.
No concerns - Mixed Use - concept will work.
Appropriate restrictive zoning.
Taking it to the next level
Density / Restrictions
Site specific zoning
Public Hearing before rezoning.
SUMMARY
Question 1: Split - some prefer detached dwellings - how, already have commercial. Some prefer complete community concept - how? Live/Work units.
Question 2: Smaller scale commercial uses - senior's housing, pedestrian oriented, Mattick's Farm boutique type design. No commercial - continual with detached.

Question 3a: Opens "Commercial door" - small business won't survive. Attached / commercial generates more traffic.
Question 3b: Zoning restrictions / tight (i.e. make zoning restrictions tight).

GROUP 7

Question #1- Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
Yes = 6 Different = 2 Housing = 3 (i.e. maintain single family dwellings).
Yes - Center = vibrance, focus
Yes - Like variety, housing / commerce
No - Traffic danger to kids (to people)
Yes - Like Cadboro Bay (personal - not big chain)
Yes - Senior housing important.
Yes - Affordable extended care.
No - Single housing better for tax base and seniors
No - Steals business from elsewhere.
Yes - Don't want low cost housing [5 agree / 5 disagree]
Different = Nature Sanctuary [4 yes / 5 no]. Adds difference in quality - not more of housing.
Yes - 10 acres - 53 houses too dense.
Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
Like list on form.
Senior's Centre without retail
Other professions (e.g. architect - e.g.. Mattick's Farm)
No video store, no 7-11.
No pub
No Fast Food
Yes to pub
Services for youth (E.g. computer centre)
No motor bike shops (bike shop okay)
Residences above businesses
WHY? - No noise, stick to local services, not ones drawing from other areas, not excessive traffic.
Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
Traffic (12)
Empty Stores - derelict (10)
Graffiti (4)
Garbage (4)

Can community regulate type of business (11)
How to fund extended care facility
Don't want class exclusive village (5)
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
Regarding Traffic <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Single homes no commerce• Speed limits (2 people agree)• Traffic calming• Type of commerce that only attracts local• Controlled crossings• Sidewalk important on both sides.
Regarding Derelict <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Store type to attract local people• Community liaison with store management.• Mixed Use (residential and commercial)• Small number of stores• Design for easy conversion (flexible use)• Can community influence type of business? Use existing democratic processes (e.g. Mattick's Farm)• (general) Have local resident as commercial manager/caretaker.• Specification restrictions (E.g. max. sq. ft.)
Regarding Garbage/Graffiti - use landscaping (hedges etc) to discourage graffiti. People living above stores. Resident manager.
GENERAL DISCUSSION
Is there a height limit?
SUMMARY
Question 1: 6 support urban village 4 support residential only 2 support 3 rd alternative - nature sanctuary Yes - vibrance, neighbourly, sense of community. No - varied
Question 2: List on response form plus no video stores, no pubs, no chain stores. Avoid problems (excessive noise, traffic, etc.)
Question 3a: Traffic, derelict stores, garbage/graffiti, community wants to influence/control type of business.
Question 3b: Traffic calming, local business - not regional - people living over stores would reduce risk of garbage/graffiti.

GROUP 8

Question #1 - Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
CONSENSUS - Gordon Head is a Complete Community
Will people really walk - what about attracting other car drivers - increase in traffic.
Complete Communities evolve and change.
WHY NOT? - (Why no to idea presented this evening) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commercial taxes will go up.• Developer will make more money - not local businesses• There are areas we can walk to• Walking distance to local schools that need students to stay open.• Want to be removed from Hub-bub / quiet / get away from commercialism.• Fear about what business will actually survive there.• Hang outs / garbage / noise• "Commercial Creep" - expanding beyond the original property.• Water supply to higher density - how to ensure good water pressure and water quality. * already a problem in existing.
Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
Don't want commercial/retail - no office
Small café near current store okay - expansion of grocery store okay (1 person)
Residential - okay Retain some open space - ensure it's protected <ul style="list-style-type: none">- chip trail- park space (i.e. San Pedro & San Juan) - ensure it's protected
MIXED RESIDENTIAL IDEAS <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Retirement Homes / elderly (provision for and garden plots) - small attached housing (i.e. on Blair)• Small townhouse complex• No apartment blocks - no high density• Not too high / 2 storey limit• No residential care facility• No low cost
GREEN SPACE IDEAS - something to attract people <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pond• Bird Sanctuary• Native plant garden• Playground• Picnic Tables
Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
See #1. (in "Why Not" cell)
Concerns - Vacancy - vandalism with commercial derelict building sites.
53 houses plan as is Yes - 5 (already lots of work done and approved). No - 5 (some mixed residential okay but no commercial) Not sure - 2 Abstention - 1
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
Implement our recommendations.

Question #4
NO - took vote. 7/13 - Official Questionnaire for residents.
SUMMARY
Question 1. Gordon Head is already a Complete Community.
Question 2. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Residential and open space only.• Retirement townhouses - single family• Attractive and useful green space
3a. No Commercial Development at all <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Traffic• Noise• Loitering• Viability of business• No high density (i.e. large Apts)• Commercial Creep
3b. & 4. - Votes 1. Village Concept - 7/13 voted NO to village 2. Current Plan (53 homes) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- As is - 5- Against (modify) - 5- Undecided - 2- Abstain - 1
OTHER CONCERNS
1. Are these questions leading? Who devised them?
2. How will these comments affect the development of other areas?
3. This is a tiny property. (2 other people agree)
4. Water quality and supply for any kind of development! What about current supply/quality.
5. How to pay for green space ideas?
6. Will this process really change the developer's direction?
7. Why this process now?
8. Saanich should ensure this kind of process earlier in the process.
9. Why not yes or no - why details?

GROUP 9

Question #1- Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not? and
Question#2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
A good location for a complete community - already soccer fields/churches.
Will reduce traffic (4 people agreed)
Support Complete Community - wants to be able to walk to village centre, meet friends and neighbors.
Good for seniors
Want Pub / Bistro
Walker friendly
Dog friendly
Getting food in easy way
Does NOT support - feels community is adequate with existing store, church, play fields.
Supports concept with reservations, e.g.. wants bistro but would people use it/support it?
Does not support commercial zoning - doesn't have to be cleaned up (E.g. contaminated soil).
Residents won't patronize village and will end up with 7-11 type stores moving in.
Housing located above retail provides eyes/ears on community.
53 SF Dwellings will be awful - too much.
Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
Commercial / Agenda running the show. What about business failures. O.K. to shop at University Heights.
Concerns re: high density of people.
Worry that village will be an inward looking enclave.
Increased traffic - didn't buy the traffic states presented/concern re: kids crossing Tyndall.
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
Could remove commercial aspect - just green space and homes. Add townhomes to proposal.
Restrictions on type of commercial development - would be good. Prevent tacky hangouts, e.g. 7-11.
OTHER POINTS RAISED
1. Does concept apply to Tyndall and San Juan property only, or will this be setting policy for all of Gordon Head?
2. Parcel of land too small for purpose.
3. No chance to comment on approved plan.
4. Property owners feel its deceitful to change zoning to commercial as it will lower property values.
SUMMARY
NO CONSENSUS

Over half the group supported the concept and want to be able to walk to a village centre to meet friends and neighbors (pub/bistro).
Want a senior-friendly community.
Want to get food in easy way
Want traffic reduced
Want rental housing located above retail (eyes and ears of community)
Some Did Not Support Concept. Feel community is adequate as is (i.e. store, church, play field; University Heights for big shopping).
Big concern about commercial zoning. Potential business failures. If not supported, what will we end up with? 7-11 hangout?
Weak bylaws re: environmental standards/cleanup.
High density / increased traffic.
WAYS TO ADDRESS CONCERNS RE: 3b
Remove commercial aspect - just green space, homes (SF and townhomes)
Strict restrictions on commercial development (i.e. to prevent tacky hangouts)

GROUP 10

Question #1 - Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
Lifestyle and Quality of life are major concerns
Resident previously lived in Fernwood which is a very different neighborhood - trying to live with one car - walking and cycling a priority.
Favour Complete Community concept.
Against Complete Community - chose neighborhood because wanted semi-rural community - bus service good.
Do not want urbanization of Gordon Head.
Maintain detached commercial and prevent further development
No more development period.
Chose neighborhood because within striking distance of city/country.
Originally zoned as park (1981 - 93), 2 referendums 86/90.
Feel Gordon Head is a complete community.
Shopping/Rec Centre already accessible.
If we have bylaws - enforce them.
Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
What about smaller homes for seniors - lots too big/houses too big.
<i>#2 - Group wants to discuss concerns - would rather return to details after discussing broader ideas.</i>
Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
How will school population be affected by development
In light of anticipated increase in traffic, can the developer be asked to put money towards calming/safety? e.g. sidewalks on San Juan?
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
If there were attractive shopping potential for attracting traffic from outside.
Q: Are there examples of communities that have done this recently (within the last 5 years in Canada). What were their experiences?
Development proposal is not creative - supports concept of mixed use.
Traffic concern - wants to find out what neighborhood does want.
What about Saanich buying land for park as per LAP 1981-93.
Why create businesses if there are vacancies elsewhere. No control over types of businesses.
Vacancies draw liquor stores. young people etc. UVic students - will draw volume of people not from neighborhood.
Is there a way for community to have control over kinds of retail - community control of commercial spaces?
Concern with traffic reduction.
Mixed Community - advantage allows for more green space.
Mixed Community allows maintaining proximity to rural.

SUMMARY
Gordon Head is already a complete community that has amenities that meet needs.
Mixed Use is interesting concept.
Interested in more green space.
Proximity to rural - reduction of sprawl
More creativity in plan approved.
Interest in Saanich revisiting purchase of land for park.
Seniors Housing - Mixed use housing
Concerns are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• increased traffic - infrastructure for safety• type fo commercial attracted• Do not want to see change in character of neighborhood - retain RS-6• Question of statistics.

GROUP 11

Question #1 - Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
Don't like it.
Nice idea
Already have retail / Shelbourne/Feltham
Already have Gordon Head Rec Centre.
Increased traffic esp. from outside the "circle".
Is there merit in the idea / Yes - 5 / No - 4
Green Space - Potential for more green space.
Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
No Commercial - medical, dental, office.
No retail whatsoever.
NO video store
NO Pub
Preserve wildlife
Only Single Family Housing.
More public space
like Estevan Village
More green space
Coffee Shop
Seniors Housing - Less traffic, more buses, no garages
Townhouses - Yes/No
If retail, apartments above.
Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
Increased water use - pressure
Increased traffic all day - fatalities, accidents
Potential increase in crime
Potential increase in loitering
Potential increase in noise, music, public in square, lights.
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
Stick to SF dwelling / seniors housing - less traffic
Turn Phase 2 and 3 of subdivision into park
Need overall traffic plan for Gordon Head
Need more traffic calming
Increased crime with more people living there all the time, i.e. seniors

Need Community Police Station and jail
SUMMARY
Split support for concept.
Much opposition / preference for SF Housing.
Some like - more green space - seniors housing and alternative and accessible housing

GROUP 12

Question #1- Land use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more "complete community", and if so how? If not, why not?
Concept will lower Traffic
Empty nester Housing - alternative to single family x 3
Shorter trips
Community Activities / Village Green
Potential for culture, e.g. art gallery
Similar concept to Cadboro Bay Village - it is an attraction
Neutral traffic - will improve safety.
Will increase parking on residential streets - need underground parking.
Not convinced that traffic will decrease x 2. + Need residential to improve safety around commercial - Might compete with Rec. Centre - competition with existing business.
Question #2 - If a mixed use Village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.
Residential <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Single Family - no suites - enforced• Range of seniors - different levels of service• Most 2 stories• Some 3 stories• Ranch-style homes - no stairs• Townhouses - 1 storey• No more than 2 stories• preserve sight lines - e.g. Mt. Doug - taller in middle site. Retain access to sunlight.• Lots of Open space - green 30%• preserve trees• development around village green - not sports• treed streets• balance of front and back yards
Retail - want <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Small coffee shop x 2• Small pharmacy• Deli x 2• Bookstore• Garden store• Gallery• Grocery store• Small pub
Office <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doctors• Massage• Medical offices• Professional offices
NO Pizza <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Take out• Franchise• Movie Theatre• Liquor Store• Gas Station• Arcade• Video store
Impact on residential on site, e.g. noise

Question #3a - What concerns would you have about a mixed use development on the Tyndall-San Juan site?
Traffic may increase may increase parking in neighborhood.
Retail attracts teenagers and vandalism.
Limit to 3 stories
What happens if businesses are not viable? Vacancies and run down.
Renters instead of owners - unkept / transient.
Question #3b - What could be done to address your concerns?
Underground parking
Lighting / less hiding spaces, increase visibility
No parking after commercial hours
Make site active with people - "eyes on the street"
Some rental if legal (no illegal suites)
Does a Mixed Use Development Have Merit? Should it be pursued in more detail? Total 6 / Yes - 5 No - 1
SUMMARY
<u>Question 1</u> Opportunities for creating a more “complete community” in Gordon Head should be explored in more detail. It could provide a community focus, housing alternatives to single family dwellings, and reduce vehicle traffic in the community. Participants were however cautious, especially about the ability to reduce vehicle traffic in the community.
<u>Question 2</u> Participants were supportive of housing alternatives to single family dwellings, particularly housing for seniors, provided it was appropriately designed. Small scale retail and professional offices were supported. Uses that are typically found in auto-dependant strip malls were not supported (i.e. gas station, restaurant franchises).
<u>Question 3a</u> Concerns include vehicle traffic, parking in residential areas, loitering/vandalism/noise, building design/scale (i.e. height), economic viability, and long term maintenance (i.e. ownership vs. rental). Participants were cautious about future commercial zoning and the range of uses permitted (i.e. different uses could have different clientele, hours operation, and traffic patterns).
<u>Question 3b</u> Concerns could be addressed through underground parking, no parking after commercial businesses are closed, design to improve safety (i.e. lighting, “eyes on the street”), limited number of rental units.
Overall, 5 of the 6 participants agreed that a mixed-used development has merit and should be pursued in more detail.

OPEN DISCUSSION - AT END OF MEETING

Q: Regarding re-zoning rules.

Q: Is environmental issue resolved? A: Government of BC has not yet approved.

This information is only useful regarding this property. What about the Allotment Gardens?

Q: Would there be a referendum regarding this information affecting Gordon Head's long term plan? A: A referendum is not Council practice. Usually zoning decisions and area plan decisions....?

Q: Current proposal is for 3 phases. How long will this take? A: Market conditions affect this.

Q: Is there an order to the phases? A: It will probably start on the south side.

Q: Is the GHRA a legitimate voice for the whole community to Council.

Q: Is Saanich considering a park here? A: It depends if the developer proceeds. It is hard for Council to fund.

Concern regarding only 3 % for nature preservation in current proposal.

Q: Why is this consultation so late in the process? A: GHRA had no opposition earlier. The developer was within his rights regarding the current zoning.

Single family dwellings will bring in families to fill schools.

We need a better sense of community (youth viewpoint)

Support mixed use for diversity of housing etc.

Thanks to the developer and residents for attending.

Q: Housing cost? A: Developer says \$300,000 - \$375,000 per single family dwelling (preliminary estimate).

TYNDALL SAN JUAN WORKSHOP RESPONSE FORM RESULTS
MARCH 28, 2001

****147 COMMENT FORMS RECEIVED****

Please check the appropriate box:

- ☐ Gordon Head Resident
- (118 - YES)
- (Note: 2 residents also business owners)
- ☐ Gordon Head Business Owner
- (4 - YES)
- ☐ Neither
- (1 - YES)

Question 1 - Land Use in Gordon Head is predominantly detached dwellings. Should Gordon Head be made a more “complete community’ and if so, how. If not, why?

Yes6446%

No5641%

Maybe1813%

n = 138

Comments explaining answers are attached - APPENDIX 1

QUESTION 2 - If a mixed use village development were to occur at Tyndall-San Juan, what specific types of uses would you like to see and why? Are there some uses you do not want to see? Why? Please be specific and consider retail, office, residential, open space, and other uses.

(**Note:** Percentages are based on total responses of each individual question)

Use	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total Responses
Village Retail	Comments - Appendix 2			
Bakery, Coffee Shop	78 63%	45 36%	1 1%	124
Small grocer	45 43%	59 56%	1 1%	105
Pharmacy	57 46%	60 48%	7 6%	124
Bike Shop	35 30%	73 62%	10 8%	118
Video Store	20 17%	90 76%	9 7%	119
Personal Care	Comments Appendix 3			
Dry cleaners	21 18%	82 71%	13 11%	116
Aesthetician	27 24%	65 59%	18 17%	110
Hair Salon, barber	45 38%	62 53%	11 9%	118
Offices	Comments Appendix 4			
Medical	47 39%	63 53%	10 8%	120

Use	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total Responses
Dental	40 34%	68 58%	10 8%	118
Travel Agent	20 19%	73 68%	15 13%	108
Insurance	21 19%	73 68%	14 13%	108
Residential	Comments Appendix 5			
Detached Dwellings	97 87%	10 9%	5 4%	112
Townhouses	77 65%	33 28%	9 7%	119
Apartments	33 29%	71 63%	9 8%	113
Flats above shops	58 50%	51 44%	7 10%	116
Senior Citizens' Housing	Comments Appendix 6			
Seniors Independent Housing	86 69%	27 22%	11 9%	124
Residential Care Facility	36 33%	56 51%	17 16%	109
Park, Greenspace	Comments Appendix 7			
Park, Greenspace	107 90%	11 9%	1 1%	119
Public Plaza, meeting place	Comments Appendix 8			
Public Plaza, meeting place	73 62%	41 35%	4 3%	118
Other desired uses	Comments Appendix 9			
Other desired uses	16 59%	9 33%	2 8%	27
Other uses you would not want	Comments Appendix 10			

QUESTION 3a What concerns would you have about mixed use development?

Answers Appendix 11

QUESTION 3b - What could be done to address your concerns?

Answers Appendix 12

Question 4 - Should more effort be directed towards preparing a mixed use village proposal?

Yes 66 50%
No 54 41%
Maybe 11 9%

n = 131

Comments Question 4 - Appendix 13

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 'Question 1 comment
20 years in GH. Raised 4 kids here. I would like to see a community gathering place. We love Cadboro Bay/ Oak Bay & Cook St. Village.
A complete community would cut down the use of an automobile which would help reduce pollution.
A few steps this direction would be positive.
A mixture of residential and business might make a more complete community.
A village concept with shops and higher density housing is a great idea if it cuts down on traffic, not promotes
All new houses does not benefit neighbourhood. Mix of housing & commercial goose. More nature ie. pond/allotment gardens/walks good for new residents & existing residents.
Already a complete community. This is closing the gate after the horse is out. Do this on the GH allotment gardens. Really wonder if this area will support this idea of commercial usage?
Already a complete community: space, schools, recreational facilities & friendly neighbours. No need to change things & upset this ambiance. My family was fortunate to grow up here.
Already a complete residential community. More development is limited by lack of land. Focus should be on developing greenways, traffic calming & tree protection.
Better for the environment. A sense of community.
But under careful protection.
Change needed for environmental sustainable development.
Community is quite complete as is. More open green space for unstructured use would provide most benefit for people req'd to spend time in a high-pressured structured community.
Create better sense of community. Reduce amount of traffic. Central meeting place: creating better sense of community awareness.
Demographics indicate the need for more empty nester and senior housing. This could free up some existing detached housing for young families to move into.
Do not commercialize. More space between lots.
Do not want to see commercial development. Bakery is fine but would be strongly opposed to more.
GH developed as suburb, w/ no core. Opportunity now to be more of a community. Current single family dwellings discourage dialogue. Mixed dwelling area will provide current & future residents' with a focus for meeting, walking, etc.
GH has no heart! This is a definite lack. This seems to be an opportunity to address this.
GH is complete already!! We do not need commercial at all. It is ridiculous to ruin a lovely neighbourhood.
GH was developed as a residential community. There is no reason to change the concept other than to provide a larger return on investment for the developer of the Tyndall Rd property.
GH, whilst having many facilities, lacks heart. Would Fairfield or Oak Bay be as attractive w/o their village centres? They reflect their community spirit?
Give GH a focal point. Village concept is "new" trend in many places throughout world -- becomes a closer community. Can help prevent many environmental concerns.
Gordon Head area should remain as residential as possible. Commercial areas can be restricted to main arterial roads.
Gordon Head is and should remain a semi-rural community. Development will change the character, effecting tourism impacting economically on the whole peninsula.
Gordon Head lacks a focal point (centre) like Cadboro Bay/Cook Street Village/Estevan etc. This is in the centre of the region, so the best place to build the village.
Gordon Head needs a focal point, a centre, a village. While there is land left and the opportunity to plan properly - lets consider this carefully.

Gordon Head needs senior housing - detached, condos and townhouses. Services mean less traffic, less noise, more dense development should please neighbours and the developer.
Group 8: mostly opposed to "Architectural Renderings" as no more complete than what exists now -- perhaps we are wedded to our vehicles. Concept might be more popular if need to walk existed. Personally, concept too high density.
Have a broader mix of housing types. Current 53 lot subdivision is poor and could be improved. Mixed residential would be better.
Homogenous communities like G.H. are neanderthals. Inefficient places to live. Better communities have mix of housing, of land uses, employ multi-modes of transport.
I agree w/points by David Harper. Good arguments for a more futuristic, complete society. GH is currently a dormitory suburb which lacks a focus. This could provide it!
I am interested in Saanich pursuing the 'complete community'.
I did not purchase my house near any land deemed commercial and do not want to live near areas like this. GHAP should be regarded when making decisions
I do not need shopping facility on Tyndall & Kenmore. The village concept would only create additional traffic all day and all night. This concept is not worthwhile.
I have great reservations about the commercial component. Once you open the door, can you severely restrict the type of tenant? I do not want to live down the street from a 7-11.
I like concept of "complete community" but don't think that the commercial use would be viable (ie profitably) if zoned commercial developer could put a 7-11 store in there.
I like the idea of a mixed neighbourhood, more interesting, will promote walking, biking, etc.
I like the neighbourhood the way it is.
I like the village idea but I think it will require too much parking and cause a lot of traffic congestion. People will drive there. If no parking provided, cars will clog the parking lots at St. Dunstan's & the soccer hut.
I live in a complete community already. I can walk, ride my bike, drive my car or bus within a very short time to any retail area, office, etc.
I need more details.
I prefer to see the area be turned into a green park. This area is already quite dense in housing development. It needs to have a few more parks.
I really believe we should have something other than housing -- think outside the development "box": why not a scientific centre, a nature centre or some other type of attractive, exciting centre?
I really want to see the land to be made into a Nature Sanctuary as outlined by the Friends of the GH Nature
I support the village concept for the Tyndall property but we need to be clear that this doesn't set precedent for all of Gordon Head. I'm concerned about commercial interest taking over & driving the agenda in future.
I think Cadboro Bay Village is a wonderful village -- Olive Oleos is a 45 min walk from my house but I love to go there. Other unique businesses ie bookshop, gift shop, vitamin store, GH is too homogenous & not too
I think that limited commercial activity is viable and would it would be like to add more green space.
I want to keep it as is.
I will move away from Gordon Head because of its spread out car predominating outlook. Developers should not have say over residents. Please consider a human friendly, not single family overuse of valued and diminishing urban land.
I would like a higher density development with a % of low-income dwellings. I would not support a predominately detached housing development.
I would like to see only single family dwellings. Traffic concerns worry me. I am not convinced "complete community" will reduce traffic. Retail has no place in the middle of a neighbourhood community.
I would like to see the area be turned into a natural park, not for housing nor village community
In practice, economics of the project will direct the whole thing.
Increased traffic, crime, noise, light, more congestion of people.
Increased traffic, crime, noise, lights, more congestion of people, concentrated traffic during store hours.
Introduce more mixed use on appropriate lots (last chance is this property and Catholic Church property on Gordon Head Rd), other lots likely only "corner store" size - too small.
It is a more complete community. We have all the stores we require on Shelbourne. Walking is good for you but not 5 or 10 min.

It will make a better community, especially for the future. It is the only way to reduce traffic, to provide opportunity for alternative modes of transport -- walking, cycling.
It would provide a centre to the community.
Keep RS-6 zoning. I would not choose to live with Commercial or high density zoning at my doorstep and I won't invite it into my neighbourhood. How many times do I have to say NO! before you listen.
Mainly to cut down the distance homeowners have to travel from their residence to shops and encourage pedestrian and bike traffic instead of cars
May get to commercial.
Mixed housing but no high density apartments, etc. No commercial needed.
Mixed use development is compulsory to maintain our goal of life and reduce environmental impacts. Complete communities are the most ethical & appropriate form of use for this & other sites in GH.
More homes, less parks -- more families.
More of the same seems to lead to more problems - increased traffic and noise in particular.
More senior housing. Providing a central area for socializing.
More small shops but no large stores. Encourage use of bicycles, public transit and walking to reduce car traffic through Gordon Head
Most agreed we need to move towards greater density while maintaining the quality of life we have. They didn't want commercial, but agree to seniors housing and advanced care facilities for seniors.
Need a plan for seniors continuing to reside in Gordon Head.
No Commercial Development. GH is already complete. People have a drive everywhere mentality and a concept where people walk is nothing but a pipe-dream. Lower environmental standards and less cleanup is
No more commercial. We already have enough. GH store, Mt Doug Market, malls Shelbourne & Feltham.
No need for commercial mix. Vandalism, litter, noise - would all be results of.
Only if half of the land is reserved as natural environment. More open space.
Our community is as we want it, minus the traffic of late.
Our roads and water resources are tight enough already. Where are all these kids going to go to school?
Prefer detached dwellings and no commercial in immediate area.
Presently a short walk and public transit enables us to partake in most community activities of interest.
R6 only please!!
See over.
Single family homes in Gordon Head are NOT single family homes, so make it unlimited family residence.
Site is close to soccer fields, walking trails & Lambrick Park, tennis courts, etc. Present GH Grocery Store could easily be expanded on present site. All these facilities w/in easy walking distance. Do we want another min-mall hang-out for teenagers?
Small commercial business catering to the local residents. No large houses, rather see townhouses or small adjoining homes for retired people, a vegetable gardening area for residents in this subdivision. A development that encourages togetherness.
Small village concept has appeal re neighbours interacting & building a network for support, security & exchange of info. Small quality coffee shop, small theatre for live plays, musical concerts (not movies) &
Some commercial, higher density housing.
The Tyndall/San Juan properties is too small for a complete community with commercial, but I have no complaints for mixed housing like town homes, small senior homes or single homes.
The community has been too far developed to "make" a village concept. "Small commercial spots do not a closed community make."
The concept plan is a very small part of Gordon Head.
The idea of a complete community might result in decrease of traffic with more people walking to facilities instead of driving elsewhere
The model I have in mind is the Oak Bay Village, small retail shops, park & open space with short immediate access to shopping & relaxation such as coffee shops. Like Cadboro Bay Village.
The plan incorporates public & private space, emphasizing interaction in the community. It would maximize the "community" elements which exist. 53 houses would only close the area & prevent interaction btwn all 4
The present commercial area ie Shelbourne & McKenzie is too far those in the present proposed subdiv to walk to. The present SF/detached housing zoning allows for illegal suites: even tho Saanich says there is

The question is "how can we decide what a complete community is?"
There is lots of green space etc. but Gordon Head should have more alternative housing and some community plaza type gathering space other than University Heights Mall.
There is no attractive focal centre for people to walk to, shop a little, have a coffee, meet friends - little sense of community.
There is no reason to chg GH from a predominantly SFD neighbourhood. It is unrealistic to believe that residents will become a walking to work population as it is too far from the majority of work place. Retail will only inc traffic & parking problems.
There should be no commercial development on these properties. Surrounding densities are too low to make commercial activity viable without increasing traffic to this area. Some detached or semi-detached seniors housing would be acceptable.
This is a complete community -- no concert hall, no airport but schools, churches, good neighbours, safe walking, parks -- an excellent place for families. Shopping an easy walk for young people, bus ride, drive. Recreation centre here.
This is a generic phrase; meaning, different things to different persons. Clarification of specific proposal is essential for success.
To allow the community to have more uses and encourage walking traffic.
To maintain multi-generational population. To keep GH as a pedestrian/walking friendly neighbourhood. To enhance, not detract from surrounding housing, parks, developments.
Traffic on our residential streets is uncontrolled and in my opinion reduces the quality of life. Saanich has done nothing about traffic calming. Do not connect San Juan Ave.
Village Concept could help provide a focal point for GH & give us a sense of community.
We already have a lot of commercial.
We are a complete and thriving community. Retail does not dictate a complete community. Peoples involvement in community activities makes it complete.
We are already complete. The beauty of Gordon Head is why we moved here. Isn't the question of complete residential away from commercial?
We have a completely comfortable community now.
We have already a lot of stores, offices, and the park is within walking distance.
We have enough commercially zoned area in Gordon Head within a reasonable area.
We need a central community oriented pedestrian link so Gordon Head can have developments that benefit the entire community and reduce car traffic.
We need more affordable senior housing and green space - a park, bike paths, and a gazebo coffee shop in the middle of the park - one that Saanich owns and operates - controls type of business - not a chain.
We need more mixed density & more parks, greenways, bike paths. Make a large portion of this property greenspace with higher density around.
When we invest \$400,000.00 for a house, I think commercial would de-value our property. Also, traffic and noises and teenagers would be problems.
Would greatly improve options and quality of life.
Would provide a focus for the neighbourhood. Would eliminate some car trips for light shopping.
Yes, but more public space, mixed use. More lakeways (laneways?), pedestrians, healthier, friendlier, safer

APPENDIX 2 Village Retail comments
2 grocery stores w/ 1 km. 2 pharmacies w/ 2 km. 2 video stores closed recently w/ 2 km.
Add bookstore/gift shop.
All these commercial uses require higher volumes than can be supported by a "ten minute walk" population base. Would require more parking and increased traffic.
Already exists: Gordon Head G store. Do not need others.
Already have grocery, pharmacy & the video store will take traffic off Shelbourne.
Already have one -- small grocery.
Any non-car dominated, quiet use.
Bakery, small grocery, pharmacy - primarily for convenience. Already have a video store at a convenient location.
Coffee shop excellent gathering place. Grocery & video store already sufficient for market & shouldn't be displaced. Pharmacy good idea if senior's housing created.
Community supported type business to walk to.
Definitely not in any shape or form.
Deli, pub.
Difficult to control "types" of retail outlets once the zoning is approved.
Essential
Gordon Head Store?
Grocery & video stores are at University Hts w/ walking distance & @ Feltham & Shelbourne. GH Store @ Univ Hts just on its feet and will suffer from competition.
Grocery: ideally the current owner could move there & the corner could be purchased by Saanich & developed into a Parkette w/flowers, trees & benches.
High traffic volume.
Hope for a multi-generational facility & not a 7-11 hang out for youth. A library would be good too.
If Saanich owned the land as a native park, a Saanich controlled gazebo coffee shop in the garden would be nice - you'd have to walk to it, it would be clean, nice, and not a commercial informal meeting place.
If quality bakery, coffee shop. Co-op grocery w/ organic produce.
If you cannot restrict the type of tenant, aren't these questions not pointless. If a desired tenant turns out to be not viable, what do you do then?
Just because one type of retail space is approved is no guarantee that will be there 5 mos later & that something totally unacceptable decides to move in.
Limited Village Retail. It is noted there is an adjacent small grocery.
Need bakery, coffee shop.
Need pleasant environment to sit and look at village green while drinking coffee.
No chain stores. Anything to increase the use of biking
No commercial at all.
No commercial zoning. I do not want our land value to depreciate in value. I do not want an increase in traffic, an increase in garbage, an increase of commercial development that is not necessary in this area.
No requirement to impose additional commercialization on this land. Already have grocery stores, bike shop & 2 video stores close by.
No tobacco please.
No tobacco sales. Food, drink and good neighbours just go together.

None likely to be viable as mall at Shelbourne & Torquay have a hard time. Tenants keep changing so why make this worse.
Not interested in any of these.
Not necessary - support existing business.
People tend to be opposed, but there might not be a future for video stores anyway.
Problem with grocery, video store & dry cleaners is lots of traffic coming thru fast & for short times will increase congestion.
Questions crossed out. Against Village Concept.
Retail development should reflect the village concept. No McDonalds or multi-national 7-11. A restaurant would fit well. A sports equipment store. A bookstore (second hand).
Retail, personal care, medical & dental service already exist in GH area. there is not reason to put existing business in difficulties to satisfy the developer.
Small enterprises that encourage people to get out of their homes and come to them. This will help to make this subdivision a complete community.
Small grocery already on Tyndall.
Small independently owned business - need deli / bookstore.
Small shops would be fine. Area to meet people.
Somewhere with outside eating.
There are 2 present villages in existence: Corner of Feltham & Shelbourne & Lambrick Community Centre.
There is already grocery shop at the corner. Bike shop & video not for senior housing.
There should be NO commercial. The community of GH is great already. Please don't change it.
These amenities already exist within a short distance. These businesses will likely be adversely affected by an addition of similar services to this neighbourhood.
Traffic Problems.
Viable, not too disruptive.
Want a nature sanctuary.
We already have at least one each of these retail facilities located within walking distance of Tyndall. It will not be financially feasible to have more businesses.
We have 3 grocery stores, 2 pharmacies & 2 video stores now.
We have a grocery at San Juan & Tyndall.
We have grocery & two video stores.
We have plenty of these w/l walking distance (Feltham & Shelbourne). They are mostly going broke. A 7-11 in the area, or a McDonalds, is a catastrophe. There is little pedestrian access to this site on the north and west.
Well supplied with stores, Mt. Doug Market & Tyndall store. Can take bus, car for other needs.
Would be greatly needed if seniors housing were built.
Yes, only to small cale if retail is input in development.
small shops only, no big chain stores
APPENDIX 3 PERSONAL CARE comments
Aesthetician and hair - already enough selection but might be nice.
All are nearby, reachable by bus, bike, car.
Already exists.

Already have dry cleaners & 2 salons.
Already have dry cleaners.
Already have one.
Already in existence.
Already located on Shelbourne & Feltham.
As above.
At Shelbourne & Feltham.
Available in the neighbourhood.
Definitely not.
Drive to destination.
Dry cleaning is environmentally damaging & isn't low impact.
Have all.
If you cannot restrict the type of tenant, aren't these questions not pointless. If a desired tenant turns out to be not viable, what do you do then?
Increased traffic.
No commercial.
No need.
Not interested in any of these.
Not necessary - support existing business.
Once zoned commercial, the particular commercial use could be controlled.
Probably not viable
Questions crossed out. Against Village Concept.
Small outlet store but not the cleaning plant.
Smell. Traffic.
Too specific - personal care okay.
Traffic Problems.
Usually price-shopped or personal preference.
Want a nature sanctuary.
APPENDIX 4 Offices comments
All above available w/l 2 km.
Already available.
Already close by & why travel agent & insurance?
Although yes to medical/dental, wouldn't chg to them. Or for travel, insurance agents.
As above.

Can be accessed by phone, on internet, by bus etc. There are already plenty to choose from.
Convenience for the elderly, do not should not have cars
Emergency & drop in medical care.
Home based maybe.
If economics are viable.
In limited form (think Mill Bay or similar tasteful complex)
Increased traffic.
Limited #.
Limited medical and dental.
Medical & dental -- possibly. Travel & Insurance -- not that often used.
Medical & dental if commercially viable.
Medical walk-in clinic.
Medical/dental needs looking into.
Medical/dental would increase traffic. Market too small for travel office?
More traffic.
Necessary for seniors.
Not chain stores.
Not interested in any of these.
Not necessary - support existing business.
On Shelbourne (6 blocks away) we have at least 12 medical facilities.
People might not use new medical people if they have a long-time doctor or dentist.
Price-shopped & close in Victoria.
Probably not room
Questions crossed out. Against Village Concept.
This is what malls are for. Lots nearby.
This would require more parking and traffic.
Too specific - prof./personal offices okay.
Travel agency would not be a priority.
Walk to.
Want a nature sanctuary.
Would be convenient.
Would probably attract traffic into the area.
APPENDIX 5 RESIDENTIAL COMMENTS
Flats -- only if flat associated with shop.
Plenty in Gordon Head.
V. good for safer neighbourhood.
A balance between four types of residence with the greater emphasis on the latter three
Am I biased or is the density on the proposal higher than surrounding homes? Also, some guidelines seem advisable to prevent some of the near-gross homes in the Gordon Point Estate Development.
Detached dwellings & flats: Residential mix including affordable housing.

Detached dwellings - RS6. Never apts or flats.
Flats are a good idea. Some detached dwellings & townhouses.
Flats is not residential -- shops are commercial.
Gardens and plots would be nice.
How high would these buildings go?
I'd prefer condos.
Include all forms of residence, keeping them small & compact, low-priced & allow seniors to stay in GH. More green space while increase density ok. Flats = eyes on the street.
Limit to seniors who would have to move away otherwise.
Limited number - maximum two stores.
Lots should be sold individually. No large development with mass produced houses, mirror images, etc.
Low level town homes could be incorporated.
Maintain character. This is why we moved here. No increased traffic.
Many types of houses would encourage the multi-generational village approach.
Mixed types essential.
Mixed use.
Mixed.
My concern is to exclude single family houses. Better use of space for life services.
Nice townhouses.
No condo roadway; do fee simple holding.
No objection to low rise townhouses for some increase in density.
Not interested in any of these.
Single family homes.
Single storey
Small apartments only.
Small apartments, 3 level max for seniors, handicapped. Flats above shops are great for keeping people from hanging around.
Smaller density.
Some
Some detached dwellings. Not high rise apartments.
Some of everything
The existing community is primarily detached housing. It should remain as such with the exception of housing for seniors.
This development should be restricted to no more than 2-storey bldgs. High density housing will put undo pressure on water & drainage systems, as will inc traffic congestion.
This is an old English, European concept that is passe.
Too high density.

Unnecessary.
Well designed as presented March 27th.
Yes to town homes but still low density / no low income.

APPENDIX 6 SENIOR CITIZENS

1
1000-1200 sq.ft., wheel chair accessible, secure bathrooms, 2 bedrms, some ground level entry. Large courtyard.
Abbeyfield House.
Affordable, as in CMHC grant funding.
Already care facilities in GH. Village concept should promote interaction & pedestrian traffic.
Already close by. Kensington, Berwick House & ? Feltham Home.
Already have some fairly close
Already some around.
But a small one.
I accept some diversity but SFD is the GH policy & should be maintained.
If adequate planning provided.
Independent housing possible.
Low rise building acceptable.
Many types of houses would encourage the multi-generational village approach.
Maybe
Might fly, but are developers interested in a site removed from Commercial District?
Mixed types essential.
Need services. The site lacks them.
Not a private institution: small multi-level care for those who need to live out their days in secure comfort & support.
Not interested in any of these.
Seniors could have most of their needs met but important not to compromise the village atmosphere.
Single storey
Site may be too small for intermediate care with staff/parking issues.
Small, ranch style: one level homes for seniors & disabled persons.
Some priority for this - important to have representation from different ages
Somewhere with outside benches, more green space.
This is the better option for the area.

APPENDIX 7 PARKS GREENSPACE
100% of the area
A useable 5% of property should be set aside for community use
A village green concept would be attractive and could become part of the meeting space
About 30%
Already too much rec parks in are - cost too much
Enough in area
I consider this essential
Keeping residences small with little lawn will maximize public greenspace
Land available for vegetable and flower gardens
Linked to greenspace and Garry oak protection
Lots all children deserve park and play space
Low water plants and trees
Maintain wild hedgerow
More greenspace
Much park unaccessible fences off for ball or soccer
Part of village centre only
Pond, nature sanctuary ie Swan Lake
The creek should be protected as park
There is Greenspace nearby
Too much density in proposed development
Very interested in this
Whole area
Without a play area provided for this development children will cross Tyndall to access play area - this is not safe. Useable greenspace must be provided
APPENDIX 8 PUBLIC PLAZA
Absolutely necessary.
Absolutely vital.
Alternatives "close" to proposed development.
Draws people.
Essential
Essential.

Even a mapped community, police station, places where children/teenagers and elders could mix.
For exercising our democratic rights.
I consider this essential.
Ideal.
Less concrete.
NO
No. Too likely to be noisy.
Not critical.
Not required.
Outdoor seating, access to soccer fields & corner grocery store, church & bus stop.
Recreation Centre.
There are sufficient amenities in existence incl local schools, churches & Lambrick Park.
This appeals to me but how would it be funded?
Use of soccer club house.
Yes, if no commercial
APPENDIX 9 OTHER USES
Accessible housing for people with disabilities similar to seniors housing.
Allotment Gardens.
Allotment organic sites, meeting place for teenagers, recreation centre.
Basically anything that appeals to a wide variety of ages & lifestyles: bakery, restaurant, bookstore.
Bike shop.
Bookshop. Juice & deli bar.
Coffee shop, pub, computer store, sandwich or bagel or donut shop.
Cycle paths.
Fish market, bookstore, community theatre spot, small gift store with cards.
Garry Oak Parks
Good lighting all night. Plenty of green areas.
Large outdoor swimming pool, high-ceiling badminton hall.
Neighbourhood pub.
None.
Office, professional.
Open public spaces.

Other professional services ie. architect, accountant chiropractor.
Park
Perhaps a banking institution.
Places for young people and families.
Pub, bistro, coffee shops.
R6 zoning.
RS-6 Zoning.
Second hand bookstore/trading place. Card shop, etc.
Senior's centre for meetings, recreation, library.
Small restaurant ok or catering?
Small theatre for community-based plays & concerts.
Some plots for growing. Adequate planning for safety. Small library?
Wine store (trendy look) Not beer. Community theatre, small gift store.
garden plots for seniors.
APPENDIX 10 NOT DESIRED USES
2 Other uses no comment
Takeover" by commercial interests say business fail -- who decides what other businesses to bring in.
7-11 or similar type store.
7-11 store; McDonalds.
7-11. Large market. MacDonald's.
7-Eleven
A large parking space for cars.
Absolutely no commercial zoning.
Any commercial space.
Any commercial.
Any high volume traffic.
Anything noisy or smelly. No pubs, dry cleaners.
Apartments or commercial (retail).
Arcade - kid gathering stores.
Car-oriented uses.
Chain organizations, outlets.
Chain store operations.
Commercial / offices.

Commercial chains.
Commercial/high density residential.
Commercial/offices.
Drive-through/in, gas.
Gas stations, any industry, liquor stores, pubs, chain stores.
Housing and commercial development.
I don't want any RS6 Housing.
It would be dumb to stick a bunch of seniors in this site, without services. If seniors, then services need, so community mixed uses required.
Large commercial enterprises. 3+ storey buildings.
Large retail, chains, 7-11.
Large volume commercial (Costco, Wal-mart). Franchise (especially fast food).
Liquor store. House of ill-repute.
Liquor store, service station, video store, fast food outfits.
Neighbourhood pub.
No chains or businesses like 7-11, Mac's or Starbucks.
No commercial or multiple family use.
No commercial, please.
No commercial; nothing over 2 stories.
No franchised businesses please -- no 7-11.
No industrial use. No more churches.
No liquor store or any shop that would attract too many cars.
No low cost housing.
No pub.
No pubs, no sports arena.
No retail of any kind. No large group centres. We have this already.
No retail.
No shopping mall, no big chain stores, no gas stations, no big commerce.
No shops like 7-11 or Starbucks.
No tobacco sales or liquor.
None other than single family dwellings.
Nothing attracting late night activity noise.
Nothing like 7-11, Tim Hortons or other chains. Keep it small & unique.
Pink stucco ghetto as at Kenmore & Shelbourne.
Pizza, 7-11.
Places where teenagers hang out and be noisy ie 7-11 stores

Pubs, industrial.
Service stations.
Single family detached houses.
Wal-mart, Costco, anything like.
APPENDIX 11Question 3a
7-11.
Ample parking for commercial purposes would lead to higher traffic. Businesses need to be oriented to walk/bike traffic.
Avoiding a one generational hang out which gets untidy & unsightly. Need something all residents can take pride in.
Careful traffic management, allowance for walkways and bicycling.
Change character of neighbourhood. Disruptive. Traffic. Find commercial development unsightly.
Commercial activities generating traffic. Late night noise. Teenagers gathering. Parking problems. Zoning change to commercial will set precedent for other lots in area.
Commercial interests running the agenda.
Commercial types are difficult to control once zoning is approved. Increased traffic.
Commercial zoning requires lower environmental standards for cleanup than for residential, lower my property value, not enough traffic on Tyndall to support Commercial village. Failure of the village would cause an uncontrollable commercial area.
Community planning. Laneways. Smaller yards. Commons area.
Creates a hang out for kids and teens
Density, water supply is already poor in this area.
Destruction of existing community major increase in traffic - failure of existing businesses.
Detached dwellings or town homes - none.
Development that would attract traffic from outside the area.
Don't need it - not enough traffic flow to justify business - they won't last.
Economic viability of commercial development, increased traffic, noise, "hang out" area, and vandalism.
Ensuring the commercial development is focussed on neighbourhood needs.
Fantastic opportunity. I have no concerns. Lets go for it. I do not support another development of single family dwellings. To much emphasis on the car already.
Going bankrupt and empty stores.
Green space with a gazebo coffee shop in a natural greenspace you walk to.
High traffic density. Strain on the already poor water supply (pressure).
Hours of operation - too much commercial, not enough green space, awkward and dangerous parking.

I believe that property values of homes directly across from the development would be adversely affected. Increased noise & traffic would be a problem.
I could only stay the 1st hour and do not exactly know the precise definition of "mixed use".
I have no concerns about multi-family use nor Senior's housing. Some commercial space is needed to give the place a centre. Some concerns re commercial viability of too many shops.
I like the idea. The area should include kids, pets, middle-age & elderly.
I would like to see park space interspaced with shops for walking. We don't always have to drive out to Beacon Hill or Butchart Gardens.
I would think the specifics will be critical - if there are businesses they need to be quiet, neighbourhood oriented, content to be small and not grow.
If I wanted mixed use, I would have chosen Fairfield.
If more commercial, not viable & would become a dead zone.
If we have commercial will bring more traffic.
Increase in traffic, garbage.
Increased traffic - aesthetics that can be associated with greater density housing - noise if commercial development - has late hours.
Increased traffic, impact on property values, hours of operation for commercial operations.
Increased traffic, noise, litter & garbage.
Increased traffic. Creeping commercialization.
Intrusive commercial activity.
It might get out of hand ie, more retail and larger homes.
It must be useful for the community as a whole and encourage walking, bicycles etc.
It would get out of residential control, present traffic problems, commercialized by super stores.
Keep GH residential
Keep high quality design. Try to get parking underground. Ensure green space & pedestrian orientation is maintained.
Large stores or franchises moving in
Main concern is desire to impose commercial enterprises on this land: not required nor desired. The MVD concept would result in inward-looking enclave & would eventually result in a ghetto.
Might increase automobile traffic. Once a commercial development has been granted, there will not be much control over the future development.
Mixed use development does not fit within the concept for GH and in particular, the Tyndall Road San Juan area.
More density than 53 homes would bring.
More really if well designed.
More stores, more traffic and lower water pressure.
More traffic, the possible opening of San Juan Ave.
My concern is with another traditional subdivision. I want a village concept.

Need affordable housing.
No concerns. Some restrictions re: commercial use.
No real concerns.
Noise, dogs, drugs, street people.
Noise, traffic, drug dealers and teenagers and B & E.
Noise. Hear neighbours concerns.
None
None.
Not needed. We have 2 mini-malls already at corner of Shelbourne & Feltham. Lots of parks within walking distance.
Only that it doesn't get built or that it is build badly so it becomes the wrong kind of model.
Our quality of life will be enhanced if decision makers on Council remain aware of the changing demographics/costs which potential land use involves.
Parking (provide some underground), sight lines to Mt Doug. Also exposure to sunshine.
Parking. Residents will still use car regardless of proximity of retail outlets.
Safety. Up keep.
Security, noise, McDonalds wrappers blowing in the wind.
Slippery slope re: commercial development. Increase traffic.
Small business - not economically feasible.
Small entrepreneurs might be slow to open businesses at the public plaza
Spread, crime.
Stores are not needed. Senior housing is a senior centre like Monterey would be good.
That commercial development would take precedence over public interest.
That it be truly controlled and not be a large vehicle traffic generator.
That it stay small & neighbourhood-focussed, inviting & maximizing community participation.
That the properties might be so highly priced that seniors and younger families cannot afford to live in the development
There would be a very fine line between attractive and too attractive - Mattick's Farm for instance attracts a huge amount of traffic from all over the peninsula - such a development would significantly increase traffic rather than decrease it.
Tight zoning for commercial uses restrictive to true community service uses.
Too busy. I prefer quiet neighbourhood.
Too large a commercial centre.
Too much traffic.
Too much traffic. Tyndall has become a Pat Bay Hwy. In the past 4 years, traffic has tripled.
Traffic & parking. Some residents will walk, most will drive. Commercial parking lots are ugly. Please retain existing hedgerow by soccer fields for wildlife. Leave lots of open ground w/houses & yards. Groundwater problems w/condos, apts.

Traffic - cars. Safety.
Traffic congestion. Shortage of water. Night noise. Over crowded schools. Just put one McDonalds or a 7-11 into this nice little commercial village & see what happens to traffic "reduction." Once zoning changes, can't keep them out.
Traffic control, security, good pedestrian access. how to limit types of tenants.
Traffic is a major concern. How do you get people out of their vehicles? Convenience is the name of the game.
Traffic noise. Outside traffic. Hang out for teenagers.
Traffic would be increased in an already dangerous area. I have seen children dangerously walk to G. Head School and be in harmful situations due to bad traffic conditions.
Traffic, attraction of undesirable elements. The 7-11 at Shelbourne & Feltham attracts teenagers. We need a traffic light at Tyndall & Feltham, turning left from Tyndall is very dangerous. Even SF development will increase traffic at this intersection.
Traffic, gathering place for kids, garbage, increased pavement, derelict buildings attract vandalism, high density, increase water pressure, problems at Hillcrest Ave where problems already exist.
Traffic, noise, outside traffic, gathering place for teenagers.
Traffic, safety, no out of character developments - follow GH LAP policies, 1997 - 6.1 and 6.4.
Traffic. High density. I do not believe Darrell Wicks' traffic figures. I do not believe that Wicks' or Harper are doing this with n o remuneration from the developer.
Traffic. What type of person will be gathered there.
Traffic: need pedestrian activated control by current corner store; lights at Kenmore & Tyndall. Graffiti: needs landscaping in front of surfaces that may be tagged.
Types of stores: bringing rowdy crowds. To be quiet & reserved, no late hours.
Viability of some of the small businesses, subsequent property flipping and change of use.
Want assurance that commercial area won't be overbearing & that residential area is small scale but not crowded, ie not max coverage houses that leave inches btwn neighbours. Protect Garry Oaks. Less grass & concrete- use brick, woodchip & native plants.
Well designed, no stucco monster houses. No high rises. No franchises or chain stores.
What amount of land -sq. footage of park? Commercial sq. footage? How / what density of housing? If we have no idea of what is proposed, how can we give reasonable comment?
What is to stop 7-11 coming in at a future date as vacancies occur?
Where will seniors and their visitors park their cars?
Who would dare to select a few commercial outlets? The 10 ac doesn't seem large enough for uses proposed. Don't accept that it will improve the quality of life in GH – either visually or insofar as traffic is concerned.
APPENDIX 12 Question 3b
A comment from a planner -- world famous. "GH is beginning to look like a "Little Los Angeles".
A newspaper article or two.

Affordable rent for business properties
Bike / pedestrian friendly, concealed parking, low speed street design.
Build single family homes. Why is there no exit onto Torquay Ave?
Careful research on suitable business.
Commercial ventures need adequate parking. This will increase traffic to this area (& decrease it elsewhere!). Underground parking will be necessary.
Community involvement.
Concern re: stereotypical plan to maximize developer's profit. Saanich could get creative and propose something that will improve the quality of living & viewing on Tyndall. Something to be truly proud of.
Create central area with facilities that people want to use and are appropriate for the area.
DO NOT change the R6 zoning. Let the construction begin.
Define the concept very accurately. If it is to be an "urban village", it would be just that - pleasant, attractive, pedestrian friendly; constant monitoring/representation needed.
Denser housing, better uses of energy resources are more appropriately addressed by the "Complete Community" concept. Who listened when Arrow Rd topside got built? Faster/increased traffic endangers walkers, esp. seniors without cars (no sidewalks).
Design the area for walkers & bikes.
Design the space to not be car friendly.
Develop the property as a single family/seniors' complex.
Develop the property as single family residences as per current zoning.
Discourage thru traffic. Gain consensus from the residents affected.
Do not build high density dwellings.
Don't know.
Don't put in any retail
Have a police community and more police patrols and more lights.
High quality architecture, covenants attached to development contract
I am not concerned but my group seems to be afraid of commercial development. I would like Saanich to be creative with concerns re: commercial development so that restrictions could be put in place to prevent "uncontrolled" commercial development.
I think the village concept is desirable since it will result in less traffic increase.
Improved water supply/pressure.
Include 10-20% of units as affordable.
Increased traffic calming measures. Better sidewalks to increase pedestrian use. Pleasing architecture - increased parking charges.
Info should have been presented at this meeting - this was a very "airy" meeting, ie. no real concrete facts.
It's a risk I'm prepared to take but it can only be answered by the people.
Just build single family houses.

Just keep big commercial ventures out so the neighbourhood community feeling can build in a supportive manner.
Keep RS-6 zoning, upgrade to RS-8, or develop as park as per GH LAP 1981 to 1993 and Parks Referendums of 1986 and 1990.
Keep the local area plan the same. An old-fashioned plan for an old fashioned community.
Keep traffic to a minimum, which means NO COMMERCIAL.
Keep village concept small and efficient.
Late hours. Limit customer parking. Speed bumps. Enforce STOP signs.
Leave GH residential -- R6.
Leave the site as "residential only" with lots of green space (Dwarf sized trees).
Leave the zoning as defined in the Cond Approval. 53 homes is too intensive. Retool the plan to lessen the density & make the area more people friendly. More green space = less sterile plan.
Leave the zoning to single family.
Limit commercial development to that compatible with residents' interest.
Limit size of available commercial space. Reasonable operating hours. Flats above shops for constant occupation & down-directed lighting in Plaza. Underground parking & small parking charges.
Look very carefully at the mix of tenants allowable both at start up and long term. Ensure that parking both immediate and local are kept to a minimum.
Make sure that the developer does put up reasonable prices houses, townhouses, etc
More community input. Keep public informed. Keep it green.
More discussion & careful appraisal of possibilities. Establish a 40 kph zone along the adjoining part of Tyndall & especially along San Jan Ave.
More information about impact on traffic/crime for both types of development. People fear both from both.
More meetings like this.
More studies of business usage. Mattick's Farm, Cook St Village & Cadboro Bay that "evolved" as result of micro & macro community needs.
Newspaper article, t.v. channel 11 programs, open community meetings.
No change.
No commercial development.
No commercial other than facilities for seniors.
No commercial zoning.
No commercial.
No multi-scale housing projects -- attached or detached.
Not develop commercially.
Nothing.
Only local type shops that would be economically successful based on local traffic.
Planning regulations from Municipality. Public input

Please tell me.
Possibly underground parking for the whole area.
Propose single dwellings in a tasteful structure to enhance the environment, not depreciate it!
Protect the hedgerow. Think about limiting car access w/l the development. Look at underground parking lot? Or restrict businesses to lower thruput types eg restaurant instead of video store & grocery.
Purchase land for green space.
Put your efforts into getting the Municipality to control traffic speed on Tyndall.
Reduce car traffic, reduce parking (free storage of cars), encourage walking/cycling.
Rely on Saanich?
Remove David Harper & his like from making any further input. His comments -- empty nesters -- is incorrect. On Leabrook Pl, 11 houses, 3 yrs ago. One house had 2 kids & now there's 5 houses & 9 kids.
Retain residential zoning, perhaps some single level senior development increased park land dedication.
Saanich buy a part of the property for a park with a coffee shop that they build to own or lease out to operators.
Security - proper design (openness) - closing hours by 9:30pm. Quiet at night, well lighted.
See above.
Set high design standards. Adapt engineering standards to reduce impacts.
Small business - Cadboro Bay is a good example (but no Peppers) smaller scale.
Stay with single family development. Do not develop until sufficient water is available at all times of the year.
Strict control of type of commercial development.
Strict limits on the types of businesses and hours of operation.
Strict regulation of which businesses go in. Zoning & design guidelines for houses. Emphasis on West Coast design - natural materials (wood, stone) & native plants (ferns, Doug Fir & Arbutus).
Take this concept to the next level.
Traffic calming on San Juan Ave 1500, 1600 block. Commitment from Saanich never to connect San Juan.
Use for open green space or if must be developed, make very large outdoor swimming pool.
Very careful planning - ongoing input - base plans on real experience elsewhere. Any development (including that already approved) should be subject to traffic calming stops being taken throughout the larger neighbourhood.
You could pay more attention to the letters of residents directly affected & look to protect trees, Garry Oaks, while you have control of how land is subdivided. No Garry Oak removal in subdivisions.
You have helped me think within the "box" of development that further urbanizes but adds little that is really needed.
Zoning by municipality reflect community wishes.
nothing

APPENDIX 13 QUESTION 4
A mixed housing use - not outright commercial - with a community greenspace in a Garry oak meadow.
Absolutely not.
Better than 53 single detached houses.
Definitely not. Give it up. Let it go.
Do we really need more single family dwellings?
Enough already
Essential. High Quality design essential.
For this property, it may be too late. The developer already has approval to proceed with a straight residential development.
Give the community a place to walk to.
Gordon Head feeds off the facilities of other areas and contributes to those areas problems with traffic - this should not continue.
Gordon Head is great already!!
Hanging baskets/sweet shops/ light tourist, a village atmosphere.
I appreciate the developer & Saanich considering this idea. If you have another idea meeting you might want to remind people to practice active citizenship, to display reasoned judgment & to practice critical thinking. Students would have done better.
I believe the perceived benefits of mixed use development do not out weigh the potential social cost to current residents.
I congratulate the developer for "hanging in there" in the face of so much vocal opposition, without still knowing the scope of support/opposition.
I see that the exit from the new development is across from Francisco Tce, a very quiet street, with kids playing in the park & on the street itself. The exit on Tyndall should be offset to maximize use of major arteries and minimize use of small streets
I was very upset by the behaviour of many citizens at the meeting. However, I'm tired of rude bullies getting their way by this irresponsible behaviour and I'm happy you've given me this opportunity with this survey. Thank you.
I would welcome a proposal to make better use of the site (ie village). I am opposed to the homogenous single detached development on this site.
If a thoughtful village & environs were to occur, the benefits would also benefit existing residents.
If this property is to be rezoned, it should revert to Park. This land is too small for a village and also, it is a wrong location for commercial use.
In a different setting with a much greater area for development the village concept may be feasible, but if commercial is included, parking would be necessary as it will fail as people will not walk.
Just because services, etc in the area, doesn't mean they will be what the neighbours want.
Keep up the good work. How about something like this for the Gordon Head Church allotment property.

Leave more than well enough alone! The small area in the centre of an established community does not lent itself to the development of a village concept.
Like concept of village as in older European communities.
Lovely lot in middle of GH. I could manage the walk while University Heights is too far from the outskirts of GH for walking.
More consultation & listen to voices.
More needs to be done to educate people about the benefits of a mixed use
Most definitely.
Move ahead quickly with the design.
Must have community input to be successful. Great ides for suburban area full of isolated people & that lot is the best for it -- proximity to existing community public spaces & not encroaching on residences.
NO.
No commercial use. We do not need additional shopping in this area.
No need for village component. This is a residential area. Small businesses would not thrive there; parking would be a nightmare. If it must be developed, keep it modestly residential with some homes for independent seniors.
No, more effort into some other use such as a science or nature centre.
Not a one-sided presentation, allowing more public debate amongst the group as a whole.
Not necessary. People need space, quiet & greenery or recreation to relax. More commerce in the midst of our home lives is not conducive to good mental health.
Only if housing/not commercial.
Opportunity to provide great & innovative development. Developer needs support to change from SFD to mixed-use village.
Opposed to commercial high density.
Process biased - not presenting any potential negatives, ie. economic viability; not allowing objections to be voiced to the whole meeting; loading questions "Complete Community", presenting "desirable" uses with no consideration for feasibility.
Review proposal for development on GH Rd (Church property).
Saanich should look at the feasability of purchasing the land - on the option- and turning it into a park.
Something better than the current approved 53 lot development. Even a better single family layout would be acceptable.
Stop now. Keep RS-6 zoning.
The "live work" unit concept is a new idea that should be examined. Also "Mattick" village - walking commercial concept is very desirable.
The time has come for GH while land still available. Large houses on small lots is a disturbing trend for area. Develop for the atmosphere of the future so residents can be proud of living in GH.
There is no requirement to develop a "coronation street west" on Tyndall Ave.
This conforms to the Saanich OCP vision statement. Saanich should take an active role in explaining their vision statement, the need for sustainable communities, how an urban village will reduce traffic, etc.

[illegible]