

Rachel Dumas

From: Terry Prentice
Sent: April-30-18 1:36 PM
To: Bill Brown
Subject: OCP 2018

Bill, sorry this was rejected because I had your email incorrect.

From: Terry Prentice
Subject: **OCP 2018**
Date: 30April, 2018 at 1:32:46 PM PDT
To: Bill.Brown@Esquimalt
Cc: Barb Desjardins <barbara.desjardins@esquimalt.ca>

I have just finished listening to the debate by Council following the introduction and First Reading of the OCP.

I think you have done a good job on writing it in the concept of an OCP, but in the debate I realized that Council was being drawn into the position of previous Councils at each new OCP, whereupon the public attempts to have the OCP written in the context of a Zoning Bylaw.

It is the Zoning Bylaw that sets out the uses and the parameters of height, setbacks, densities, but the public wants the OCP to incorporate as much as it can of the Zoning Bylaw, so it ties the hands of Council when zoning changes are being considered.

You were right in advising Council that the OCP is written for their guidance in how they want to see the community develop and grow. It is not supposed to be another tool the public can use to challenge the Council on zoning changes.

On the other hand as shown by many written OCP submissions and the presentations by the public at the meeting all they wanted was to limit heights of buildings to six stories, which is a parameter of the Zoning Bylaw.

You have managed to keep heights out of the document except when describing 'Neighbourhood Commercial Mixed-Use', and 'Medium and High Density Residential Development'. This led to a Council debate around twelve stories in the previous OCP and the limit of six stories in the current proposed OCP, and where in the municipality it should be/could be, Constance-Naden, along Esquimalt Road, north side or south side, east of Head street.

If the height was removed from these zones, Council could then receive applications in these zones and at that time determine the willingness to accept three, four, six, eight, ten or twelve, or maybe 16-20 stories, and to determine what tradeoffs/bonuses it wants/requires to go ahead with a zoning application.

As it is written it becomes one of the "weasel" clauses to which I referred, and the public will insist that Council cannot consider anything over six because it is written in the OCP.

I realize this does not suggest "better" wording, but I think as the planner you should consider changes to avoid tying the hands of Council, and misleading the public on the purpose of an OCP.