



TOWN OF VIEW ROYAL

MINUTES OF THE OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, JUNE 2, 2025 VIEW ROYAL MUNICIPAL OFFICE – COUNCIL CHAMBERS

PRESENT: Mayor Tobias, Chair
Councillor Lemon
T. Allan
C. Harris
M. Lloyd
K. Peatt
J. Priest
E. Willis

REGRETS: W. Abbott
K. Abraham

PRESENT ALSO: L. Taylor, Director of Development Services
S. Scory, Senior Planner
L. Curtis, Community Planner

5 members of the public
0 members of the press

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MOVED BY: M. Lloyd
SECONDED: E. Willis

THAT the agenda be approved as presented.

CARRIED

4. **MINUTES, RECEIPT & ADOPTION OF**

MOVED BY: J. Priest
SECONDED: K. Peatt

THAT the minutes of the Committee meeting held May 5, 2025, be received.

CARRIED

5. **CHAIR'S REPORT**
6. **PETITION & DELEGATIONS**
7. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**
8. **REPORTS**
 - 8.1 **STAFF REPORTS**

a) Official Community Plan Phase 1 Process Update report dated May 22, 2025, from the Director of Development Services

The Director of Development Services gave a presentation on three different options concerning land use scenarios. The Director noted that Council had concerns regarding the two land use scenarios that were presented at the Council meeting on May 13, 2025, and informed the Committee that staff will be presenting the three options at the Committee of the Whole meeting in June.

Staff noted that the public was informed of the provincial housing requirements (Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) and Transit-Oriented Areas (TOA) in the surveys and poster boards at the open houses and workshops.

The Committee members provided the following comments:

- feedback has been received from the public, and there is broad support for increased density outside of what the provincial legislation has required;
- the OCP encompasses more than just housing, and it is not desirable to separate housing and land use from topics such as active transportation, economic development, and connected communities, all of which requires increased density to support;
- the Committee is looking for balanced planning and growth across the entire community;
- Option 1 is the bare minimum and would result in the majority of the community being left out given that it would create pockets of development in some neighbourhoods, but none in others;
- the Committee discourages only focusing on Small-Scale Multi-Unit Housing (SSMUH) and Transit-Oriented Areas (TOA), particularly since the uptake of SSMUH has been so low;
- future generations must be taken into consideration to ensure their housing needs are being met;
- future more senior levels of government are just as likely to pressure municipalities to continue to densify in the face of rising climate change challenges, housing shortages, and affordability issues;
- some concern was expressed about the look and feel of 6-storey buildings along corridors. The Director noted that OCP land use policies and Development Permit Area Design Guidelines will help to ensure that development occurs responsibly;
- it makes more sense to zone in advance for what is wanted instead of leaving it to higher levels of government to dictate what goes where; and
- it is inefficient to rely solely on spot rezoning. Spot rezoning results in the process being dragged out, takes up more of Council's time when other topics could be focused on, and adds to costs at the end of the day. The whole point of updating the OCP is to have as many people give their opinions as possible, while spot rezoning captures only input from a handful of people in opposition to the proposed development.

MOVED BY: E. Willis
SECONDED: K. Peatt

THAT the Committee recommend to Council that Option 3 – Phase 1 OCP amendments to comply with the provincial housing legislation and continue with the original scope of work and deliverables for Phase 1 be approved.

CARRIED

Opposed T. Allan, J. Priest, and S. Tobias

b) Official Community Plan Review Update: Draft Vision and Land Use Survey report dated May 20, 2025, from the Senior Planner

The Senior Planner introduced the draft Vision and Land Use Survey and invited Committee members to provide feedback on the survey. The Committee provided the following comments:

- add housing co-ops to residential land use designations;
- add definitions to the survey: TOA, SSMUH, floor space ratio (FSR), all acronyms should be explained in the survey;
- have the necessary maps lead each of the sections, so that they are easier to find and so that information may be better understood;
- include images so that respondents have an idea of what a TOA will look like, and give examples of different FSRs;
- consider inverting the scenario questions by asking respondents what scenario their preferred option is, followed by open-ended questions on what they like about each scenario;
- draft survey took approximately 12-15 minutes to complete; and
- shorten the description with photos of proposed designs.

9. CORRESPONDENCE

- a) Letter dated May 6, 2025, from D. Wilson

MOVED BY: M. Lloyd
SECONDED: K. Peatt

THAT the letter dated May 6, 2025 from D. Wilson be received for information.

CARRIED

- b) Email dated June 1, 2025, from J. Devonshire

MOVED BY: M. Lloyd
SECONDED: K. Peatt

THAT the email dated June 1, 2025 from J. Devonshire be received for information.

CARRIED

10. NEW BUSINESS

a) Official Community Plan Questions to the Committee dated May 27, 2025 from Mayor Tobias

The Mayor reviewed the questions he had prepared with the Committee. The following are the questions and responses provided:

Question 1. Is the current mandatory zoning adequate for the Town you want to see in 20 years?

The Mayor indicated that this question was answered when the Committee discussed their preferred option – Option 3 – detailed in section 8.1 a) above.

Question 2. Does the Committee recommend that we also include a corridor densification plan with the mandatory rezoning?

The Mayor indicated that this question was answered when the Committee discussed their preferred option – Option 3 – detailed in section 8.1 a) above.

Question 3. If we recommend a further densification on the corridors, are there services required for the density such as commercial space?

- The Committee would like to see more mixed-use buildings with services or commercial space on the ground floor of buildings along the corridors and in Urban Centres and Neighbourhood Villages.
- The Director of Development Services noted that creating OCP Development Permit Area Guidelines and Zoning Bylaw regulations could be used to further ensure that this type of development would be supported along the corridors and within the Urban Centres and Neighbourhood Villages.

Question 4. The Town Centre has been designated in that area now used as the Fort Victoria RV Park. As discussed, despite this designation for 14 years the site has no plans for sale or redevelopment, nor does it intend to for the foreseeable future. Does the Committee recommend that we continue with this plan for a Town Centre?

- The Committee does not support a Town Centre being located at Fort Victoria.
- The Committee debated the removal of the Town Centre designation and whether it would be better to change the designation to a Neighbourhood Village designation.
- Feedback from the public and Council led to the removal of Town Centre from the draft land use scenarios. Instead, the draft land use scenarios identify the Fort Victoria RV Park as either a corridor or Neighbourhood Village – both of which have very similar proposed uses.
- Could consider developing around the area and if Fort Victoria ever becomes available, it could be blended in with the rest of the surrounding development.
- However, the large powerlines which traverse over a portion of property, and the one point of access are challenges that would need to be considered in great detail for any future development to the site and area.

Question 5. The Town has approved a significant amount of market rental. Are there other types of housing such as co-op housing that the Committee recommends to Council?

- Co-op housing can be added as a permitted land use within appropriate land use designations to encourage more to be constructed within View Royal.
- Government subsidized housing would need to be supported within the OCP's Housing and Land Use policies. Land use designations do not take into account tenure.
- It is also possible to encourage below market housing and/or inclusionary housing within the OCP's Housing and Land Use policies as well.

Question 6. Does the Committee recommend to Council that Hospital TOA be considered as the Town Centre as there may be interest and complimentary services and transportation infrastructure to support it?

- The Committee does not see a need to have a Town Centre at this location and questioned if designating the property as a Town Centre would be a benefit.
- Not sure that designating 2 Hospital Way a Town Centre would matter in the greater scheme of things.

- The Director of Development Services noted that neither Land Use Scenario—Option 1 nor Land Use Scenario—Option 2 include a Town Centre designation. Land Use Scenario—Option 3 (2011 OCP Land Use Designation with new SSMUH and TOA land use designations) still includes the Town Centre designation.

Question 7. Council was presented two options in the staff report. I have included third option given Council's feedback. Which option does the Committee recommend:

- [Mayor Tobias'] Option 1: Balanced Growth Across Centres and Corridors
- [Mayor Tobias'] Option 2: Market-Responsive and Employment Land Strategy
- [Mayor Tobias'] Option 3: Legislative Compliance + Western Gateway Focus

- The Mayor indicated that this question was answered when the Committee discussed their preferred option – Option 3 – detailed in section 8.1 a) above.
- The Committee would like to see balanced growth across the centres and corridors within View Royal.

11. TERMINATION

MOVED BY: T. Allan
SECONDED: C. Harris

THAT this meeting now terminate.
Time: 8:55 p.m.

CARRIED


CHAIR


RECORDING SECRETARY