

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Simplicity and ability to increase affordable housing				This is a housing crisis - we don't have time to waste.		
Voluntary registration	No			No	Not at this time.	Not at this time.
It hits most of my boxes except for parking and suite size	See above no additional parking maximum suite 750 sq ft				New suites should be compliant	Get this done
Oh my god approve them already 😊😊	How many goddamn ways can you postpone this to appease the nimbys	Just approve pilot projects exists to delay. Secondary suites are not creating a goddamn time machine or anything.	If there is a pilot project I will rolllllllll my eyes	APPROVE THE SUITES	Do better	Oak bay council is the least efficient group of individuals I've ever witnessed in my life.
			Henderson			Consider a family member clause similar to Saanich. Some families are living in multi generational homes to care for elderly parents while still maintaining personal space and privacy.
enforcement						
secondary suites only gives a financial benefit to the owners, the neighbours are having to out with the nuicance, been there and well aware.	the owners should be made more responsible for what secondary suites creates for the neighbours around them			pilot programs are great, but realty is something completely different		DO NOT ALLOW SECONDARY SUITES, we lived closed to 20 years with an secondary suite and it was hell on earth and the owners only saw the income the suite generated and this is all what the owners are interested about , their own FINANCIAL BENEFIT. If you can not afford Oak BAY living than you need to live elsewhere, that is reality for living. People spend a lot of money to live in Oak Bay and therefore expect a certain Lifestyle.
It is a compromise and directionally will help resistant neighbours accept and see that this is a good thing for our community. Renewal and affordability and inclusion of others.	Not sure about the 40% calculation. I can see how when one ages in place, the need for space decreases.		South Oak Bay		This is an added level of bureaucracy, self declaration is better.	
less regulatory confusion, conflicts can still be resolved within bylaw enforcement, more flexibility as needs change, ie live-in care versus rental	owner occupy should be included		South Oak Bay	Should be near transit so parking is less of an issue	Too subjective, open to neighbour hood lobbying, beaurocrat expansion	If we expect to keep Oak Bay alive and thriving we need more younger people who can afford to live here. I want to age in place and not depend on seniors homes so I want to be able to have a younger renter who may provide care and maintenance as well.
All regulations seem appropriate.	No.					

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
We need to densify Oak Bay to accommodate those who need to level somewhere. The more barriers we put in front of secondary suits the fewer we will have. We need all we can get.				Just get secondary suites done. There is no need to do a pilot program as they have been successful in Saanich and Victoria.	Rezoning merely gives NIMBYs the ability to slow down and sometimes stop progress. It happened with the Oak Bay Lodge and would happen with every re-zoning app for a secondary suite. Many who would have put in secondary suites will not so they avoided the hassle and animosity that rezoning apps bring. The vocal minority should not rule Oak Bay.	Oak Bay needs secondary suites to accommodate the people that need a place to live. Get it done.
Regulate secondary suites the same way we regulate homes. No additional bylaws needed- just adds cost and bureaucracy and inequality.				This is a terrible idea without public policy defence. It is pure Nymby. Rich people afraid of poor people without any evidence of something to fear.		Get on with it. This survey is very destructive. It is very technical and most people wont know about it and wont have time to wrap their heads around it.
It would prevent the street parking issue from becoming worse than it already is and ensure compliance with regulations - Having the requirement for homes with suites be owner occupied would ensure that suites would be less likely to be problematic. If people want to be landlords they should run the suites like a business.	I would like to see the lot size increased to a minimum of 10,000ft2	RS1, RS2, RS3 and RS4				I believe that the housing issue in Oak Bay would be better addressed by developments like the one proposed by the United Church for apartments than it will be by secondary suites.
I would prefer to use my house in a way that best suits me.	I would prefer the owner to live on site.			We already have lots of secondary suites her. I prefer to make them safe and legal. I would also like the option to remain in my home as I age. A secondary suite would allow that. additionally, it allows for a higher density without changing the character of neighbourhoods, provides housing for those who cannot afford a house, like many of our children who can't live near as it is so expensive. The usual parking complaints seem silly to me. Our roads are built for travel and parking. Vancouver has successfully dealt with this issue.	This process has been going on forever. Let's stop putting up roadblocks. We need more and diverse types of housing.	Let's just get on with it. The discussion has been ongoing for as long as I can remember.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Provides maximum flexibility. Off street parking requirement is misleading: very few homes without suites offer 2 off street parking (as required). Many homes occupied by owners have 3 or more cars (and no suite). On my street: retired couple: 3 cars. Next door: family of 3 (2 adults, one toddler): 3 cars, next door: family of 4 (2 adult kids): 5 cars.	Only secondary suite permitted. Owner occupied and mandatory business license.			No pilot, no more delays, make a decision. Allow, do not allow bit make a decision. While i appreciate your motivation to be inclusive (and you have been), this has taking way too long. Make a decision immediately.	Staff time and limited resources the district has are better spent on existing service requirements and infrastructure needs.	Make a decision: go, no go in June. If a go, select option based on feedback from this survey and move on.
I Believe that housing is necessary but that it should not come at the cost of neighborhoods. If a secondary suite is used they should have to meet certain requirements including offstreet parking, I'll licensing for you, and an increase in property taxes to cover the extra use of the sewers the policing the schooling the roads the hospitals.						Taxes should be higher in a home with a secondary suite as there is a greater use of resources
Similar to current situation except suites not legal.	No			We already are in a pilot program, theres suites all over oak bay.		
Must be regulated and taxed approximately. No street parking should be allowed. Owners must live in the house.	I am not in favour of secondary suites.	South oak bay	South oak vay	Pilot programs are never successful but try it if you want.		No secondary suites.
Everyone who owns a whom should have this option,subject to health, safety, fire regulations	Owner occupied - there should be some 'check in' by owner to ensure the higher quality tenant			Just get on with it! no pilot, just do it Every other municipality does this... extra caution is conservative, not with the times		Just do it! long overdue
Not overly regulated				No off street parking required -	Way too cumbersome for staff and council to deal with- it's been ten years and still no action on suites !	
Housing shortage existing, secondary suites are already in OB in most if not all areas	Owner occupied				Secondary suites are here & needed ... leave them be and introduce regulations slowly & carefully	
					This current council appears not to want to see any changes in Oak Bay and I can not imagine resining passing to allow secondary suites.	There are a lot of very large homes in Oak Bay with very few people rattling around in them . Secondary suites would enable old people to stay, new people to come or stay, the community to deal with the population boom that is the reality of our time. It would ideally make housing more affordable for buyers and renters. It might even combat some loneliness issues. Higher density promotes Neighbourhood.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
B is the closest but there should be an annual business license, bylaw enforcement for non registers suites and extra fees for garbage and a oversized garbage bin to accommodate it.						
Mandatory business license a d compliance program			Any street that can accommodate both parking and the free flow of 2 way traffic.not impeded by parked cars.			I have no problem with suites.....but I do with the number of cars what would end up parked on the streets. So, a parking place must be provided on the property.
The suite would comply with building code, provide off street parking & have an owner living in one of the units.	I like the "C" option but I would also like to be able to board students - either international or university.			I don't think we need a pilot program. Oak Bay knows there are many suites already in the municipality, lets just get on with a program to legalize them.	The more difficult that the process is, the more likely that existing suites will not be made legal. Have an amnesty program for existing suites and then develop a by-law to cover all new suite application.	Oak Bay should get on with it. This municipality is one of only 2 on the south island that has not permitted suites. With the housing crisis that is presently upon us, Oak Bay should at least try to help provide housing options. Rental housing is very important to the retail and restaurant industries. Without reasonably priced accommodation, it becomes much more difficult to get employees.
Encourages sense of community, but requires a balance between regulations and community.	Add mandatory licensing.			Yes, just get on with it. We don't need to wait another five years to address housing shortages and lack of density.	We don't need more red tape and hoops to jump through. Let's move FORWARD.	Make it happen - NOW!!!!
Least restrictive	Require owner occupancy					
Owner occupancy, no unit size restriction	Off street parking should be required on streets less than a certain width. If streets are wide enough for the free flow of traffic and the owner has off street parking it additional off street parking should not be required			There is no need for a pilot programme. This issue has been discussed for all of the 12 years that I have lived in Oak Bay. The issues are clear. Let's get on with it. The rest of the province is the pilot programme. Adopt the rules of the best communities which have been with secondary suites for decades.	If this is required, it will be years before secondary suites are allowed in any number. Funds required for such a plan could be put to much more productive uses.	This is not a discussion of how to get to Mars. Any concerns that have been voiced are can be dealt with by requiring owner occupancy, off street parking where necessary and the health and safety issues. Secondary suites have existed for decades in most, if not all, municipalities in BC (including Oak Bay) without the world coming to an end. Let's get on with legalizing what already exists.
Where is my choice to say no suites? if all my neighbours have suites where will I park. How are you going to control it? Who is going to pay for the additional enforcement? Again I work very hard to work here, have a single family dwelling with no suite, ensure my yard is beautiful and follow all the bi-laws which currently means no suites yet you are asking people that have illegal suites to give their opinion on suites? Fox, hen house!	See 21		more urban or commercial areas of oak bay. Closer to Oak bay avenue, fort and fowl bay etc		Why does every municipality have to be the same? We already pay the most taxes why do we have to densify our housing? Will the homes will additional accommodation pay additional taxes for the extra load on the infrastructure. How will you now regulate how many people are living in the municipality and should be paying taxes for services?	See all of the above. This is a giant leap backwards.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Some regulation, but open enough to encourage needed secondary residences.						There is a serious need for more affordable accommodation to encourage people to live as well as work in Oak Bay
I'd like to think that better regulation and active District involvement would mean better housing and tenancy for renters, and that clearer, universally applied standards would help neighbourhood relationships.	I might decrease both the min lot size and the max unit size/proportion.			use existing suites for the pilot, with some sort of amnesty for self-declaring homeowners (whose suites would probably tend to be the more code-compliant anyway).		re the requirement for Oak Bay homes to provide 2 parking spaces (I assume this means off-street): many homes are now parking 2020s cars in 1930s-1950s driveways. Many of these cars do not fit into the garage at all, which would have been one parking space, and barely in the driveway, and it's rare to see both in use. (Ditto laneway garages.) The extensive use of residential on-street parking instead of outdated off-street spaces has been especially obvious in the past year with so many people working from home. Having so many cars parked on the street, especially right up to and opposite driveways, makes it more difficult for drivers to use their off-street spaces - which leads to more on-street parking. And we should probably be looking at 3 off-street spaces for new builds or houses with suites. As a cyclist and driver, I would love to see (at least) 2 cars per lot parked off the street, we're nowhere near that. I hope this is a step toward considering permitting and regulating laneway and garden buildings as well - since they already exist.
I am interested in maintaining the environment we currently enjoy in Oak Bay. I want extra off-street parking, landlords on site, adherence to building codes and district enforcement. I do not have, nor do I ever intend to have, a secondary suite.	no	RS4. I think RS5 is too big a zone to start with.	Gonzales	Please do not start with a large number of houses (e.g. RS5). That is too big an experiment that will be hard to pull back.	This sounds costly and a lot of effort, but may lead to the best results for the community.	Please do your best to ensure we keep the incredible quality of life we have here in Oak Bay. Keeping the density in check is key to this. I worked hard to afford the chance to live here and I do not think it should be opened up for everyone to come in and lower the quality of the experience.
	In the past we requested information/permission for a nanny/ granny suite in the back yard. This has not been addresses, why?					Yes re large properties, why not nanny/ grannie suites in the back yard?

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
All housing should be safe for residents, and a complaint-based compliance/enforcement system will not ensure that living units have been inspected. If homeowners choose to be landlords, they should be aware of their legal responsibilities as, effectively, small business owners who have particular responsibilities for people renting the housing they provide.	Restricting secondary suites to certain zones or sizes of property will mean that the large number of current, not registered and not legal suites that don't meet those criteria will continue to exist without tenant safety protections.		All of them.			I have the impression from the survey that there has not been consideration of changing the single-family residence zoning which is inherently exclusive and thus exclusionary. Housing prices continue to increase steeply and the range of housing options is inadequate for the number of people--including current homeowners wishing to age in the neighbourhood--to continue to live here. I hope that council will consider a broader range of zoning change opportunities.
Fewer regulations leads to lower cost of enforcement						
Less red tape and cost to implement on municipal and resident side. Helps to increase housing options.	Must be registered and pay an annual fee for secondary suite.					
fairness to all with taxes paid by ALL owners with secondary suites, and no reliance on complaints for enforcement.	Restrict secondary suites to specific roads/areas of Oak Bay		High traffic areas e.g. Oak Bay Avenue, area of Elgin/Byron/Foul Bay	Enforcement of off-street parking would solve problems	Individuals who move into an area would have no control over the construction of new secondary suites in their immediate neighbourhood.	My main concern is the current lack of off-street parking and the lack of enforcement for houses where there is no off-street parking in use. Secondary suites will make this situation worse, with more traffic on the already congested roads.
If people need to rent a secondary suite, it should be safe and comfortable area with amenities. The only way to achieve this is by inspection to ensure adherence by owners.	I think lot size should be bigger to ensure renters have access to their own piece of outdoor property for relaxation/gardening - if they want it.			I think if there are supplementary suites, they should be available throughout the whole District of Oak Bay - although I don't see Upland residences partaking. Yes, should be a pilot process to try and work out the kinks before potential suites are made in homes. Owners don't want to sink in money to create suites and then find that parameters have changed - hence = pilot project.	I don't think rezoning is necessary if there are strong regulations regarding what can and can't exist in secondary suites.	I think that homeowners that create secondary suites should have their taxes increased. Suite renters generate more vehicles on the street/garbage/compost/water consumption/road wear etc etc. If I suddenly had my neighbours renting out suites around me, the least they can do is contribute more taxes to OB to help with OB operating costs/beautification etc etc
Pretty strict control appears to be part of the program.			Wherever laws/bylaws might allow it. I.e. Not Uplands.			
It matches all my previous answers.					Surely Council has better things to do than hear arguments about every single secondary suite in town.	
It seems a reasonable compromise between de facto secondary suites, and heavily regulated secondary suites.						We don't really have traffic or parking problems in Oak Bay. Just go anywhere else and compare.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I support full regulation of secondary suites.			North Henderson. Large homes on large lots. Close to UVic and Camosun.			I think the proliferation and non regulation of secondary suites is taxing Oak Bay's infrastructure. On street parking is jamming up some streets ie Thompson Ave for example.
Less negative impact on community	Suites owners need to pay more taxes for cover expenses related to renters and administration.	RS2	The Uplands			This process should also consider those residents who don't want suites.
I moved to Oak Bay because it has more regulations, which I really prefer to maintain the more controlled character. I really don't want to have to complain to have rules on suites enforced in Oak Bay, so if the District would like to move ahead with secondary suites, they need to take on responsibility for the full enforcement of the regulations surrounding it.	Is there a limit to how many secondary suites a home could have? Why does Oak Bay need to have secondary suites in the first place? Why not just enforce the existing ones to meet the current rules? If we cannot even do that, how can we even think of allowing more and actually regulating it?	RS4 only	Along the dense areas of Oak Bay Ave, Foul Bay Rd.	Keep it small and time limited to you can retract it, if needed. Add a sunset clause.	If people really want it, they can go through the process. A blanket wide approach will do a disservice to the community, it needs to be very tailored.	Why was there no option to say "no secondary suites"? Has this already been decided to go ahead? Could I buy a few big houses, suite them out, and fill them with UVic students for revenue like in Gordon Head?
The number of cars parked on the street in my neighbourhood is out of control. I doubt a fire truck can safely drive on Henderson between Middowne and Neil Street. Owners need to also be living in the house to ensure respectful tenants.						
It is balanced	Scenario A with annual licence and enforcement of unregistered or non compliant suites. Utilize licensing fees to offset costs related to bylaw and require additional fees for the garbage and recycling produced by additional tenancies.				It should be widespread to provided equal opportunity to all residents who could legalize existing suites and assurance of safety standards and for new units.	This is a long needed housing option in Oak Bay. It is a benefit to seniors who may want to age in place, people wishing to live in the community and cannot yet afford to buy, provides more options than typical apartments living more suitable to families, and promotes vibrancy, diversity, and inclusivity. The additional residency options will increase access to walkable areas such as Oak Bay and Estevan Village, supporting local business.
Scenario A provides for all homes to have boarding or suites. I do not like the lack of registration mentioned in it.	Yes, registration should be required and complaints should be District enforced			I thin this is another issue that has been studied to death. Let's get it done.	See previous comments	I would really like to have garden homes considered as well as this would be a wonderful opportunity to increase density and provide affordable housing.
	Would have chosen a with one additional parking and remove complaints based compliance			Yet another step to delay secondary suites in all neighborhoods	Very disruptive to renters and owners and would only feel like a money grab	

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
	Change to no minimum lot size					Not a fan of secondary suites but if they are to be allowed then the regulations should be structured to encourage retention of character homes and as a way to help older residents remain in their homes (extra income to help pay property taxes as well as the social benefit of sharing a home and potentially having help with the garden, etc). What we do not want is for every new building project in OB to include a secondary suite, which would have a very negative impact on our neighborhoods, both socially and in terms of infrastructure.
It allows for regulations and parking pressures						
All of it except mandatory owner occupancy, and no registration.	I would not have mandatory owner occupancy and I would have a voluntary registration list.					I would like to know what downside the District can anticipate from the implementation of secondary suites?
Need to allow as many affordable housing options as possible and increase housing density						
scenario d seems to offer sufficient regulation and oversight by the municipality to ensure safety of tenants and maintenance of the OB neighbourhood fundamental character, but yet it's flexible enough to allow for suite rentals without requiring homeowners to make major renos to the existing home (e.g. ceiling height restrictions) to be in compliance.	yes: i would want to see it available in all SFDs, not just rs1 to rs5 zones.					just: the sooner the better...please!
maximum unit size requirement	in all single family homes, no additional parking requirements,			A pilot program will just delay any progress that can be made to introduce gentle density through secondary suites.	Thorough waste of resources for rezoning.	There needs to be action now and should also consider allowing in duplexes
less hassle						
I think secondary suites need to be regulated carefully for both safety of the tenants and the owners.				Doing a pilot program in a specific neighbourhood(s) would not be fair in my opinion.		I think we need secondary suites, both because we need housing and because it is the only way for young people to afford a house.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
It does not restrict based on land use zones.	Yes, I'd require one off-street parking space.	A pilot program would not solve our housing crisis in a meaningful way. In addition, we know that secondary suites are already widespread throughout oak bay, and it's important to encourage this housing stock. I know many people who have chosen not to rent their suites out any more for a variety of reasons, and this is very problematic.			Personally, I wouldn't do it. I'd just keep renting out my suite as I am now...	In my 30 years in the neighbourhood I have seen many people have to leave the area due to a lack of size-appropriate housing options. Secondary suites are an essential way to assist with this issue. More important, though, is the ability for people to build carriage houses. This would provide safer, more appropriate housing options in our community that comply with the Building Code and provide increased density. I have a space where I would build one immediately if permitted, in order to provide additional housing in the community. Please expand your study to consider this important issue. Many people, especially in a community where property values are as high as Oak Bay, would prefer not to share a ceiling/floor with a tenant and instead would be more comfortable having a carriage house.
				Nothing mentioned about neighbours to the houses with secondary suites? Only about people who consider to have them		
Spread throughout the municipality, light-handed bureaucracy, owned- occupied.	I would drop the parking requirement			The current reality has been a pilot program since Oak Bay was born.....we have suites! Nobody has died and property values have not plummeted. Sky has not fallen. Just do it.		
More flexibility for younger families wanting to live here	No				Suites allow young families the ability to afford living in Oak Bay. Too much red tape will make this far too difficult.	
I agree and prefer with all stipulations in scenario A with the exception of "boarding permitted" in addition to the suite.	See above			Only that the pilot program should be district wide rather than by specific neighbourhoods.		

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Parking. A common theme with the housing market is the assumption that people don't have cars. People still have cars and will always have cars. Cars should not dominate the streetscape and there should be a requirement to have additional off-street parking. OR the option to rent with the condition that the renter does not own a vehicle					I could see how it would be helpful, but I don't think our municipality has the resources	Parking must be provided.
Offers the most flexibility for home owners and creates greater opportunity for housing stock	Require owner occupancy					The cost of housing across the region is out of reach for many young families. Secondary suites offer an opportunity for families to become homeowners and increases the supply of stable, affordable housing.
Summarizes our concerns						
owner occupied						
Stronger regulations managing suites	Parking should not be required. When I think of all the single family homes in oak bay today, very few meet the two parking spot rule. Forcing us to add a third spot is prohibitive. Better to request that if a parking spot is not available, renter cannot own a car. This is a reasonable alternative.			A pilot program designed for specific zones or neighbourhood plays to favourites as much as not requiring those with illegal suites to abide by rules that new suites must.	I understand the value of rezoning as it protects future tenants and provides the neighbourhood a voice. However, the burden to the city is high, what middle ground alternatives are there?	Secondary suites are a must. Rising house prices require that home owners have income alternatives and those who cannot afford a home deserve the option to live in desirable neighbourhoods. It is abhorrent to think that those who have broken rules by having illegal secondary suites would be able to legalize without the same requirements as those who have patiently waited for the rules to change.
Owner occupancy requires & street parking required for each tennant.	Good parking & low noise level required.					That as few as possible per house with laneway parking & quiet tennants.
It's simple. It's not as restrictive as the other options. It takes less resources to enforce because there's not as much enforcement.				This survey looks like its biased towards people who don't want secondary suites at all.	If they're allowed everywhere there's no need to rezone.	
It is fair	Should be permitted in all zones					Just get on with it.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I think option C is a nice balance, in that management of the program may be less labour intensive, registration rather than business licence is respectful to homeowners who don't consider having a suite as owning a business, no boarding means fewer people using the street and services (traffic, parking, etc.), item C's floor square footage will ensure the homeowner hadn't created a duplex, while retaining flexibility in suite size.		RS5			Though site specific rezoning would ensure consistent standards are maintained, throughout the municipality, it would be cumbersome and expensive to run (for the municipality), and stressful for the homeowner.	Thank you for inviting me to participate in this survey, and for your thoroughness in considering the complexities of this. question.
All aspects. provides greatest options for adding housing for young and old alike in a tight housing scenario	No			Families in oak bay are struggling due to the elevated prices of housing , and no option to have a mortgage helper. No pilot is needed. This just needs to get done and oak bay finally modernizes its archaic, reserved bylaws. Our families need options to support a diverse community, supporting students and families that want their aging parents to live in a suite. Please make this happen. Oak bay community members need this yesterday.	housing options needed now especially for young people	Again, this study is so overdue. Thank you for your efforts to make this happen but this conservative slow approach is killing the diversity in our neighborhood's. We need students and new professionals, single income, the fixed income joining our community with affordable rental options that will again support our mortgage poor families in oak bay. This will ease stress and mental health levels as well as provide a better work/life balance - something many families struggle with in oak bay just to live here. please move on this - our children have no where to live, better secondary suites than huge new houses for few inhabitants
	The size restrictions and the lack of parking.					

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>Parking should not be required. It's unreasonable and untenable to add parking to an existing lot and would therefore mean no secondary suite could be added. Oak bay has loads of street parking and could accommodate another car per house. If we are to limit the parking per house it should be based on number of cars per house as a whole instead of based on suites. Maybe issue a max number of permits per house for street parking and extras cars can be parked on the property. Something that recognizes not all people have cars</p>	<p>I prefer scenario A except for the last two - I think enforcement should be more than complaint based because some neighbours are vindictive while others are more relaxed; I don't think the rule enforcement should be as arbitrary as based on the temperament of one's neighbours. I also think there should be mandatory registration. Cheap or free to encourage compliance. It's important we know how many households are in the municipality for planning, safety and disaster management.</p>			<p>Not everyone wants a secondary suite. Allowing them in one area only ghettoizes that area; problems might be misattributed to secondary suites; excessive complaints could be down to one neighbour who is particularly unhappy launching a campaign. Scattering new secondary suites around the community gives a better idea of if they actually work or are problematic by diluting the new way of doing things. Perhaps a lottery could be held for a certain number of secondary suites to be built. Homeowners could put their names forward and X number of new suites get to go ahead (meeting specified rules).</p>	<p>This should be straightforward with easy application process, clear parameters/rules and easy enforcement. Asking council to adjudicate every application is not a good use of their time.</p>	<p>It's time to allow secondary suites. Aging parents, adult children, live in caregivers, renters... all would benefit. The community is aging and it would be nice to add some density. How many of the houses are down to one of two residents? It just doesn't seem responsible to prevent some small suites in a housing crisis with an aging population.</p>
<p>Safe, regulated, minimal impact on neighbours and streets ape.</p>		<p>Unsure</p>				
<p>Owner occupied</p>	<p>Bit about the zones</p>					
<p>More restrictions create a need for more bylaw officers and a greater expense and a possible need for fines and unnecessary disruptions in the lives of the people in homes with suites. Sharing a home with strangers is never an easy scenario for everyone.</p>	<p>Change land use to scenario A.</p>			<p>How much intrusive and annoying follow up would be required for a pilot program? Secondary suites exist currently in Oak Bay. How Disruptive have they been to neighbourhoods and to the municipality?</p>		<p>The more difficult the process is made the more likely people will continue to have secondary suites in homes throughout the municipality. Keep it simple.</p>
<p>Logic</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No pilot</p>	<p>No pilot</p>	<p>There are already over 20% of Oak Bay homes with secondary suites. In 2010, former Planning Director Nigel Beatty informed Council that 1 in 7 homes had suites at that time.</p>		<p>Regardless of rules & zones, suites will proliferate, as they have done for over 20 years. Come to grips with that fact and end this constant delay to approve additional housing for people</p>
<p>Adds rental capacity to those who may have e room, encourages people to build homes for more rental space</p>						
<p>Our streets are already crowded - I like requiring off street parking and the enforcement by the district -too often ppl won't participate if it is voluntary</p>	<p>Sq footage max</p>					

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>Actually, I think that Scenario A is too unregulated but I like the following: (i) no additional off street parking required, (ii) no minimum lot size, and (iii) allowing anywhere where there are single family homes. I think that in a time where many families cycle and walk for transportation , Oak Bay's current requirement to have 2 off street parking spaces is overkill. I think that of the current 2 parking spots required by Oak Bay, one of these spots could be allocated for occupants of secondary suites, without adding the requirement to have a 3rd offsite parking spot. Requirement for minimum lot size would put at a disadvantage those property owners with smaller lots sizes, this is unfair. Higher density living should be encouraged.</p>	<p>Please see response in 21. I would prefer a modified Scenario A which requires owner occupancy, voluntary registration, limits additional boarders but is more relaxed in terms of minimum lot size, unit size and parking.</p>			<p>Pilot should perhaps cap the number of secondary suites included in the pilot without restricting to certain locations</p>		<p>I hope that Oak Bay's secondary suite study also includes consideration for legalizing carriage houses as allowed currently by other municipalities in the CRD e.g. Saanich.</p>
<p>municipal oversight with registration and enforcement</p>						
<p>I like the secondary suites can go anywhere and is not impacted by zoning. That would be too restrictive. I also like that there are no limits on the size of the suite. I like that boarding is permitted. And, I like that additional parking isn't required.</p>	<p>I would want the boarding to explicit allow for VRBO, airbnb.</p>			<p>This process has already taken way too long. Do not start with a pilot. Just get to it! We are eons behind other districts and you are just driving this all underground which isn't ideal.</p>	<p>Too expensive, cumbersome and a deterrent.</p>	<p>This is the most drawn out process I have ever seen. Oak Bay needs to join the 21st century. It is absolutely ridiculous and an archaic policy. People need financial options for staying in the neighbourhood. This includes airbnb and secondary suites. Otherwise, only the old and rich can stay.</p>
<p>Garden suites are feasible where it makes sense. No additional parking load in neighborhoods.</p>	<p>No Development permit requirements.</p>	<p>RS-4</p>		<p>The existing development permit requirements in Saanich and Victoria are very long and costly, to the point that building garden suites is not feasible.</p>	<p>The existing development permit requirements in Saanich and Victoria are very long and costly, to the point that building garden suites is not feasible.</p>	<p>The existing development permit requirements in Saanich and Victoria are very long and costly, to the point that building garden suites is not feasible.</p>
<p>No suites</p>	<p>No suites</p>	<p>No suites</p>	<p>No suites</p>	<p>No suites very poor survey questions. No place for no suites. We have been through this already. Why waste money!</p>	<p>No suites</p>	<p>No suites</p>
<p>Owner in residence to keep an eye on things. Only complaints for enforcement to simplify and prevent unnecessary intrusion.</p>	<p>No minimum lot size.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Not necessary</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>I think it's important that we have a variety of housing available in our community to meet the needs of various residents.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
This scenario seems to be balanced.	One off-street parking space required for new and existing suites.	RS4				
In category order, I prefer: A A C A A B D D	See above	N/A	N/A	We need more housing options in the District, secondary suites are a good first step so drawing out the process with a pilot program seems like a waste of time.	This would put an enormous burden on home owners. I have no interest in having a secondary suite in my home, but fully support diversifying housing options in the District in an expeditious manner.	
Allows for the most housing. We have a CRISIS happening.	Only if magically there was housing for everyone.			It's not needed. There are lots of secondary suites here already - can't you consider that a multi-decade pilot?	Oak Bay is glacially slow for rezoning. This adds an unnecessary barrier.	Why do all the questions assume I'm a homeowner? I'm unable to provide a real answer as I don't have a house to renovate to add a suite to.
Want to ensure that all suites are safe and have regulations. Offstreet parking is very important. Also feel that having owner occupancy ensures that suites will have better oversight and neighbourhood friendly.	I Would increase the amount of property size required before you can have a suite.			Concerned about the length of a pilot program and it lasting for years and years.	This seems very onerous and resource demanding. If secondary suites meet all safety requirements they should be allowed.	Given the proximity to post secondary education and the crunch for rentals in the CRD, I believe the secondary suites are necessary in oak bay. The cost of housing prevents many people from having safe and secure homes to live in. Illegal secondary suites already operating in OB and are not meeting requirements and are not neighbourhood friendly. It is essential that secondary suites are only allowed in owner occupied homes. Carriage houses should also be considered in OB where the lot size will accommodate one.
Reasonable approach with minimal reliance on complaints or too much municipal oversight or inspection. People generally follow rules and abide by regulations. Most homes are older so less bylaw regulation is better for existing suites but full compliance with the current building code should be required for new single family homes.	The complaint based system turns neighbors into tattle tales - often where no complaint is even warranted. Parking is a problem because so many homes have at least two cars with one parked on the street (which has nothing to do with suites). All homeowners should be required to have monthly paid resident permit for one vehicle if they choose to park a vehicle on the street or such a permit could be used by a tenant for the secondary suite thereby forcing people to park in their driveways once again.	No pilot program - just get on with it. Suites are everywhere already.	Absolutely opposed to limiting secondary suites to certain neighborhoods as they are everywhere already.	Please do not do it as Oak Bay will never get past a pilot phase - too many tattle tales and too many nimbys here.	Far too much staff and council time would be taken up with this. The Nimbys would simply organize and fight each application one at a time at the council table making the issue far too polarizing and politized.	I served on the OCP advisory committee and never thought it would take so long to introduce various housing choices or new options to this community. Please get on with it.
						The cost of housing in this municipality is enormously high and people deserve to live with mortgage helpers... and we have a crisis in housing here in Victoria. We can contribute to the solution as a municipality.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Full transparency, registration, compliance, occupancy, parking restrictions and being held accountable by disgruntled neighbours.	Homeowner is charged as two households for the garbage fees and additional fee for sticker access to Elgin street yard. Tenant sticker could be different in colour and issued for only as long as the paid lease.		Uplands, Henderson, North Oak Bay, South Oak Bay.	Transparency is essential for everyone to observe the success or failure of the program.	A safe disclosure email address should be available for anyone to share concerns about fraud.	
limited number of suites allowed with strict regulation	parking on property must be provided; no add on street parking					I think this whole suite business needs to be very carefully handled. Grandfather the ones that exist but limit the building of new ones. There is not enough on street parking as it is and some streets are very narrow, Register them all with the municipality and with CRA (for taxable income purposes)
It will be the most regulated and it will be overseen by the District. I don't want secondary suites, but if this becomes the way ahead, I want secondary suites strictly enforced, up to code, owner occupied with requisite parking etc.	No.	RM or C areas.		That it be reviewed by the District with community input, possibly a municipal referendum at election time.	No.	Thank-you for the opportunity to let me make my thoughts known.
lack of interference and cost of monitoring -	- but ideally, I would modify scenario A to require the provision of one additional parking space for new secondary suites				a waste of time and needlessly intrusive	I appreciate the diligence shown in this process, while being grateful we are finally getting on with addressing the terrible affordable housing shortage
Easy to add housing and density						
Off street parking	No minimum lot size			Suites have been in Oak Bay for so many years that a pilot program seems to be a waste of time.	The rezoned property could be taxed differently to add extra money to the municipal infrastructure.	Existing illegal suites need to be dealt with first. Check any real estate listing and all the homes already have existing suites and nothing is done about them. They need to be inspected to pass the minimum safety requirements and parking is such an issue, the streets are becoming impassable in some areas because of so much in street parking.
There's a housing crisis and an aging population that needs family support If it was more regulated I would have a better, nicer and safer suite to rent. Usually if the owner lives in the house it is better taken care of.					Each scenario is slightly different, so I think case by case would be best.	Thank you for asking! I rent a suite in Oak Bay as I like the location, and am happy to pay more to rent a better and safer place.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
The scenario that would fit with my previous answers in the previous section is not illustrated. Would prefer: no additional parking requirement as we already require 2, owner occupied in either suite or main house, in any size SF house, option of boarders as well, max 40% size, voluntary registration, complaint based enforcement.	See above...combinations			Secondary suites exist throughout Oak Bay, but likely some neighbourhoods already have none. Not sure a pilot project is needed. They are already here.	This is overly onerous on a property owner - costly and time consuming and allows for NIMBY to halt even an existing one. Strongly object!! It could be seen as a money grab and discriminatory in nature.	I would like to see this move forward with the basic health and safety, but not to make it overly onerous on the property owner. We have them and we need them. Enough discussion and time for action. It has been over a decade in trying to decide when most municipalities in the province permit them. Let's catch up.
It is the least regulated option	I don't find complaint basis of enforcement sufficient - District initiated compliance program should be added					
Only secondary suites means no overcrowding with boarders ie: parking issues. Suites should have on-site parking, too many vehicles parked on the street, making navigating roadway hazardous.	If suites are registered then tax assessments could help pay for needed infrastructure in Oak Bay.	RS5		On street parking has to be addressed.	Tedious, time consuming and expensive. One house, one suite in Single family residential zones.	One single family home with one suite. Address on-street parking issues and assess homes for tax purposes. Extra suites mean extra Infrastructure requirements.
Better chance of maintaining the character and density of our community.			North Oak Bay		Of street parking is a necessity.	
Like the owner to live in the house.	The rule that says you can't have boarders and a secondary suite. We are very short of affordable housing.					
Owner occupied and off street parking				Pilot program is just more procrastination - it needs to just be done		We moved to oak bay because it didn't have secondary suites. Overcrowded and transient neighbourhoods result with little or no sense of community. All existing secondary suites should be inspected.
Allows for the most additional homes in Oak Bay. Homes are needed, are difficult to afford and the supply needs to be increased to meet demand						
Owner accountability. Fee paid for services supplied by Oak Bay to manage the secondary suite program, to enforce rules and respond to complaints- There is no benefit to non suite owners otherwise. Everyone should benefit.	I would prefer it not be allowed as widely as indicated.		Any neighborhood with over 60% + of affected homeowners in favor.	There are many existing suites- start with a pilot making them 'legal' perhaps, before homeowners spend dollars renovating with a legal suite in mind.		It was difficult for me to answer some of the questions as incorporating a suite into my home is not something I would consider.
Owner occupancy required. Additional parking	Lot size - would have no minimum. Would allow across all single family homes					

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
	Should be a max unit size.			No pilot program. We need to just get on with it.	It may placate some who are against or unsure of suites, by giving them an opportunity to speak to Council on any and all individual suites, but it would be an unnecessarily bureaucratic process.	Please get on with secondary suites. I do not have one in my home, nor do I intend to, but there are 3 homes with suites on my block amongst the 7 closest neighbouring houses to mine. They are not a problem and provide a valuable housing option for the suite occupants and allow homeowners to better afford to live in this very expensive neighbourhood.
Size limit, off street parking requirement, business licence	Sewer surcharge for two family dwelling		Upper Henderson/Lansdowne Slope		approval at Staff Level for each unit	Adequate off street parking is essential as roads already clogged. Residents/tenants who park on the street should be required to buy a parking permit for use of public space. Additional water and sewer charges should be assessed on the suite to adjust for increased density. Neighbourhood approval should be considered in assessing applications. Owner's occupancy essential for care and upkeep of the property to maintain neighbourhood standards. Rental income to be declared in income tax. No homeowners grant for suite owners - business license necessary. Single family homes should not subsidize secondary suites.
We are in a housing crisis and anything Oak Bay can do to help should be done. Even a small suite helps the renter, especially as smaller suites allow people with a lower budget to live in Oak Bay.	It is ridiculous to keep the maximum 2 unrelated persons per house rule; I have room for 4 students, why should I not be able to accommodate them until some grumpy neighbour complains? We need to support lower income people not kick them out for living together. Maybe all the neighbours (almost the whole block both sides) with 2 people in large 3 bedroom houses should be penalized for not sharing their spaces?			Oh my, why is Oak Bay being so elitist, approve the suites like the other municipalities have done and support the poor. Immediately approve garden suites while you are at it, just adopt the rules other municipalities have approved.	This is elitist and more "not in my neighbourhood" rhetoric. Everyone needs to support the poor.	Other municipalities have already done this and it supports the OCP, lets get it done and start looking at garden houses right away. Suites will revitalize Oak Bay and allow younger families to enjoy our beautiful neighbourhood. When allowing suites, we MUST also get rid of the unfair policy re the number of unrelated people in a house. Leaving this policy give the neighbours too much power to intimidate and threaten home owners with suites, I have already been threatened just for having extra cars parked on the street. Also with increased density comes an additional demand on services, we need to plan increased facilities at our existing parks and maybe designate houses to purchase to add to existing parks or to the Rec Centre (no long term plan is a plan for failure).
		Rs5			It would result in a potentially huge backlog of applications.	

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
minimize red tape; maximizes scope for additional housing						Thank you for providing us with an opportunity to complete this survey. There is an urgent need to address the housing crisis and I urge council to move forward as expeditiously as possible.
Simpler solutions have a greater chance of success and compliance	I would add parking requirements for new and existing suites	if a pilot was to be done I would recommend that houses that are older than a certain age be selected as a way to create a heritage bonus system to help prevent all the houses being knocked down and replaced with boxes like is happening now	if a pilot was to be done I would recommend that houses that are older than a certain age be selected as a way to create a heritage bonus system to help prevent all the houses being knocked down and replaced with boxes like is happening now	if a pilot was to be done I would recommend that houses that are older than a certain age be selected as a way to create a heritage bonus system to help prevent all the houses being knocked down and replaced with boxes like is happening now	if a pilot was to be done I would recommend that houses that are older than a certain age be selected as a way to create a heritage bonus system to help prevent all the houses being knocked down and replaced with boxes like is happening now	if a pilot was to be done I would recommend that houses that are older than a certain age be selected as a way to create a heritage bonus system to help prevent all the houses being knocked down and replaced with boxes like is happening now
We need to treat existing suites differently than new construction	Need to have height and all health safety requirements for existing suites so that they are safe			No need to respect existing suites that meet all health and safety reps close down dangerous suites!	No need to rezone for safe suites that have been in use for decades	
compliance						
There will be many problems that come from expanding secondary suites, enforcement of regulations is essential.	The less done the better, we have a great community now, lets not lose green space and gardens to create smaller lots or secondary buildings. There are too many oversized houses being built that are taking up the majority of the lot and leaving next to no green space.	RS1	Only areas. within a block of main roads. Leave established neighborhoods alone.	Please get back to the basics and stop trying to re-engineer our wonderful community. Stop spending our tax dollars on consultants and expanding staffing positions please.		
It doesn't cost the district or the home owner more, whereas all the other options drive up the cost of housing, making suites less affordable.	Health and safety building code compliance but not all the extras that drive up the cost to build them like ceiling height, etc.			It's not 1985. This is long overdue. I can't believe we're so terrified of bringing our bylaws up to speed with the rest of the region that we have to tiptoe like this! Council must get on with it!	This is ridiculous and expensive and shows that there is very little compassion from Council about the housing crisis that they would even consider piling on this work on staff, driving up the cost to create a suite, and therefore the cost to rent it!	Get on with it!
Strong regulatory and enforcement, so as to minimize negative impact	Prohibit suites in some neighbourhoods entirety, such as Uplands.		I don't know the names of all neighbourhoods or their exact boundaries so can't answer		This is a very important factor in my opinion. This survey, sadly, does not probe into whether or not the presence of secondary suites was part of one's reasoning for moving to oak bay, and I believe it was for many people like myself who used to live in other municipalities where suites were problematic.	I believe most people do not oppose suites per se, only the negative impacts of them and/or the issue of fairness when it comes to paying ones fair share of property taxes to reflect the additional drain on municipal funds that suites can cause. This survey falls short of capturing these elements for consideration, which I believe means that proper decision making cannot happen.
I don't think any of the options are perfect. Frankly suites should be required in all new builds	Allow suites in all Zones, no owner occupied,	Allow all zones	Allow all zones	Mandate suites for all new builds.	Housing and rental stock is needed. You should make people rezone if they don't want a suite	Consider carriage houses. Consider strata conversation of carriage houses

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I think that in allowing a secondary suite it must be at a home that provides for the added usage. Parking is always a big one and the home needs to allow for enough spots for the entire home which may be 2 on street in front of home as well as 1 in driveway if 3 vehicles in the home.		If one is to offer this which has been in place in various municipalities across the province for year then it should be all or nothing. Those that are allowed will get an immediate bump in land value which is unfair.	All or nothing. It is unfair to do it any other way.	As above, it needs to be across the entire municipality as it is unfair otherwise.	I think that for existing suites there should be some items that could be grandfathered	I think that at the same time garden suites should be considered.
Less exploitation of community members that chose not to have suits.	nothing to add			Please treat this as an Oak Bay issue, not something to impose upon certain neighbourhoods within Oak Bay. Parking is not the only 'car' issue. Traffic is already dividing the community (physically) along Cadboro Bay Road. I realize a lot of traffic is from out of community, but suites in Oak Bay only add to the problem.	I believe that many of us that have no intention of adding a secondary suite feel we are being taken advantage of by those that do. My situation is exasperated by a neighbour who also runs a carpentry business out of his home (the electric saw started at 8:30 am today). Indeed the property across the road is not a home.. with the suite and the business, it is just a tool for making money.	I would like to reiterate the point that this is an all-Oak Bay issue. Please do not select neighbourhoods for densification.
						You survey have all leading questions, you are "assuming" everyone wants suites. It is set up to get the response you are looking for and will not reflect the true feelings of the community. I'm not in favor of suites!
						This survey does not give the option of asking if we want secondary suites in Oak Bay. Oak Bay's infrastructure is not equipped to handle any more secondary suites. As it stand at the moment, I say NO to secondary suites of any kind.
I mostly like the mandatory registration aspect as well as the compliance program. As I currently am a renter in the area, I would appreciate some oversight from the municipality as to building code compliance as well as the ability to search any vacancies when I would next require a new rental home.						Improving and adding to our rental housing stock in the municipality would be greatly appreciated!

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Specifically - my choice would be not to allow suites. Oak Bay is at capacity.	Eliminate any existing suites. Easy enough to find.			Quit wasting time and energy on this question! Just because other districts support suites does nit mean Oak Bay should. Suites making the purchase price of housing more expensive and bring down the quality of a neighborhood. Less people/low density, quiet neighborhoods are part of what makes Oak Bay a desirable place to live - keep it that way!	Do not allow suites anywhere.	It is extremely disappointing to see Oak Bay go down this road. There is no homeless crisis on Oak Bay. There is no need for suites in Oak Bay. Keep the district low density. If someone wants a house with a suite they can buy a house in Victoria or Saanich! Oak Bay should not submit to will/desires of people/pressure from outside the district.
It deals with the parking issue which I am personally familiar with from living in Vancouver where some houses had 3 suites. It deals with safety and liability for the owner and the municipality by complying with the building code. If inspections are required this option has some revenue and the fee could be increased if the wage and other costs were not covered. Profit would not be a goal but just covering the new costs would be the ongoing goal.	No.	not applicable			Think that if parking, size restrictions and compliance with Building code is required then rezoning is an Unnecessary hurdle with extra costs to Oak Bay which should be cost recovered through the licence fee if rezoning hearing option was approved.	I am sure that many of the existing suites do not comply with Building and Fire Codes. For this to work and be fair, existing suites need to be reported and inspected. there needs to be a level playing field for suite provision. by this I mean if new suites cost a lot extra due to Codes then existing suites should have similar costs. I believe there is a liability issue for Oak Bay if it does not require compliance with the Building and Fire Codes for all suites. If someone dies in a non compliant suite with no smoke alarm or proper egress, they will sue Oak Bay.
						Overall, I don't think it is a good idea. Their doesn't seem to be too many issues with the status quo. Is this a non issue looking for a solution? Everywhere else this has been tried, there are ongoing issues with enforcement, tenant safety, regulations, increase in traffic/parking, burdens on infrastructure, etc..... Oak Bay needs to get our infrastructure in order before this is considered. You know our infrastructure is in "poor of very poor shape". People 'only see above the ground' and don't realize the implications on the hard and soft

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>Although I think it is impossible to actually enforce, more regulation to ensure tenant safety, parking supply, traffic reduction, building code issues, density issues, greenspace and urban tree canopy, etc.... all need to be considered. As well, I don't think there is a way to ensure that the cost to infrastructure by increasing sinks, toilets, showers, etc..., and the reduction of permeable ground needed for parking can be captured, from the owner/financial benefactor of the suite.</p>	<p>All additional costs (infrastructure, permeable ground, parking, regulation/enforcement, etc...) for those having a secondary suite in their homes should be covered by registration, taxes, etc....</p>		<p>The RS5 areas around Oak Bay Lodge or around Carnarvon Park.</p>	<p>Regardless of the location, the all hard and soft costs to the municipality should be recouped from the owner.</p>	<p>All costs for the rezoning, and hard and soft infrastructure costs, need to be carried by the applicant. The whole process needs to be cost neutral to the district and, if it results in the need to have new staff or processes, this should not result in increased costs to the Oak Bay taxpayer.</p>	<p>infrastructure or the community. People push for more density, more infill, more multifamily residential, more services, etc..., but unless there is going to be an huge tax increase to fix the infrastructure to accommodate all the 'wish book' desires people seem to want, there is no solution. (Carnarvon Park Plan as an example. Great plan but no money for follow through so it is like a child's very long, wish list letter to Santa!)</p> <p>Oak Bay should focus on the core issues of municipal government: infrastructure and public safety, before anything else happens. Oak Bay is a very safe community so that box is ticked. A singular, focused and sustained infrastructure program, to exclusion of all other 'wants' should be the focus of council for the next 10 years. Climate change is leading to less frequent but more intense winter rainfall and every year, people's basements flood because of poorly maintained, decaying and failing municipal infrastructure. Spend money on these issues, community needs, not community wants.</p> <p>Oak Bay is trying to do 'everything' at the same time, and this is like multitasking; you end up doing everything poorly. Pick infrastructure, do a great job of it and then move on.</p>
<p>Highest level of control, promotes fewest secondary suites</p>	<p>No changes</p>		<p>Unsure, just like the trial to be constrained</p>			
<p>Parking and registration requirements</p>	<p>I am not in favour of allowing secondary suites, particularly living in an area where there is not room for two cars to pass because of parked cars on both sides of the streets.</p>					<p>some areas of Oak Bay have no problems with traffic and parking but south Oak Bay is not one of them. Driving and parking is a problem, particularly when construction work is taking place (new condos or housing being built where workers use street parking spaces and residents have problems driving safely down a street) Any additional cars parked on the streets would be completely unacceptable. I am not in favour of secondary suites but if they have to be allowed, permit them only in areas of university/colleges and only if off-street parking is mandatory and if governance and payment of taxes are required.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
The above options are severely limited and do not capture, even close, to my preferred option.	Add in no secondary suites in any form, and add in secondary suites only where a significant majority of household members within the 10 closest households agree.	Any pilot should only occur after a more complete and honest survey occurs.	Yours. Not mine. I would take every legal and civil option available to fight secondary suites in my neighborhood.	It is flawed from the outset and is doomed to fail due to the lack of public buy-in because of the limitations on the options presented. Fire all the consultants, and the planning staff, conduct an Oak Bay core review, and get back to basics. Do you not understand that we like it how it is, and that is an honest and viable alternative.	It should be as small a site as possible, e.g. one house at a time and the outcome must be determined by the neighborhood, not by the council or especially by local govt. bureaucrats.	Where bureaucrats make decisions about how people live, especially changing neighborhoods without heeding the immediate populations' wishes, you invite insurrection. To believe council or the bureaucrats know best is hubris of the most arrogant kind.
Most open						My feeling is that Oak Bay is too restrictive and unwelcoming. We need to open up opportunities to density and to loosen the by-laws. Unfortunately people stay quiet in order to protect themselves and avoid conflict with neighbours. I have lived in Oak Bay for many years and will say that it is terribly elitist. I'm increasingly embarrassed by the closed attitudes of some residents and of the overall perceived culture. Unless there are changes my next home will likely be outside of the municipality.
Secondary suites must be safe, meet the BCBC, and be regulated.	All secondary suites must meet the requirements of the BCBC.	Up to the residents of the neighborhood.	Up to the residents of the neighborhood.			Legalizing secondary suites will not get rid of the illegal suites. Legalizing secondary suites will NOT result in more affordable housing.
More supervision of the suites. Less street parking						
Again, I don't want to see secondary suites made legal or expanded in Oak Bay. I am vehemently opposed to this activity.	Again, I don't want to see secondary suites made legal or expanded in Oak Bay. I am vehemently opposed to this activity.			Again, I don't want to see secondary suites made legal or expanded in Oak Bay. I am vehemently opposed to this activity.	Again, I don't want to see secondary suites made legal or expanded in Oak Bay. I am vehemently opposed to this activity.	Again, I don't want to see secondary suites made legal or expanded in Oak Bay. I am vehemently opposed to this activity.
I do not want existing illegal secondary suites permitted or new suites allowed. I am opposed to secondary suites.	I am opposed to secondary suites and am disappointed that the District of Oak Bay does not enforce this Bylaw.					Secondary suites are currently illegal in Oak Bay and the District should enforce it. I am not in favour of secondary suites.
off street parking mandatory for all suites and owner occupancy required.	one time license fee and allow boarding too; allow garden/carriage house suites too.				Municipal capacity and costs issues.	Garden suits and carriage house suites should be considered. They can be built to code, meeting existing municipal bylaws and allow owners to build to need. There can be creative artistic buildings which meet the needs of a secondary suite.
Owner on-site and construction/health and safety measures compliant	Parking. On street is fine. And boarding as well as secondary suites fine.				I'd like the district to consider construction of backyard bungalows/carriage houses.	Suites and lane way housing/carriage houses will help add enrich the neighbourhood and help with the housing crisis.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Mandatory license and District initiated compliance	Allow boarders in owner occupied portion of home, eg home stay students, etc.		Henderson and estevan	Absurd to engage in such a program without creating a map and registry of already existing illegal suites in Oak Bay. OB needs to identify existing suites, then inspect them for safety etc, then issue remediation orders etc if needed, then fines, liens on title if no compliance, and only then see where to start on a pilot. OB gets a lot of criticism for not having this type of housing, when the truth is there is TON of it generating undeclared taxable income and operating with impunity. There are long established illegal secondary suites in more than a dozen houses within a block or 2 of my house. The municipal total must be in the hundreds.	See Q 26 Also, the staffing and logistics of such a program could pay for itself in part or in full, through a rigorous and meaningful compliance regime.	See Q 26
						The entire survey is slanted toward single family home owners. Almost 40% of Oak Bay residents like me live in condos or apartments. Where is our voice? There seems to be a built in presumption of acceptance of secondary suites in some form. Despite my residency I am totally opposed to such suites based on past experience as a sshowner. Building more unaffordable housing to address an affordability crisis is nonsensical.
Since we have a housing crisis and secondary suites will help relieve it, and also encourage more people to live closer into Victoria with less transportation needs, etc. contributing to the climate crisis, I think we should be as encouraging as possible to those who want to have secondary suites in their houses.				This has been delayed and delayed, and has been implemented successfully in Victoria and I think just about every other local municipality without problems. We should stop dithering and just get this done!		The current situation is unfair to residents of secondary suites, people who have secondary suites in their homes, people who want secondary suites in their home, and our whole region. Just because a vocal few people resist a needed change doesn't mean that it's OK to delay and delay doing something about it!
Manageable and compliant.			The areas to the west of cadboro bay rd.			
				don't allow it	don't do it	stop their increase and make present ones have a business license
It would ensure properly regulated suites.	None.	RS4 and RS5.				

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
no seconday suites	no seconday suites	no seconday suites	no seconday suites	no seconday suites	no seconday suites	Please keep Oak Bay a single family, healthy community. I move here from Fairfield where they put in secondary suites. Results, higher property values, higher crime in the community and absolutely NO parking for us or anybody that wanted to visit. I moved here for that reason. Please do not do this.
What a stupid question, far too many variables to make a decision based on what I just responded to, its a foolish "pigeon hole" for results.			I listed them above		If it ill effects the neighbours quality of life its a non starter, parking included. The Clive , in my opinion, was a disaster on the pre existing neighbours, shame on all those involved that allowed that to happen.	
Secondary suites MUST be regulated as businesses just as any apartment or condo building providing accomodation. It also allows the municipality to recoup costs associated with secondary suites and their burden on the District	a 40% ratio is too high and needs to be reduced to 25%.	Strictly in an existing Multiple Dwelling Zone.	The area of Oak Bay north of Cadboro Bay north of Oak Bay High School	Residents of the specific neighbourhood MUST be able to reject the pilot program - is		This survey is inadequate and biased - it does not lay out the full costs to Oak BAy, nor seeks to ask about negative or missing aspects of secondary suites.
Removes red tape and provides family's with opportunity to supplement mortgage via suite						
Greatest flexibility for all during this current crisis	Faster implementation. Less surveys and more housing. As a millennial who is able to save, it's totally depressing as home ownership gets more and more unaffordable in OB every year. By potentially having a legal suite, would provide a greater chance of getting a mortgage and partially offsetting the massive expense with some rental income.					It cannot come fast enough. The people who live in these secondary suites are often not just UVic students, as is perceived by some, but essential workers across so many sectors, who benefit the municipality so greatly. I will personally vote against any elected member who does not advance legalization during their term. That means implementing - not just more surveys. We need more housing in this crisis! Sincerely, A struggling millennial.
Parking, owner occupancy and registration	The rest of the regulations are not my 1st choice but would be ok with them.					Affordable housing is desperately needed across all of the CRD. These suites need to get approved and built asap.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Freedom to allow affordability in the community. Currently lots of suites exist without regulations or compliance.	Open up this community to a wider spectrum of citizens. Also, garden suites for large lots should be considered as part of this plan. Why consider it separately?			Pilot program is not required. Other municipalities have allowed secondary suites forever. Let's just get on with it!	If building codes are met then rezoning should not be required.	Please also consider garden suites for larger lot sizes. This would be preferable over secondary suites for many home owners.
Less intrusive on the homeowner. Too many nanny state rules. If you have the space and meet the requirements and are not a bother to your neighbours then why not?	If no off street parking available, then ensure adequate on-street parking...the occupant of the suite may not have a car, but they will receive guests just like anyone else. Increase suites on a street by 20-30% you are increasing street parking pressure by a similar amount. Also maximum person occupancy based on the number of bedrooms is not included					No mention of maximum adult occupancy in the suites. There needs to be a cap of 2 adults per bedroom. All suites should be subject to an initial inspection to ensure basic plumbing, electrical and life safety standards are met. Proof of landlord property insurance indicating a suite should be required
It would allow fairer tax assessment and contribution in order to make necessary infrastructure upgrades and maintenance.	N/A	What are the options? This survey is unclear.	Henderson	Fix the infrastructure first and please engage fewer pro developer staff members. Where is the open planning review process we have been requesting for years!	Align taxes and/or permits on the applications / existence to cover administration costs. This should be a zero sum design.	Protect our trees. Stop allowing anyone with deep pockets to build McMansions, thereby reducing our rapidly shrinking urban forest. Has council totally forgotten the everyday residents here?
Freedom to make more housing available in the ongoing housing crisis. Housing is a right and we need to increase the density in Oak Bay. We need to strengthen public transit and car shares, not waste valuable land on parking spaces.				We need to be trying this everywhere now, there are already many suites in many areas.	It is too bureaucratic and will delay the process of providing more housing.	This has been done in many other jurisdictions with great success.
Freedom to use your home smartly and sensibly based on the extraordinary house costs nowadays	It should have a designated lot size as in perhaps +.14 acre	No zones and let volunteers come forward		Should be available to all residents based on house size, lot size and what they have available to offer.		It is a very desirable area for students, hospital workers, and those who cannot afford their own home in the area. Let them in
Some registration, some enforcement, and no requirements for existing to have an additional parking spot (as that would likely require some tenants to move)	Possibly have a max size of suite. This might be bigger for a bigger lot, so if you have a .14 acre lot then maybe max at 950 sq ft for example. Then if you have a .25 acre lot then max could be bigger, but they still have to work within regulations for max GFA of the house anyways.	RS5. If it works there then it will be fine for properties with larger plots. Plus a lot of the district is RS5.		Need to ensure that if you choose a pilot it will be fair.		It is very important to not have secondary suites in already subdivided small lots. For example, 0.07 size lot, or even 0.10 or 0.12. Many of these homes are already too large for their lot, so adding more people on site would significantly impact the neighborhood and result in too much densification. It also tends to mean less greenery and gardens, which is very important to retain in oak bay.
Owner occupancy	No min lit size					

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
flexible and based on experience elsewhere; reduces the over regulated mindset for Oak Bay	A pilot first (in the event that "wrinkles" were discovered		Henderson, North Oak Bay	Would be good to publicize ahead what was being tested...e .g. evaluation of scenario A and B. Important to name success criteria. How long is the pilot? And to name the plan for expansion in the event that success criteria are met and/or modifications are made based on pilot	way too bureaucratic. Further, how would this not lead to neighbour against neighbour as the reason for saying yes and saying no would not be understood community wide. We have that now with rezoning applications whihc are widely perceived to be a nightmare in Oak Bay. We are also perceived as elitist in our approach to development and contributions to housing crises. The "too bad if you can't afford to live here" approach. We should keep in mind that we are not the first area of the CRD to consider suites/boardings. Some consistency across neighbourhoods would be sensible.	We are overdue for change here. It is unconscionable that we don't act. The Concerned Citizens who are picking apart the survey are looking for ways to legitimize stalling and status quo. The culture of Oak Bay is changing and council needs to keep pace. Culture trumps strategy every time. (Harvard Business Review March 2011)
Parking is already a HUGE and unenforced issue where I live.						Anything subject to bylaws already is doomed. We don't employ the staff to enforce our current bylaws.
I want it regulated. If people want to gain revenue from having a suite in their home they need to follow the regulations and we all follow the same rules. I think this will also keep it from becoming over run with suites.				No pilot program. It would be unfair to those that want a suite and can not have one as they are not in the pilot area.	Too bureaucratic. Too much time and money will be spent by the homeowner, OB Municipal staff and elected officials.	I am in favour of secondary suites as they are already happening. I believe ALL of them, existing and new need to be regulated. No grandfathering of existing.
Voluntary registration	Option for additional boarding to assist in housing crisis. As long as parking rules apply.			Oak Bay is already lagging in supporting an imminent regional housing crisis. A blanket approach with site specific amendments addresses this best. Site specific zoning is discriminatory.	I am worried that a pilot program will not address the needed housing issues of the region.	
Off street parking for sure! Must be registered for taxes				No pilot programs, once they start and they don't work, they are hard to cancel!		We don't need suites in rental houses!! Lets keep Oak Bay the way it was quaint ! Don't turn it into Victoria!! This is why I have stayed here for close to 80 years!!!
Both boarding and suites.	Owner-occupied and parking.					
It requires people to provide a decent safe living space and not just create any old kind of secondary suite. I support major enforcement, although I know that Oak Bay is pretty wimpy about enforcing anything.	I don't care about the unit size restrictions. AND I would definitely want something in there about no chopping down trees in order to create parking.		A neighbourhood that currently has the largest number of illegal secondary suites.	Don't kill any trees! And how about tackling this assumption that having a car is completely normal and acceptable? Why not allow people to say that they will only rent to people who don't have a car? If you want to live in Oak Bay, you just might have to make a few sacrifices.	There should be opportunity for neighbours to have input into whether or not a secondary suite is allowed. The only problem is that Council doesn't listen. They do not reply to letters, emails or anything else. People who are their friends get to do whatever they want. They ignore everyone else unless an election is coming up.	Owner-occupancy in part of the house is essential.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I like the idea of a district-initiated compliance program.	No.	Doesn't matter which zone—I just think a pilot program is a good idea.				Oak Bay has already gotten much noisier in recent years (way more traffic, and way more unbearably noisier cars). I worry that allowing more rental housing will exacerbate these problems. Hence my preference for a pilot program.
see previous answers	no					Get on with it.
					It would be extremely time consuming and clog up the permitting/zoning department	Please approve them!
					Time consuming, require more labour to review all applications and create a slow system.	
Owner occupancy required	parking - no requirement to provide 1 spot on property			suites are here already - manage with least govt intrusion	complete waste of councils time to deal with each property independently	Find flexible and creative ways to deal with housing options for seniors so they can remain in the community they raised their families in - besides basement secondary suites as not many seniors I know want to live in their basement suite
landlords of secondary and tertiary suites need to pay fair share municipal of costs- they must be assessed and thereby taxed landlord needs to pay for their double garbage and recycling use permitting existing suites must come with a full and proper bylaw building code inspections including such as plumbing and wiring, window size, legal access and egress	landlord must provide at least 4 off street parking sites - 2 for each unit On our 10 house street we have 2 houses each with 2x2 bedroom suites, one house with 3 bedroom Air B&B, and a new house with a basement suite as well as a garden suite We have significant parking issues and garbage issues as a consequence. These illegal properties do not pay their fair share of municipal costs, such as additional fire protection , park use and maintenance	landlord needs to pay for their double use of garbage and recycling permitting existing suites must come with full and proper bylaw building code inspection including all such as plumbing and wiring, window size, legal access and egress	Landlord needs to pay for their double use of garbage and recycling permitting existing suites must come with full and proper bylaw building code inspection including all such as plumbing and wiring, window size, legal access and egress	to contemplate an area for a pilot program, the municipality must receive application from property owners within pilot program area (EXCLUDING TENANTS) who want pilot program and such residents must pay in advance all costs for municipality to seek approval of every resident home owner- TAXPAYER to pilot program Illegal tenants (non taxpayers) are NOT to be included in survey to determine the will of pilot area property owners		this entire investigation - staff time etc - must be fully funded in advance on user pay basis Existing and prospective additional suite property owners must individually pay cash in advance before any more staff time is spent on topic
Shouldn't require a business license.	Would bolster compliance enforcement.					
I prefer no new suites						

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Equal opportunity to all residents across the municipality.	All suite owners should be licensed to have a suite and subject to additional costs related to extra utilities ie. addition garbage fee and permitted larger garbage/paper/garden waste bin. All suites should be regulated.					
It seems to be a reasonable solution.						
Owner occupancy required, mandatory registration	Off street parking requirement.					
NO SECONDARY SUITES UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES	NO SCONDARY SUITES UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES	NO SECONDARY SUITES UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES	NO SECONDARY SUITES UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES	NO SECONDARY SUITES UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES	NO SECONDARY SUITES UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES	NO SECONDARY SUITES UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES
A, B or C seem fine.						We couldn't have bought the home without the mortgage helper of a secondary suite. We would like others to be able to do the same without too much difficulty. At the same time, we want to preserve the character of the neighbourhood. We are a childless couple with a single tenant (who doesn't own a car). The suite entrance is at the back. For us, new houses with huge footprints and lots subdivided to 30' frontages seem like a much greater threat to the neighbourhood.
The flexibility as we need to improve the rental pool in Oak Bay						No, Oak Bay needs to progress and allow density to increase as South Vancouver Island is a popular destination for both old and young and the young cannot find suitable accommodation.
	Add registration and owner occupancy			It would be too time consuming and would not glean useful data	Too bureaucratic and unnecessary	This is like studying whether the sun comes up in the morning. Secondary suites exist, throughout the community, and add needed home options for a wide population. They enhance Oak Bay, and should be welcomed as long as they are approved, safe and inspected.
			Jubilee area	Avoid North Oak Bay.....there are already too many illegal suites, student rental houses etc here		Oak Bay does NOT need secondary suites

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Most restrictive and heavy emphasis on compliance and enforcement	Increase lot size to ensure more room between neighbors		Estevan Village area	If the pilot program is deemed unsuccessful do the secondary suites stay that were permitted during the pilot?	Secondary suites can have a big impact on neighbors and/or a neighborhood, rezoning is the best tool for determining public support....or not.	In a perfect world, secondary suites (provided they meet code, owner occupied in the dwelling, lot size, rezoning approval, etc.) can potentially have very little impact on a neighborhood. Typically small in size, often single occupancy; preferably no vehicle and functioning largely undetected. However, the problem arises when the low impact scenario described here does not occur....then what do you do as a neighbor, what does Oak bay Bylaw Enforcement do? Historically the kitchen stove (cooking facilities) is removed and bylaw takes no further action. This can be a slippery slope, very frustrating for a neighborhood, and taxing for the municipality. In short, a secondary suite program has to be extremely tightly controlled because once implemented you can't undo it.
Owner occupied home is critical, as well as off-street parking. Oak Bay already has an excess of on-street parking, so that some streets are difficult to navigate.				Oak Bay is full of secondary suites now. They require regulation, not a pilot program to add more.	Enforcement is critical.	The complaints-based reporting system currently in place is problematic for obvious reasons. It pits neighbours against one another.
This is the only way to truly increase housing affordability and access. This allows for home owners and potential renters and boarders an opportunity for affordable housing which will increase housing opportunities, access and affordability.	Could include voluntary registration	Zones that are occupied by students and younger workers				
It is a balanced approach to a growing need for affordable housing options.	No			No	No	Tiny homes should be allowed on lots over 6500 square feet with lane access.
						I DO NOT agree with secondary suites under ANY scenario. It comes with nothing but trouble: taxes, parking, crime, community density, community investment, etc.. It's ugly! I moved to Oak Bay for all the reasons that that came with increased density in Fairfield. It would make more sense to approve town homes, condominium developments, etc as a way to increase density. Do not approve secondary suites!!!!!!

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
It will help to house more people while keeping the character of oak bay much the same						
It has the fewest restrictions to support the most new, legal secondary suites.	Add "owner occupancy" requirement to avoid landlord absenteeism.					Legal secondary suites are a small step in the direction of housing affordability and it is ridiculous that there are massive properties throughout Oak Bay where it is not legal to have more than one household, but which could easily support 10-20 families.
I think that housing is very dire and if you put limits on this it will be a nightmare of even worse enclavementa where it isn't and a over burden where not. I think enforcement of what there is, grandfathering (ugh), and open terms is the best low barrier means. Not everyone will like it but I encourage the municipality to consider a bold audacious decision. It's been years in the making. Such that children of those there will not be able to keep their family homes and make the area open to many by converting homes into two or three suites. This would allow my parents to age in place , me and my sister to support. Do it! Please!	I would like one secondary suite and the ability to have a third area that could be separate entrance as long for family.			Please just join the 21st century and help our community become good neighbours to increase housing overall. Ok, I might consider an exception for heritage designated homes.		
Good balance of regulation vs flexibility						
Scenario A is closest to my preferred choice, however none of the choices listed truly meets my suggestion for the best scenario.	I think the best way forward is Option A with a change to the registration to require a business licence.	If the choice is Pilot or continue to wait many more years for Council to get moving on allowing secondary suites, then I would be prepared to accept a pilot in the RS5 zone but I would prefer to skip the pilot and start immediately with allowing secondary suites. It's been studied long enough. It's time to amend the zoning bylaw and permit them.			Waste of council and homeowner time and money!	
						I don't want secondary suites to be allowed in Oak Bay
Two types of enforcement possible, and maximum unit size up to 150m.	Yes, I don't feel secondary suites in new buildings should be considered until a full review of the current Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is undertaken by the District.			The cost of putting a well structured pilot project in a municipality the size of Oak Bay would be quite expensive, and would not necessarily yield useful additional information.	Counter productive and expensive.	Please deal with existing suites first, as a matter of fairness. New homes, if permitted, will easily incorporate secondary suites into their design process and will likely be granted secondary suite permits as part of a broader application - easier compliance. It is important that the need for upgrading main water and sewer systems as a result of newly built secondary suites be fully understood and considered.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Most Flexible	No					I don't want suites legalized
enforceable compliance with the addition of a secondary suite					Unsure of the practicality of this option. The District is not enforcing the current situation of illegal suites and this would require knowledge of every situation. Homeowners with illegal suites would not voluntarily submit to this process.	Adjacent homeowners subjected to increased noise and traffic in residential zones with smaller lots need to also be considered. While it is good to improve housing options, some streets were not designed for increased density.
If it is complaint based, then enforcement will occur if neighbors have issues so problems will be identified and dealt with. Tenants won't sign a lease if they do not like the property, so landlords will need to ensure the suite is in condition anyway. So, there does not seem to be a need for all these extra regulations and requirements. It becomes restrictive and limits housing.	To clarify: if people want a secondary suite, they should have the parking space already on their property. We don't need to be clogging up the streets with extra vehicles. It just causes problems with neighbors too. So, if you want a secondary suite, you need the parking on your property already.					I think secondary suites are long over-due in Oak Bay, so long as the suites meet the standard health and safety requirements: windows, smoke detectors, insulation, etc. Many homes in Oak Bay are older so there needs to be accommodation for ceiling heights. Tenants in Oak Bay have been living in the shadows for too long and it's not good for their mental health. For years, Oak Bay has been talking about secondary suites but there does not seem to be any action or follow-through. I agree with having a system for neighbor complaints: home owners need to be responsible and ensure tenants in secondary suites are responsible and follow all bylaws such as noise and don't park in other people's spots other than on the property.
By having the owner in the house, noise would be regulated. By having designated parking, there would not be the issue of parking complaints.				This has been such a long time coming. The district of Oak Bay will have the ability to enact new bylaws or make changes as time goes on. The time to allow secondary suites is here. They exist in every major city around the world. Other cities have tried and succeeded, so those are your 'pilot projects'. There is no need for a pilot project.		Please make this happen! For working families, secondary suites would be such a great addition. Housing is so unaffordable and the rental rate is so dismal in Victoria. Oak Bay needs to be a growing community, not stagnant and not structured to placate the wealthy long term residents. With the right structure to avoid noise (having the owner live in the house) and parking issues (1 off-site spot), this will work.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I am not against secondary suites but I am against having suite people parking their cars on the street. Secondary suites should not allow vehicles. Our streets are crowded enough and children are at risk! Please allow suites but for students and elderly that don't have vehicles.	There are many suites on my street and now many many cars parked on the street. It's hard to find a road in South Oak bay you don't have to zig zag down or treat as a single lane. Cars are the culprit here. If I were in charge, people would have to park their cars in their driveway. I have two vehicles and 90% of the time we park in our driveway. The people across the street have 6 cars! Three of which are parked on the road. We also have 9 small children in three houses near me who ride their bikes. There is no reaction time for a car pulling out of a driveway for all the cars on the street. Please consider this. One car on the street, one in the driveway and if you are fortunate enough to have other vehicles, get them off the street for the sake of the safety of the children. Thank you.					I think secondary suites are crucial to our seniors who may not be able to afford to live in Oak Bay anymore (due to monster housing and what is happening). Please allow our seniors to stay in Oak Bay where their families live and who dedicated their lives to this area. Also, help out a student (with a bike or will take the bus!) as we are close to Camosun and the University. Have a noise condition (quiet after 10pm) as we do want to be respectful to our seniors and children sleeping. I'm not a senior or a student btw but love my neighbourhood and don't want to see children getting hurt or seniors who are forced to leave.
Owner Occupancy not required.	I would require registration with mandatory business license					
						I am opposed to secondary suites
				Please no pilot programs....just go for it!		
it is less restrictive and will be easier for homeowners to comply when building	I think the unit size should be restricted to 40% of the GFQ and there should be parking available for the suite	please don't delay the process any longer with a pilot program first, just roll it out District wide	please don't delay the process any longer with a pilot program first, just roll it out District wide	please don't delay the process any longer with a pilot program first, just roll it out District wide	please don't delay the process any longer with a re-zoning process for all new or existing suites, we have all waited long enough for this	We are long overdue to have these regulations in place, please let's move forward with approving the strategy so we can create more affordable housing options in our community
It is the most flexible and allows the homeowner to build the secondary suite which best fits his/her needs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Don't do a pilot program. Do scenario A and let's get on with it.	Don't do it. Proceed with scenario A and get on with it.	This should have started 5 years ago. We are long overdue for secondary suites in Oak Bay which continues to experience genteel poverty.
No additional on street parking.						Additional costs of services, and amenities, municipal and regional, should be carried by those who have secondary accommodation. Only they benefit from secondary accommodation.
as stated previously, the secondary suite size should not exceed 600 ft2 with one bedroom, one bathroom. Further, there must be additional parking and the suite parking and owner parking must be enforced. All parking must be dedicated as required by the bylaws.	maximum unit size should not exceed 600 ft2		not my neighbourhood.		require every home owner to answer the question "do you have a secondary suite in your home, occupied or unoccupied." This question could be asked with the next Utility Bills. There should be a penalty for none compliance. This will provide Oak Bay with necessary accurate information as to where the existing suite are.	The current process should go no further until ALL current secondary suite are identified. I realize that from a political position, the mayor and council likely would object to my suggestions in items 18 and 19.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Basically permits everything	I would prefer some owner occupancy		Near UVic and Camosun	I am in a 1-bedroom condo, and see a lot of value in higher density in Oak Bay		
extra off-street parking required, only secondary suites permitted, enforcement requirements,	should be permitted in all areas				I would hope that the regulations that are developed would negate the need for site specific rezoning	My hope is that by allowing secondary suites in our municipality, with strict and enforced regulations, that we will be able to provide some much needed diverse housing options. I would also hope to retain much of the current ambiance of our municipality - the tree canopy being a priority. I foresee parking becoming an issue in some neighbourhoods, but I believe this can be successfully addressed.
I think registration should be required to ensure emergency services are aware of the extra suite. Much thought has to go into incentives for existing suites to ensure they come forward but aren't all shuttered due to too-stringent rules.	I think there may need to be two definitions of "suites" to allow for significantly different scenarios. Existing suites (or suites in houses built prior to a certain date for example) could be treated as "Boarders+" and where not all building code can be met could still operate, perhaps with more connection to main house required. This would allow for less expensive student-housing style of suites while new builds, which can more easily meet building code, could have more stringent compliance requirements.	N/A	N/A	If a pilot program is run, to what purpose? What could be learned in this scenario?	Seems overkill for what is essentially boarders with a separate door.	Think carefully about the carrots and sticks to be employed to ensure compliance, and consider carefully how the extra costs to the municipality from enforcement to infrastructure will be covered - ideally those that benefit from the additional revenue (which will be between \$10,000 and \$36,000 per year) should pay all or most of any additional costs. Might also be worth noting that "regulating" suites will not necessarily change the number or quality of suites in Oak Bay - they simply provide an option for some homeowners who want the extra revenue. Final note: an exemption or incentive model for intergenerational families may be helpful - we should encourage grandparents and extended families to live together with separate doors without seeing it as revenue.
Mandatory Business Licence; compliance program, small size			Goldsmith Street, East side of Foul Bay Rd, Haultain Road between Foul Bay and Florence			
Simple						
Too many questions! Keep it shorter or do a voluntary extension part.						Way too long a survey, you lost me at around twenty questions and I'm a dedicated responder. As a result, your data is likely compromised. Make sure you have an expert statistician analyze and summarize the results, or you'll get crap outcomes.
Most regulated.	Can't answer....have not given it enough thought.				It should be highly regulated.	Whatever is decided it must not destroy the community nature of Oak Bay and must protect our property values.
I believe all of these have already been addressed in previous questions			Unsure, don't know enough about the neighbourhoods			

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Owner occupied. More rules in D. Better to start in a restrictive way and loosen up later if needed, than to start with a lack of rules and try to tighten up later.						
Meets all code life safety requirements, ensures that building owners have a vested interest in the occupancy, tries to deal with parking (however, based on the existing suites in my area, garages are being used for storage as the basements have been fully developed as living space for the suite and some houses with suites have 3 to 4 vehicles associated with them), the suites are not assessed for tax purposes, and I am sure income isn't always reported to the CCRA.	Active monitoring of illegal rather than complaint based.			A failed pilot should deal with suites that remain after the end of the program at the owners expense not the District of Oak Bay taxpayers	The process would deal with issues associated with existing suites and ensure new suites meet code and life/health safety requirement, parking and neighbourhood concerns.	The existing enforcement is non existent relying on neighbour complaints. One suite currently under construction in my area has had significant structural changes including removal of load bearing walls, stairwells cut through foundation walls and windows added all without permits or in compliance with fire code.
I think haven't ng as few restrictions as possible makes sense to encourage secondary suites.				I don't think this needs to be studied further. A pilot program feels like an opportunity to delay any real action. Most municipalities in greater Victoria (not to mention BC) already allow suites, so I think it is easy to understand what it is all about without a pilot program.	That would certainly discourage legal secondary suites from being created!	I'm in favour of secondary suites. It's embarrassing to me that I live in a community where this is not currently legal. We absolutely need this type of housing stock for a varied, vibrant and affordable community.
Compliance for parking requirements, licensed and in compliance with program and safety requirements. Too many unregistered suites right now, and likely not paying property tax related and parking on the street rather than using parking off street parking				I'm sure it would be hard to choose a specific neighbourhood. I would not want it in mine, but there maybe possibly other areas that are suitable.		There are quite a number of "secondary suites" in the neighbourhood. I have witnessed some of the impacts of the additions. A few examples: excess noise from two families in the same house, on road parking rather than using off road parking (Off road parking is now a childrens playground), less respect for the neighbourhood and neighbours. Regulating secondary suites and ensuring compliance may provide some direction rather than a free for all in older and new homes (also ones being built with a secondary suite in mind)

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Allows some transition - recognizes there are already secondary suites and adds some control.	No extra parking required - there is enough space devoted to cars. Allow boarding and secondary suites.		Where there is already illegal suites, close to public transit and commercial facilities, along major roads.	While a pilot would probably make this more acceptable to some, I prefer to get going. This has been discussed and dithered about for years already, many doing it illegally, and Oak Bay is becoming unaffordable because of lack of options.	Waste of time and money; raises angst and worry between neighbours.	
Affordable housing is desperately needed throughout the region, but especially Oak Bay.	Make it happen faster.				WE are bogged down in bureaucracy already.	Oak Bay needs to stop dragging feet & help with affordable housing
It seems to be a nice balance of grandfathering existing suites and allowing new. I also like the requirement to have the owner living in the main part of the home.	I thought I saw in a previous question an option for 40% of GFA or 90 m2, whichever is less. I would choose this requirement if I could.		It would be helpful to have a list of neighbourhoods here. I think neighbourhoods close to Oak Bay village and Estevan might be good choices. I think there's a need for more discussion of this.	There should be an opportunity for community input after a certain period. One or two years? More? And this could hopefully be in person (Covid allowing) and NOT in the OB municipal building, which is far too small. I went to a talk about this issue when OB held an information forum at UVic -- that venue was much better (though even that room was a bit too small).	It sounds over-regulated and expensive. If you have a complaints-based system (for suites creating problems for neighbours), I don't think this level of policing would be necessary.	I feel apprehensive about this, because I like the way Oak Bay is now and don't want to see it change in a big way. It's been a lovely place the whole 30+ years I've lived here. However, the house prices here are increasingly out of reach for most, and allowing suites might allow people other than the wealthy to live here.
It's the most hands off approach. We're in a housing crisis and now is the time for meaningful action.	Nope!			Pilot programs are a great way for NIMBYs to NIMBY. Like they're all for pilot programs as long as they're in someone else's neighborhood.	Have you ever sat through a Council meeting? Particularly for a rezoning? These meetings would be absolute bloodbaths.	I think we need to stop consulting and start doing. 95% of the municipality is zoned for single family. We don't even permit duplexes. Like yes it's nice for me to keep my property value high, but we're in a housing crisis. And the notion of allowing young people to buy homes in Oak Bay is a noble goal. If they need mortgage helpers to achieve it, we shouldn't stand in the way.
Unit size, parking and registration	Enforcement complaint based			Seems unfair and unnecessary. Make changes on a District wide basis as needed.	research, best practices and community feedback needed to inform site specific rezoning program.	Go for it!
We are in a crisis and desperately need more rental housing. Make suites as easy as possible to build and/or legalize.	I would provide a survey for renters who don't currently live in our community or those people who are not privileged home owners.	Pilot program is a waste of resources. Implement the program district wide.			Again, this would be a huge waste of staff resources and council time.	It's 2021 and we still don't have legal suites. Make it happen, make it an easy process!

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
			Henderson/ North Oak Bay		Criteria to be met should be comprehensive and clear. Deviations allowed from criteria should be rare. Council should act consistently.	If we want to maintain a family oriented Oak Bay, I am not convinced that secondary suites are the answer since these are unlikely to be attractive to families (other than as mortgage helpers, which would require the owner to occupy part of the house). More emphasis should be given to subdividing large lots, and developing duplexes and townhouses, all of which would be more attractive to families or older individuals who wish to remain in the community. The policy should aim to prevent existing single family houses from being purchased by investors and turned into multi-suite rentals as allowing these types of investments would raise the price of single family homes and make it more difficult for families to purchase homes in Oak Bay.
Parking mandatory	No					
Control of parking issues and unit size by needing mandatory business license and compliance program.				The neighbourhood chosen should have a referendum first, on allowing the pilot program.	I think this is a mandatory requirement for possible secondary suites to ensure the health and safety standards are met for the tenants and the neighbours are not impacted.	There needs to be a mechanism to ensure the secondary suites are not used for AirB&Bs. There might be consideration for how many secondary suites are allowed within a neighbourhood, eg. a maximum per block, so that a neighbourhood does not become a hive of small living spaces.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I strongly prefer to have owner occupancy. Also, since renting a secondary suite is a business, a mandatory business license is appropriate. A business license is only required with Scenario D.	I would increase the minimum lot size to 650 m2.		Henderson, as it is near the University of Victoria (there may be more demand for rentals by university students).	I believe a pilot program near the University of Victoria could be a useful way to gain information on secondary suites in Oak Bay.	I believe specific rezoning is a good idea, as it would allow neighbours to have some input.	I believe owner occupancy is very important. I also believe site specific zoning (Scenario F) is the best option, if secondary suites are to be permitted in Oak Bay. I would like Oak Bay to remain a family-friendly district. Secondary suites are generally too small for families (families generally prefer 3 or more bedrooms). Once secondary suites are allowed, it will become more profitable to convert a lot that previously allowed just one family into a lot for two households (ie, a house with a secondary suite). This increases density, but does not provide more housing for families as secondary suites are generally not used by families (being too small). If the district wanted to increase density, rather than secondary suites, I would prefer to see more row housing. Row housing can be built so it is large enough to accommodate families (ie, 3 bedrooms or larger).
Easy to understand and inexpensive for the district to maintain				This whole process is taking too long	to expensive to maintain	Why does everything in Oak Bay take so long
I think we need more homes/people for our community to thrive	I'm ok with a reasonably priced license and registration				Get secondary suites already stop being nibbys	
						I don't want secondary suites in Oak Bay

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>Currently, renters of suites have no buy-in to behave as residents in a family-like neighbourhood ie joining Blockwatch, adhering to parking or other by-laws, like yard maintenance, etc. Many are students or young professionals, who are just looking for cheap accommodations. They often drive motorcycles or other poorly maintained vehicles in our experience & keep unusual hours. Renting out your home for profit also leads to absentee landlords renting out whole house, up & down. A few go the extra mile to find long-term renters, but this is not the norm. These homes/suites are often poorly or minimally maintained in and out, no fences, poor landscaping, inadequate upkeep of property. We have had multiple bad experiences and enforcement of current by-laws has been a joke, forcing neighbours to police their neighbourhood. NO MORE SECONDARY SUITES.</p>
						<p>I am not in favour of legalization of secondary suites in Oak Bay. Oak Bay can afford to be different, and be proud of being different.</p>
<p>opens up options but isn't a radical departure</p>	<p>open up to all single family houses</p>				<p>Given the shortage of affordable housing in Greater Victoria, the opening up of secondary suite options is necessary and long overdue</p>	<p>Looking forward to seeing real changes</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>People need Oak Bay municipal council to identify and address ---- both head-on and with prevention ---- some of the practical reasons and potential losses that negatively influence the experiences, associations, and views that community members tend to have toward even long-term renters and rented secondary suites.</p> <p>For examples:</p> <p>(1) Poisonous / toxic and otherwise unwelcome airborne contaminates that drift into neighbours' outdoors spaces, windows, and homes (where the contaminates are trapped and absorbed), or drift out to neighbourhood sidewalks.</p> <p>ie. Cigarette smoke, pot smoke, poisonous dryer sheets, incense, perfumes, vehicle idling, gas leaf blowers, gas lawn mowers, use of dirty barbecue grills, outdoor burning.</p> <p>(2) Disturbances of sound that prevents neighbours from sleeping when they need to (for</p>

<p>Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)</p>	<p>Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)</p>	<p>Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)</p>
						<p>neighbours from sleeping when they need to (for health reasons, shift work, early mornings, etc.), or prevents them from utilizing or enjoying the peace and calm that they need at home, indoors or outdoors, whether for solitude, quiet conversations, work, study, meditative activities, gardening, yoga, exercise, other activities of living.</p> <p>ie. Yelling, partying, loud evening activities, and other behaviours associated with alcohol, other drugs, inconsideration, or imagination deficits. Insufficiently trained dogs that awake neighbours or rob them of peace and calm at home.</p> <p>(3) Untidy appearance of some rentals from neighbours' homes and from sidewalks.</p> <p>ie. Litter, discarded furniture left too long, garbage, recycling. Unclipped trees and bushes that unsafely reduce walkers' and runners' line of sight at dawn, dusk, and night, or force them off sidewalks.</p> <p>(4) Just like other homes, both secondary suites and homes that have secondary suites (like other rental homes, and like rental apartment</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I prefer Scenario A for the following categories: Land Use, Minimum Lot Size, Unit Size, Boarding permitted, Parking, Owner Occupancy.	Yes, I prefer Scenario A (the Scenario that I chose) for all categories except the following 2 categories: Registration and Enforcement. For these 2 categories, I prefer Scenario D.	n/a	n/a		<p>Requiring a site specific rezoning process for every existing and new secondary suite in our municipality would be likely to unnecessarily generate social conflict within neighbourhoods and within the municipality.</p> <p>Such a requirement might also increase the likelihood that more existing secondary suite owners (than preferred) will avoid participation in our municipality's requests. (ie. to begin with, that they identify themselves as owners of secondary suites).</p> <p>A wiser approach in the longer run would be to begin by working with owners who are willing and able. Making registration fees nominal and creatively offering incentives (to secondary suite owners' registration and participation) that are low-cost to our municipality likely also would help.</p>	<p>buildings with balconies) can contribute to and enhance a neighbourhood's positive and health enhancing appearance, its biodiversity, and its air quality.</p> <p>ie. Oak Bay municipality, in various ways, could encourage native vegetable gardening plots, flower beds, flower planters, hanging flower baskets, building and erecting houses for mason bees (they basically don't sting), planting of bee attracting flowers, et cetera. (Municipally encouraged green roofs on apartment buildings and commercial buildings would be signs of progress too.)</p> <p>It would be great if Oak Bay could become a model example to other municipalities of how, through a large but wisely and preventatively managed secondary suite expansion and enforcement program, the healthiness, health-mindedness, homyness, neighbourliness, safety, and appearance of a community can become even more enhanced and the community thereby even more attractive to considerate people, active citizens, and healthy lifestyles.</p>
no business license						
Locations, lot size, parking requirement for new suites and complaint-based compliance.		RD1	Carnarvon and Henderson	Flexibility for grandfathering on completion.	Agree that resource demands make this a challenging option. Better to encourage compliance through published regulations and complaint-based enforcement.	Noting that secondary suites exist in Oak Bay, a consistent policy approach is necessary. It is good to see this initiative progress. My most significant concern is parking and congestion.
It creates the most options for increased housing.				Oak Bay has been studying secondary suites for years and years, all the while the housing crisis is getting worse. Please stop studying and move to implementation.	This would result in very few new housing options, with the continuation of many illegal secondary suites.	Please stop studying and delaying this work. We are in a housing crisis it is time to move forward an implement broad options for secondary suites.
That it allows for secondary suites in all homes	That there would be registration required and one additional parking space					
						i am opposed to secondary suites as you should be.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
It gives everyone more freedom. There is too much regulation in Oak Bay.				Why does Oak Bay have to interfere so much in how people make use of their property.	Why the bureaucracy	Generally they should be allowed providing they meet insurance standards.
None of scenarios are adequate to cover most issues,e.g.,parking.Many existing houses do not have even one off street parking space...noise level has increased with monster homes. Why not use the larger lots for duplexes, 4 plexus, one level for seniors who then will give up their large old multi level homes to young families. Build condos or apts. on main roads like Cadboro Bay,Foul Bay, Fort st. & require underground parking.	Redo the survey as it is too "leading". Some choices are too limiting or unanswerable.	All the properties Oak Bay already owns and rents out,eg, Hampshire, St. Ann, Heron Rd.etc. As the municipality should not be in the house rentals business whe they own properties that could be developed for multiple units of more affordable housing.	Properties already zoned for high density and adequate parking.	Do better research on similar communities elsewhere to learn from their problems & solutions rather than to try and reinvent the wheel. No more monster, land hog, exclusive massive one family developments like that allowed on Prospect Pl. Think how many dwelling could have accommodated there!	Forgot to include Oak Bay Ave. Would be another ideal higher density location provided parking is adequately dealt with. There already are good examples existing.	Existing 50' x 100-115' los with inadequate parking can't handle more density & monster homes on larger lots don't solve any responsible planning...so think how to build separate duplex or quads...and how will you accommodate these for aging seniors who want to stay in their neighbourhood but are willing to "recycle" their older home to younger growing families.
Use all available space						
Secondary suites provide a home to someone and they should be safe and well constructed. Having a secondary suite is a privilege and not a tax avoidance scheme.						
Owner occupancy required. Off site parking required for all suites (new and existing) and owner. Enforcement.	I am against policies that encourage suites in some parts of oak bay but not others. I therefore do not focus on lot size or percentage of plan.	Not Henderson. Enforcement is terrible and suites have already resulted in negative impacts. It does not offer a clear starting point.	Not Henderson. Enforcement is terrible and suites have already had a negative impact. It does not offer a clear starting point	No pilot program please. The rules should be thought out and implemented for all of oak bay fairly no pilot program should be implemented without effective enforcement.	The is the only scenario that I would support as it is the only scenario that can be fairly implemented across oak bay and would require policies and enforcement to be fully in place	I think the first survey questions did not allow responders to fully express opinions or select options.
there are no real choices here. Parking is a hug issue. Any secondary suite shouldbe required to provide off street parking for all vehicles. No exception.	no					
Provides more housing						Oak Bay needs to provide more housing options and should not be a community only for the wealthy
Provides greatest degree of control and least potential impact on existing neighbourhoods	There should be a charge (tax?) on owners who have secondary suites to compensate for the increased use of municipal facilities and services					

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
the minimum lot size/house size requirement	No additional parking required			not needed. get on with it. We need more densification without demolition and fewer monster homes. Change the FSR as promised in multiple elections.	Allowing secondary suites as proposed would help seniors to live in place with a caregiver living in the home. Or act as a mortgage helper and allow younger people and families to move in to our community by making home ownership more affordable.	Allowing secondary suites as proposed would help seniors to live in place with a caregiver living in the home. Or act as a mortgage helper and allow younger people and families to move in to our community by making home ownership more affordable. It's also important to monitor secondary suites to ensure that additional living spaces on any particular street can be managed by existing infrastructure, specifically sewage and storm. It shouldn't be that difficult to profile preferred streets and/or neighbourhoods if those particular areas have newer underground infrastructure. Limit secondary suites where there is older infrastructure, or infrastructure that requires upgrading. Additional parking is a red herring for NIMBYs. What Oak Bay really needs to get a handle on, is the DEMOLITION and OVERBUILDING on existing lots and CANOPY DESTRUCTION, not secondary suites. Having an additional car at a particular address is of no more concern to a neighbourhood than having a local teenager get a license and a car in any particular home. No-one seems to think that should be regulated. Come on you guys, get your act together.
					This is an unnecessary burden for homeowners and waste of municipal time and resources	
Less policing required and homeowners are free to use their home as they wish as long as they are being good neighbours					This is not worth the time and resources required	
Off street parking, business license, compliance program	Reduction of maximum size			If pilot program demonstrates negative impacts to an area how are these rectified? Removal of pilot suites? If so are there financial implications or legal exposure to municipality?		If secondary suites are approved owners need to pay appropriate increased share for demand / loads on municipal infrastructure. Street parking is already a problem in many neighborhoods - off street parking should be a requirement for all suites

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
It feels the most moderate way to begin, and then ease restrictions from there as we see how things go?						
all single family homes eligible	prefer owner occupied; 40%GFA			the reality is that there are secondary suites all over Oak Bay. Why would we do a pilot program? Seems to me that that is already underway - aka illegal suites.		RE: parking, we live on a street where everyone parks on the street and almost no one apart from us and a couple of others actually park in their driveway. I fail to see what the concern is regarding parking when homeowners are parking at will, sometimes 2 or 3 cars per house, on the street.
We need diversity and choice in our neighborhood More government isn't the answer				We already have over 1800 suites in Oak Bay Why do we need to spend tax dollars on this		Housing is SO expensive, Oak Bay has little opportunity for lower or middle class people to live here Get on with more options like suites!
	Forget the idea of secondary suites! Totally against it. Mainly parking and traffic!					This is a community of single family dwellings. It is dense enough as it is. The house next to mine is about 12 feet away. Oak Bay should not have to provide street parking. The streets are packed with parked cars now. Roads like Cadbury Bay and Foul Bay are busier than ever and waits at traffic lights are long. I worked hard to buy a house here and if I didn't I would have had to look elsewhere. I would love to live in the Uplands but cannot afford to. I am certain Uplands residents would not suite their homes nor put up with excessive street parking. It's not the excessive garbage or overloading the municipality's resources for me. It's the traffic and on street parking. Finally I found the survey slanted in favour of those wanting suites. There was definitive yes or no questions whether or not we wanted suites.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I prefer Scenario A except require owner occupancy on the property (is this legal?) and enforcement of existing and new secondary suites should be district initiated compliance program	Yes Owner occupancy required on the property and enforcement of existing and new suites should be district initiated compliance program.			Waste of money and time to monitor, non-compliant secondary suites would continue to exist throughout the district, maybe even more would be built.		Please look at Bylaws regarding animals, for example how many dogs are allowed on a property. My understanding it is currently 2 per household. If there is a secondary suite does that make 4 dogs on the property? What is a household? Good to have a clear Bylaw in advance of any complaints/issues. Also is there any data projecting how many secondary suites there could potentially be in Oak Bay, and what the increase in population would be? Based on these projections can the infrastructure handle the increase, ie everything from garbage pickup; school capacity; recreational facilities; transportation; health services etc. While I understand these areas do not all fall within municipal responsibility they affect the citizens of Oak Bay so need to be considered. Has any modelling been done? If the vehicles are electric cars, there will be a need for plug ins for cars thus some sort of parking on property will need to be provided. I would prefer to support more reZoning of properties for townhouses and fourplexes than secondary suites but your survey does not offer this option.
owner occupancy required, flexibility in unit size, complaint basis	off street parking required					
The homeowner makes the decisions about their own house and what happens within their walls, and how much space they are willing to allocate towards a suite.					This would take time and money to process every single application - a waste of resources. Spot check during the pilot project.	
Don't want to see uncontrolled growth of secondary suites. Definitely do want owner occupancy required.	I'm of two minds here. Don't want to see streets choked up with more parked cars. Also don't want to see front yards paved over to accommodate tenant parking.			What I would really like to see is more multi unit low rise housing along main corridors of oak bay ave, foul bay, cadboro bay roads.		I would prefer not to see more secondary suites in my neighbourhood. We moved to Oak Bay in 2019, and the relative lack of suites was a positive for us in choosing to buy here.
	I am generally against secondary suites in the District.					I am against secondary suites in Oak Bay. I would like to keep the neighborhood quiet and less cars on street. Streets are already crowded with parked cars.
Parking restrictions must be enforced						

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Would have picked b except for parking	Small suites are often the only way a student can afford to live - they often don't have a car. In oak bay most people with homes have a driveway or garage so street parking good enough for tenant. I think should be licensed/registered -					Our street is full of small suites. There if they are owner occupied there is absolutely no problem. Some are low ceiling height but otherwise very nice. mostly have affordable housing for students or lower income folks. Affordable Housing is such a problem- I think allowing suites in owner occupied homes with complaint based system and no parking requirements is best. Having them registered means people will claim their extra income for taxes instead of hiding their suites. This and the idea of blanket rezoning needs to be considered to we see some duplexes and triplexes being build to gently build density
	I would make registration mandatory, but have NO recurring fee/business license requirement.					
I strongly believe in the value to the municipality and community on mandatory licensing and enforcement of the rules surrounding occupancy and compliance.	See above.					Owner occupied homes with suites is a must. If this rule is not followed, the municipality must be given the authority and teeth to act swiftly. Licensing is important to ensure compliance with health and safety regulations. I strongly recommend reviewing Pitt Meadow's policy on suites - they have an annual fee for licensed suites and an annual fee for unlicensed suites (4x the amount) as well as a mechanism to bring illegal suites in to compliance:(https://www.pittmeadows.ca/sites/default/files/docs/a_guide_to_secondary_suites.pdf) If you allow a wild west of suites in Oak Bay, mark my word, Oak Bay will turn in to the chaotic and unpleasant mess that the City of Victoria has become - the renters outnumber the property owners and now control who gets elected....unless you want a bunch of Ben Isitts and Lisa Helps' running Oak Bay in the next 8 or so years!

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Minimum lot size helps to ensure space between neighbours so people who choose not to have a suite in their home are less impacted by additional noise, mandatory business license means there is some effort involved on the home owners part to comply to bylaws etc, the requirement for off street parking for both new and existing suites helps keep our narrow neighborhood streets easy to navigate.	I'd increase the minimum lot size. I also would limit the number of suites approved in each neighbourhood or keep it the way it is now with not allowing them		South oak bay			I think adding seconds suites to oak bay will be a major negative for the lovely non crowded neighbourhood feel that draws so many to the area. If it is approved I think there should strong restrictions and limits on the number of suites per neighbourhood. Many people have chosen to buy here because of the lovely family orientated feel and space between neighbours.
It permits more home owners to rent out their suite, and allows more lower income families to have a place to live. Victoria and oak bay are experiencing a housing crisis where younger people simply cannot afford to live due to rising housing costs. This can be countered by increasing housing supply through rental suites.						
Off street parking requirement will eliminate too many homes that would otherwise qualify to have a secondary suite.	Parking			Pilot program is only intended to delay. Program should be implemented district wide as this type of housing is sorely needed.	Again, the rezoning program - like the Pilot Program - is not cautionary but obstruction. Simply pass the secondary suite program district wide.	Simply pass the secondary suite program district wide. Not everyone will be happy but Oak Bay will become a more dynamic, youthful community and provide much needed housing for the area.
We need additional housing in Oak Bay, housing that will only be affordable if people are allowed to have suites to assist with the mortgage. A lot of the homes in Oak Bay are older homes and so to suite them, the restrictions need to be somewhat flexible in terms of how the suite will be laid out (size ratio etc), but should always be safe for the renter. I also feel an owner needs to register the suite, get a licence (affordable license) and claim the rent as taxable income.	That there be an annual licence required to ensure the suite is to standard/safe to live in and that people are claiming the rent as taxable income			There are already multiple (unlicenced, illegal) suites in Oak Bay. Just go on and legalize them so that people like me and my husband (annual income of \$150,000) are able to buy a home, use a suite income to bump up the amount we can purchase and allow us to remain in the neighbourhood we have lived in for nearly 15 years.		Make haste, is my additional comment.
Prioritizes housing needs for all people over exclusion based on class/income.					It creates too large of a barrier during a time when people need more help to pay mortgages and have safe and dignified housing.	

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Some oversight from the district and consideration to neighbouring properties without putting too much restrictions	Yes, I would not limit to zoning but allow in all single family home. With the cost of housing if we want to attract young families in our community we need to allow them to subsidize their income to be able to afford a home.					
Mandatory business license	Change parking to scenario B				Too expensive.	
						I don't want suites in Oak Bay
						I am opposed to suites in Oak Bay
						Don't legalize suites in Oak Bay
						Don't legalize suites in Oak Bay
I picked B because I think owners should live in the house, too and there should be no requirement to register a suite. BUT B is flawed because it says required to provide parking, and that I do not support that requirement. Vast majority of secondary suite renters do not have a car - where is the option to say renters cannot have a car??	Yes! Providing parking should NOT be required. What about an option that says if you don't provide a parking spot, you can only rent to renters without a vehicle?			We do not need a pilot program!!!! Communities all over BC allow secondary suites - Just move forward and get on with this. A pilot is just another stalling tactic.	That is a ridiculous, bureaucratic requirement. Come on - what other municipality require a site-specific refining program?!	Please just move on with legalizing secondary suites. We don't have one and most likely won't be adding one, but this municipality is so far behind in allowing alternate forms of accommodation. No pilot project - just legalize with building code requirements and do it now.
						There should be no secondary suites in Oak Bay. It would ruin the community. It ruined Fairfield and is the reason why we moved to OB. We had no parking, our stuff was stolen in our house and we had no idea who were our neighbours were because of the transient nature of suites.
I'd like there to be building compliance and accountability by city and home owners but this should be easy to do for extra housing in a very low density area of Victoria	See above.	Just get it passed. This has been going on for years and needs to be done. Oak Bay does little to accommodate people within the greater city and it is needed. Students and single people and families are in a housing crisis		Don't do it. It is just more study and delay	Do this easily and quickly. Don't make it painful but city should have a record of all suites	Please work quickly
Off street parking is essential on our narrow, congested roads.	Regular on-site visits to ensure continued compliance.	RS5				
Everything					Pilot unnecessary	We need more housing options.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
		These questions are so vague and unclear that this survey is not valid.	These questions are so vague and unclear that this survey is not valid.	These questions are so vague and unclear that this survey is not valid.	These questions are so vague and unclear that this survey is not valid.	These questions are so vague and unclear that this survey is not valid.
Business license if you are renting your home for financial gain.	No					
One off street parking for new and existing suites	Max. Unit size 40% or 90 m2 whichever is less				I do not think that the zone you live in should determine if you are allowed to have a suite in your house. The determination should be based on following the regulations cited above (ie parking off street,	I don't think the zone you live in should determine whether you are allowed or not to have a suite in your house. The determination should be based on following the regulations cited above (min. Lot size, off-street parking, max sq. Ft of the suite, ...)
minimizing land use space (space is something we never get back) and regulation compliance and business licence to ensure a fair tax expectation from non secondary suite owners.		who is selecting the test zone and how is that test zone explored and presented to the community it is in.		Yes, these questions are a bit confining, i believe they are not open questions but more so directed with bias.		
						Strongly opposed - DO NOT WANT SECONDARY SUITES!!!
Minimum lot size and owner occupied				If this program is going to work, it has to work for the whole district. It becomes a NIMBY situation if you separate on section from another		Stop wasting time!! Oak Bay is part of the housing shortage problem. Open your eyes. Young people have nowhere to live and this municipality has been sitting on their hands for decades while the situation becomes dire. The community is amazing but it shouldn't be so elitist.
There is a housing crisis here and I don't think there should be any policing that will minimize the possibility of having more/accessible housing	No.					
Off-street parking and business license requirements			Estevan			
					Closeness to public transit.	
Regulations	No					
I allows young families to be able to buy existing houses and would reduce those with a lot of money tearing down our current houses then building huge inappropriate homes			near public transport and shopping to reduce the need for vehicles.			

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Trying to control how people live ie eating is well beyond what a community should try. How would a boarding arrangement be enforced.	I don't think it advisable for neighbourhoods to turn into areas of investment only, no private ownership. It changes the stability of a neighbourhood too much.				There will have to be a development permit and building permit if new construction is required. If existing a building inspector must do an inspection, so existing will also need a minimum of a building permit application.	
If you wanted to move to Fairfield for a secondary sweet do so. Oakbay it's not that kind of community I don't know why you didn't allow that option on your questions except a railroad the answers	If you wanted to move to Fairfield for a secondary sweet do so. Oakbay it's not that kind of community I don't know why you didn't allow that option on your questions except a railroad the answers	See above				This is probably one of the worst surveys that shows by us for secondary suites — does not Gauge How many people are against it and then of those who are potentially thinking about secondary suites limiting the survey to just those. The results of the survey can be very skewed and taken out of context it will definitely get the attention of the media and I'm very concerned about what's been done here and I will be bringing it to the media's attention
No owner occupancy						Please make it easier for younger people to afford housing in Oak bay
Most regulated and no on street parking	Don't want at all					Don't want at all
Most efficient way to create housing availability in Oak Bay						
housing shortage is so severe that max number of suites possible is necessary						
license			Henderson			Limit secondary suites
No business license	Owner occupied not required					I think suites are a great idea, housing is unaffordable especially in Oak Bay
We are in a housing availability and affordability crisis with more and more families falling into homelessness every day. Remove rental and secondary suite restrictions of all kinds to enable homeowners to provide housing and address this crisis.	It would happen immediately.			Please take a blanket and sweeping approach to address the urgent housing crisis immediately.	Site specific and case by case approach will do nothing to help the families becoming homeless every day in the CRD. It is a gutless, fear-led status quo maneuver and needs to be summarily rejected by compassionate and responsible leaders.	Please permit secondary suites everywhere, immediately and with urgency. It is the ultimate responsibility of planners to ensure there is an adequate housing supply. Please imagine your legacy and what contribution you made to help your precariously housed neighbours. Homelessness is your responsibility and the buck stops with you. Don't blow this. Everyone deserves a home. Thank you.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I am not in favour of secondary suites. If you cannot afford a condo or home in Oak Bay you cannot live here. People are not entitled to live wherever they want. When we lived in Vancouver I would love to have lived in Shaughnessy or British Properties, but we could not afford to so we lived in Burnaby.	No secondary suites, other than existing ones, allowed. We do not need or want more people, cars, crime, etc. that this would bring.					Please do not allow more suites in Oak Bay. No one I know wants more suites, people, traffic, cars, crime, congestion. Leave Oak Bay alone!
Most aligned with the objective of supporting densification and alternative housing options. Least regulated.						
Extra parking and compliance program						
Broad participation where most residents get to choose if they want to have suites etc.	A secondary suites make additional demands on all services and infrastructure. These should be paid by the owners of the properties. This is especially true for non renewable services. Therefore owners should pay higher taxes for municipal services; this means they need to be registered and regulated under a business license. Suites should require extra parking. (Even if it means cleaning out the garage)		Any neighbourhood would be good. The one one with the most suites currently or potentially would be a very good option			There is a housing shortage in Victoria. Many if not most of our first responders live outside the area. We need to act (to permit and regulate) secondary suites. But we need a clearer vision of the future for Oak Bay and how we are going to provide affordable housing
Home owners are able to provide a secondary suite to family members or rent a suite to the most suitable candidate in the most efficient way if fewer restrictions on suites are imposed. Building codes, health, safety and community enforcement should always be a part of the plan. The size of the lot, size of the suite, and occupation should be up the home owner.	Make the enforcement less complain based and more regulated by the district. Enforcement should never be simply on the honour system. Voluntary or mandatory registration should be implemented into this plan as well so building codes can be monitored.					People need nice , safe places to live. Langford can do it. So can Oak Bay.
						When I lived in "illegal" suites, I had no support or backup as a tenant as it was all unofficial, now that I live in an apartment building, I feel more positively supported buy being part of the tenancy act of BC. There are so many "illegal" suites and some landlords get away with all sorts of things because of this.
Prevent abuse				Allow with tight controls clearly defined up front	Keep it simple and same for all	

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Oppose secondary suites so selected most restrictive option.	Allow suites only in Uplands		Uplands			Do not support secondary suites
Not so many restrictions	No			Pilot projects just prolonging allowing suites, they are already here, and don't seem to be causing any trouble	No	I love living in Oak Bay my children both had to buy somewhere else in Victoria as they couldn't afford the house prices; could of if they were able to have a suite to help pay the mortgage.
My scenario was mixed between b & d. so I really don't have a definite preference.			All of Oak Bay. There are many large homes with few people living in them. Many seniors could stay in their homes longer if they were freely allowed to rent suites. The cost of maintaining a home as one ages is difficult when one is on a fixed income and taxes and utilities continue to rise. I believe this contributes to the overall rise in house prices as the older generations are being forced out of their long time homes due to the high cost of maintenance. Younger generations are unable to afford these homes , Only the wealthy end up living in Oak Bay this in turn changes the dynamics of the community which should be balanced in all ways.	Just get it going.		They should be allowed throughout Oak Bay. I support a pilot program.
I think owner occupancy is the most important feature of this scenario.	Over time vehicle use will decline so I don't think it is necessary to require additional parking spaces.					I am in favour of densification of our community so that our children can see a route to living where they were raised.
	I would suggest to have a resident limit to the suite. For example, no more than 2 people per suite bedroom.					I think secondary suites are very effective in solving the housing problem we currently face. I strongly agree with having them approved! Thank you!
I think one must have mandatory registration for safety reasons and therefore also district initiated compliance , not just based on any complaints		RSS single family				I think more affordable housing is desperately needed throughout CRD so this would help. Rentals vs. condos I think are much better for many reasons but not affordable often for developers to create due to cost of land in Oak Bay especially. I also never understood why duplexes were no longer allowed ..I used to own one in Oak Bay and a friend and I owned it together, sharing a mortgage. I volunteer at an Abbeyfield type house in Oak Bay which is made up of suites and that works well.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Prefer only single family dwellings in Oak Bay						Prefer only single family dwellings in Oak Bay.
		?	?			
Strict compliance with regulations to ensure the responsible acceptance of residents in our communities and to not allow business operations for profit.	I would not like additional suites at all as high density populations should be based in city centres which is happening nicely in downtown Victoria. It is desirable to have the option to live in a lower density community with access to busier centres. That is an attraction to living in Oak Bay. Condominium development along Oak Bay Avenue, Cadboro Bay Rd and perhaps Foul Bay Rd should be encouraged for a higher density population base for Oak Bay.					If there are additional suites allowed there should be a licensing requirement that provides house owner responsibility for the actions of the residents. For example, parking only allowed in front of house where the suite is located. No profit making businesses should be allowed to buy houses and create suites for rental purposed - owners should live in homes.
It would maximize the potential for adding affordable housing, and give homeowners flexibility in how they pursued this.				Secondary suites are well and successfully incorporated in other parts of The CRD. We don't need to reinvent the wheel.	This is just a recipe for making it impossible to have a secondary suite. Waste of time and money.	This should have been done 20 years ago. Get on with it.
				We know the suites already exist and are needed to afford the homes and to house people. Just start demanding that new suites meet building codes, start grandfathering older suites if they are meeting		

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Bylaw compliance and strictest regulations for size and safety	Don't care about lot size . I do care about number of people, unrelated adults filling those suites and rental houses.			Reasonable safety codes. Start enforcing 2 parking spot rules for all houses and move parking off the streets. Why aren't people using their lanes to assist with safer biking. Create a mandatory tax and license fee to help pay for enforcement. Limit home occupancy/suite occupancies so there are less parking and noise and mess violations. This is the biggest problem having lived next to rental with 9 students!!! I feel real estate agents need to be involved in educating new owners about the rules and expectations with regards to suites and basic bylaws. Nothing is enforced except through complaint process and you have a tipping point effect of rules being ignored because everyone can get away with it. Put a timeline of 1 year to get registered and 2-3 years to inspect and get the suites to code. Keep compliance fees reasonable but non-compliance at a much higher penalty.		Recognize the need for them, set clear regulations and enforce them. Use social media, OB news and realtors to reinforce housing and basic bylaw rules for new residents and those that happily ignore "inconvenient" rules. Rentals get a bad rep for the main issues of noise, parking, garbage and unkempt gardens but that is all that I see with the UVic ghetto rentals that dominate upper Henderson area, my old neighbourhood. No enforcement for obvious issues with many houses in that area regarding garbage, derelict lots, dumping of furniture and too many tenants and cars.
Reflects other municipalities with secondary suites and the existence of what are now illegal suites in Oak Bay. As long as the building code or at minimum, health and safety requirements are met, people should be free to have a secondary suite. It is too difficult to regulate different lifestyles and family requirements - there is so much variety today in how people live together.	Would require unit size restriction.		Area bordered by Foul Bay Road from Oak Bay Avenue to King Street and east to just beyond Oak Bay High.	It seems frustrating to not be able to have legal suites in an area where there is a high demand for them - and especially in the areas close to the Victoria border and Oak Bay Rec Centre which are on good transportation routes for so many destinations and which could house many more people.		
no secondary suites	a new council that adheres to the wishes of the taxpayers			no secondary suites	no secondary suites	Don't even think about it
It's nice to have the parking spot option D adds control and enables the municipal to fairly charge for services	I don't think it should be complaint based				Site specific is the only open and fair way to measure the neighborhood response	

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Owner occupancy	Only secondary suites permitted	North Oak Bay	North Oak Bay	Survey the surrounding neighborhood as part - before and after		Issues with infrastructure must be addressed, especially sewage and water. On street parking can become a problem on narrow residential streets. 'Backyard' spaces for owners beside a secondary suite could be a recurring issue and a very sensitive one.
Doesn't need to be micro-managed by municipality. Not micro-managed in Victoria, and look how beautiful is Rockland, James Bay, and Fernwood. Suites don't need to be registered or licensed. How ridiculous. There is already good control through building inspection in construction process, and through Residential Tenancy Branch. They are not businesses and to suggest a business license is ridiculous. The idea is to increase options and affordability for homeowners and potential residents. And to disallow boarders if you put in a suite doesn't add to the housing base, it's neutral. Oak Bay can not refuse to join the rest of Greater Victoria and continue to make it impossible to reform our approach to housing.	Yes, specify that if the house is large enough there can be 2 secondary suites. Also there should be scenarios for duplexes, triplexes, and quadriplexes for large heritage style houses, similar to Rockland.		North Oak Bay	"Detailed regulation...research...best practices...community feedback" This is far too much stalling and over-examining! Be leaders! You know it's necessary and right. Just allow suites, make common sense decisions, and implement.	This would be utter madness! And completely undermine the reasonable attempt to reform housing policy in the municipality. You can't actually be serious!?!?	Please see above comments. And actually, recognize that North Oak Bay (not including Uplands) is very different from South Oak Bay and Uplands. There is easy access to the University; public transit along the several major through streets; shopping, groceries, restaurants, health care, recreation, high school, and other services. There is a broader socioeconomic mix of residents, and a more relaxed, open atmosphere. There is less need for cars. North Oak Bay is ideal for multiple suites, garden suites, and duplexes, triplexes etc. But this needs to be done, not studied any more, and Council will just be accountable through elections. Everyone will have a different opinion, but the OCP is in place so make it easy not more difficult. Oak Bay needs to be part of the solution and less of a frozen, arrogant anachronism. I have lived here on and off for more than 50 years and I understand the place. Having suites will make Oak Bay a happier place.
Least restrictive						secondary suites should be allowed to whomever would like to add them, providing they also provide an off street parking space
Protects existing neighbourhoods			North Oak Bay			

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Licensing and minimizing size	Think complaint base is enough	No preference, think pilot is good and seemed like a wider pilot then putting in one neighborhood		Survey the neighbors of the suite. While I appreciate the need for more housing having lived next to secondary suite rented by noisy people I have experienced being woken up many night		Not sure of legal aspects here, but I would like to see landlords more responsible for their tenants. The suite next to me was rented by students, who's parties flowed outside, and kept me awake. While the police were their to call, I would like to see some consequences for landlords as well
Prefer no sec suites at all	Prefer no sec suites at all			Prefer no sec suites at all So no need - moot point	Prefer no sec suites at all	Prefer no sec suites at all - I lived in Fairfield on Howe street and the experience was terrible with secondary suites, so moved to Oak Bay in 2014. The best neighborhood in CANADA
Allowing for increased housing with regulations in place		RS4	Henderson	Many secondary suites in Henderson area - would be good to regulate further		
There are no unnecessary restrictions that will limit the uptake of legal suites. Too much regulation especially parking will cause illegal suites like in saanich that are unsafe for residents	Accessory dwelling units should be allowed as secondary suites especially where there are alleyways. Also a pilot program that takes 2 years will not do anything to address the housing crisis and will encourage illegally suites to be constructed during the waiting period. We are in a housing crisis we need to start acting like it and get this moving!	Just regulate them now no pilot program we are in a housing crisis and all the communities around have had secondary suites for years. There will be illegal non compliant suites built during the waiting period so just regulate now.		Detached secondary suites should also be allowed they can be built on more properties and can be better quality housing for renters and owners.	I don't understand why it is even important to consider	
Owner occupied	Mandatory registration					
I don't like any of the scenarios	Add a scenario where suite is only allowed with rezoning and public hearing			There should be no pilot program. Suites permitted on a case by case basis only.		Why is the status quo not an option?
						I don't want suites in Oak Bay
One off street parking should be available for new and existing suites	District initiated compliance program should be minimal, not expensive to run.		Difficult to answer without having research data available to consider. Not sure one neighbourhood would be enough for a pilot. Why couldn't you sample a portion of all neighborhoods?			Secondary suite bylaws need to protect the neighbourhood... for additional noise, parking, suite development size, etc. With the current building bylaws at min 5' to property line...this does nothing to protect neighbours from negative impacts of noise, privacy, etc. Why do you allow building so close to property lines?

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
	Each house allowed to park only 1 vehicle of the street whether that be the home owner, boarder or renter of secondary suite, all additional vehicles must have off-street parking provided.				We do not need to spend money on a bureaucracy to manage individual rezoning applications. Make the rules and if an application complies, approve it.	Secondary suites are a secondary issue. The real issue is density in Oak Bay. We need to increase it meaningfully while respecting the nature and character of our neighborhood's. This to me means more housing options eg. townhomes, low-rise condos, and x-plexes. I'd rather see increased density be driven by more "home-owners" who take pride in their properties and neighborhoods rather than increasing rental stock.
Maybe some average Canadians could live in Oak Bay!	No			Get in with it!!	Just do it. No more bureaucratic delays.	2014 -78% supported secondary suites. Why are we doing another survey seven years later? Just do what the people are telling you to do. That is your job!!
Priority need will predictably be parking demands and the District needs to be hands-on to steer this major change to OB structure.		Given the sizeable sample of exiting secondary suites in OB, why create? Instead why not work with this sample to answer and questions and better define path forward?				With the additional information the District has put into the public domain why isn't a public vote being put forward as an option on such a fundamental retooling of the community character?
Requires more oversight..still feel the need for two additional off street parking	Require two additional parking stalls for the existing suite	Better fit for the zone				Secondary suites are problematic and become a drain on municipal resources.(police, fire, garbage, sewer, on street parking) and only benefit the property owner. In principal they sound good, in reality they are problematic
N/A. As I want no suites - the dynamics of the livability, safety, parking problem & too many cars, will change negatively	STOP THE PROCESS	NIMBY	NIMBY	No! Suites!	NIMBY	Our quiet peaceful serene beautiful city will be lost forever...and that's not an understatement
Non-discriminatory	N/a	N/a	N/a	No	No	No
requirement for off street parking and registration. Also owner-occupied and no boarders as well as a suite	no			Strongly oppose a pilot where specific zones or neighbourhoods are identified - unless they happen to be the Uplands and along Beach Drive.	This creates too much bureaucracy. Registration is sufficient.	

<p>Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)</p>	<p>Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)</p>	<p>Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)</p>
<p>Flexibility needed because OB strict building codes discourage home improvement and your red tape is overwhelming for simply basic improvements.</p>	<p>Owner occupied is my preference in either the suite or in the main house.</p>			<p>Pilot project should include whoever wants to make a suite.</p>		<p>Housing is required for family members too, who are aging and need to be on the ground floor so bathroom and tiny kitchenette should be allowed with out a lot of fuss about codes etc. My son was injured and could not make it up the stairs for months on end and we needed a small bathroom in the basement and kitchenette for his independence and we were refused because 1937 house needed to be brought up to current code which was a financial burden to us so he suffered and also my elderly father could not be accommodated in his last few fragile years on the ground floor.</p>
<p>I think that "luxury" secondary suites are unnecessary and that a cap on the size would restrict those looking for very large floor space to the over abundance of condominiums being built in Greater Victoria.</p>	<p>I would add District based compliance program to this scenario.</p>			<p>I actually have a problem with the concept of a pilot program. People are already renting parts of their houses so the situation already exists.</p>		<p>I actually have a problem with the attitude in Oak Bay and in Greater Victoria towards renters. The majority of people in Europe rent their accommodation, sometimes for generations. There is a bias against people who would be very happy to pay less than \$1200 for an apartment. My mother was a debutante here in Victoria. One of my forefathers was the Lt. Gov. of Upper Canada. Before my mother died, my parents owned a house in Uplands. I have never been a social outcast and when I was renting, which I did for many many years, I resented the attitude prevalent in North America that renters on the whole are an uneducated, economically disadvantaged lot who have no sense of responsibility. My priorities have always been travel and quality of life not owning property. We are not talking about letting the street people from the parks into these suites, but people whose life choices or even careers (artists of any sort) have not left them with enough money to - or the desire to - buy a dwelling.</p> <p>I also have to say the people who rent want the same things in their housing as the people who own. This is to say, lots of natural light, large windows, "normal" ceiling height etc. Renters are not sub-humans!</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Minimal government interference, freedom of choice.						
Our block is looking like a used car lot. Why should the property owner benefit financially yet we all put up with extra traffic and sometimes noise.	?		North Oak Bay	no but thank you for asking	Some streets are too narrow for the additional cars parked on the streets	NO and thank you for asking
						Oak Bay needs to maintain its' ambiance and that's the reason people live in the district. if secondary suites are added, that atmosphere is lost as it will become very congested, vehicle traffic alone would multiply. there are currently streets that are almost impossible to drive down due to cars parked both sides along the entire street. also all the infrastructure is aging and requires replacing. with secondary suites, there would be more people using roads, sewers, water mains, etc so would put more pressure on all infrastructure. Secondary suites would cause extreme congestion and traffic and Oak Bay would lose its' small community atmosphere. I don't believe that secondary suites are necessary. Those home owners who are advocating for secondary suites are looking to their own needs, ie. extra income and therefore secondary suites should not be permitted. I am totally against secondary suites being allowed in Oak Bay
more restrictions required as enforcement will be difficult. i am against any secondary suites being allowed	no secondary suites allowed in Oak Bay at all. there are already many in the district and that is sufficient	no pilot program, no secondary suites allowed	no pilot program, no secondary suites allowed	pilot programs always get out of hand, no way of mandating or controlling adequately	regardless of it's a specific rezoning or not, secondary suites are not required in Oak Bay	
This questionnaire is wildly unfair! Where's the don't support option!?!?					This is appalling! What about those of us who don't support suites?!	This is very upsetting: I do not support suites and this questionnaire is an insult.
Mandatory business license and District-initiated compliance program.	Yes, existing suites only! No new suites!			No pilot programs! No discussion in the survey about increased traffic and vandalism.	For existing suites only! No new suites to be permitted.	Strongly opposed any new secondary suites. The survey did not talk about extra policing costs, fire dept costs, garbage, recyclings costs or increased traffic in the area. Also Oak Bay already is showing very poor street and sidewalk maintenance from weeds etc. and secondary suites will only add to the unkept look of the neighborhoods, due to increased litter and car parking plus increased visitor parking on the street which is not even addressed here.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Owner occupant						
Would not require additional parking for existing, but would prefer a limit on size in sq.ft. as 40% of living area could be quite large (more like a duplex than secondary suite).	Size limit of 940 to 970 sf as is fairly typical of other municipalities in this region.	If this option were used zoning with larger site requirements make most sense to me.	Henderson to house UVic students.	I don't think a pilot program is critical considering the experience with other municipalities in the region, Oak Bay is coming late to the realization that there is a housing crunch and moving forward is more important.	Adding the expense and hassle of rezoning would stop most home owners interested in creating a suite.	It's about time, at least 5 years behind all other municipalities in the region.
To ensure compliance , health , safety and community considerations		Not sure				
maximum unit size no additional boarding no mandatory business license requiring an annual fee less expensive to taxpayer to enforce than district initiate program			near the village; near Oak Bay Avenue			please don't legalize suites Oak Bay residents, in general need to consider our level of entitlement. We can expand our population density with risking the community's culture and ambience. Oak Bay needs a larger population to sustain businesses.
Easier transition and better for tax payers	No	No	No		No	No
Better chance of correcting problems with existing suites while at the same time allowing new suites as long as they fit within the guidelines, i.e. back up one step to fix chronic issues where suites shouldn't have been in the first place while boldly moving forward with new accommodation that fits within the acceptable standards	Mandatory "registration" not mandatory "business license" in the traditional sense. Every existing suite needs to be grandfathered on a list, with or without deficiencies, for a small fee, then subject to complaint based enforcement if it has deficiencies that create neighbourhood problems. New suites need to make a proper application, make declarations of compliance, pay a proper fee for a license and after that it's complaint based enforcement. New construction or major renovations (involving a building permit) should require all that, doing it to full building code, giving notice to neighbours, plus an inspection before being given a suite occupancy permit.			Don't do a pilot in a select area then stop for a review before moving ahead in other areas, rather bite the bullet and come up with a master plan for the whole municipality and announce a phased implementation, either by area or on some other basis, so city hall isn't overwhelmed with applications and complaints. There's so much catch up that needs to be done, we can't afford to keep dilly-dallying. Taking tentative little baby steps will take too long. Mind you, that requires a council and staff that can focus on practical alternatives, not spin off getting bogged down on grievances, petty details, and pie in the sky thinking. Hmm, is Stew Young available for hire as a consultant?		

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Closest to my preferences in previous answers	I don't think lot or unit size (in m2) should be a consideration. Limiting to 40% should be fine, and would allow very large homes to create even larger living units that could accommodate families	I would suggest denser zones such as RS4 and RS5 are good pilot areas as they may be more challenging. Lower-density zones, like RS1 - RS3, are much more likely to be able to accommodate secondary suites more easily (e.g. parking). Using the higher-density zones would (a) provide 'worst-case' data and (b) demonstrate whether all zones should allow secondary suites.	Not applicable.	I think there are three big challenges. First, in denser zones, the residences might not be suitable to suite. Second, it seems many residences in the district are not up to modern codes to begin with, so it may be difficult to get good suites. Finally, there can be a major investment, significant time and inconvenience in developing a secondary suite, so there may need to be some form of financial incentive or guarantee that would encourage new suites to participate in the pilot. (Alternatively, you could incentivise people with unregulated suites to participate in the pilot and related inspections/upgrades/estimations.)	I think it's a good idea, at least to help the municipality track and monitor housing availability, but it shouldn't be onerous or costly. I also don't think we need to post rezoning signs all over the place.	My biggest concern about secondary suites (or densification) in any municipality is the loss of single-family residences that can actually suit a family. It seems to be nearly impossible to find a rental home for family of 5+ (including multi-generational families). Even a 3-bedroom is very challenging. So splitting homes that were intentionally design for a family and its needs as the kids grow, often means neither 'suite' is ideal, while seemingly trying to solve availability by reducing space/person. Personally, I'd much rather see densification activities limited to primary transit corridors, like the Shelbourne Valley Plan, for example. That doesn't appear to have been a consideration of the OPC.
						please don't legalize suites
						Keep Suites out of Oak Bay
						we don't want suites in our district
Registration and enforcement	No additional parking and only existing suites			Only existing suites, mandatory registration and enforcement		Look at the disaster Fairfield is with all of their suites. The streets are jammed with cars and it is so over populated. Suites do not address the need for higher density housing such as duplexes and row housing. These are so needed in Oak Bay. It is time to get away from single family homes with or without suites and apartment style condos and have nicer row housing like every other municipality. These housing options and not suites, are an important part of downsizing and staying within Oak Bay instead of moving to Saanich or Sidney.

<p>Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)</p>	<p>Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)</p>	<p>Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)</p>
<p>Must be Owner Occupied to monitor and be responsible for every facet of home ownership in Oak Bay. Home owner must take responsibility for actions of Tenants re bylaws, noise and parking, condition of property and registration of a pet and animal control as it pertains to quiet enjoyment of neighbours property and safety and well being of neighbourhood. Ie..how many dogs per home, what breeds are considered dangerous and banned from urban rental suites...this is so important ie. pit bulls are everywhere now as these dogs were the only breed remaining in shelters for adoption after Covid isolation, accelerated the adoption of most dogs and cats in shelters...dangerous dogs were the only breeds remaining and are now out and on the streets in droves and not muzzled. Other issues that make a dog a liability and not acceptable in suites for</p>						

<p>Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)</p>	<p>Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)</p>	<p>Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)</p>
<p>sure are excessive barking and never leaving a pet at night or outside of property unleashed. Nuisance Pets to be evicted by bylaws officer if they are out at night or running off leash or barking..I am a dog owner and lover but...just like renting your condo or Townhouse, when you are responsible for the behaviour and habits of tenants and the strata council holds you responsible for tenants strict adherence to all bylaws and rules..fines are levied and continue for each and every infraction. The importance in choosing a perfect tenant with all the checks and contracts filled out as per the Landlord and Tenant agreement etc. of BC should be discussed in detail and perhaps a short day course or online tutorial anonymously could be promoted to all home owners getting into or already secondary suites in their homes. I have had rentals in two condos I owned and joined a group, the name has changed somewhat but like Rental society for owners of rental properties. Small fee for the services offered..all forms that are currently used by Landlord and Tenants Anreements</p>						

<p>Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)</p>	<p>Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)</p>	<p>Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)</p>
<p>Giving Notice to tenants due to various reasons..owner needs suite for family member, unpaid rent, noise or other activities not in the agreement, etc. Quick consult with a lawyer in case of emergent problems needing evictions, or Police attendance, Credit reports on All applying tenants within 24 hrs. that no one else can do. As an experienced owner of tenant choosing and business actions and forms, needed as per a legally binding tenancy, but for the protection of the home owner as opposed to the tenants, which is already heavily weighted in favour of the tenant as per Landlord and Tenant Agreement. Following the guidelines fastidiously is the answer to a good outcome as the landlord, and the tenant. I would be happy to assist Oak Bay with this, but I am sure you have people on staff who have experience as I have. These are the most common problems with neighbours..1.....too many cars and visitors due to secondary suites.</p> <p>Too much noise due to outdoor parties, music, animals being brought in even if</p>					<p>As stated above, Oak Bay needs these suites now for seniors and for helping the almost 0 vacancy rate in Oak Bay which means that service and young people, many the adult children of Oak Bay residents, can not live here due to a</p>	

<p>Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)</p>	<p>Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)</p>	<p>Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)</p>
<p>paperwork says no pets. Extra tenants staying overnight and using water, etc. Hard to monitor..Official paperwork states clearly about who and how long a visitor can stay in the home..good to go over that in detail before signing anything. There are several more scenarios that are dealt with ahead of acceptance of tenants, that are so important to be discussed and signed by tenants. The problems in rentals mostly come to light at the end of the tenancy, and without all the paperwork done well at the beginning, there is little recourse for any damage, no notice, theft, bounced cheques, damage deposit being withheld for good reason. 2. Boarders tenants can bring cars and noise and visitors and added to a home with a secondary suite with more people is more like a hotel and not good for a single family home neighbourhood. One small suite about 900:sq. Feet is enough for two adults and a child in my opinion but according to Oak Bay might be different. I think some control over the number of tenants in the secondary suites is important. I do know that in rental apartments, the regs. were, One child in one private bedroom and two adults sharing a second private bedroom. What are your thoughts re that issue. How many people are acceptable in one home in Oak Bay?</p>	<p>Don't know about the zoning numbers stated in my scenario but voted for it anyway, as I am so Committed to the Importance of there being a home owner and manager of the home and suite being on site, I had to vote that scenario.</p>			<p>Many other districts are allowing suites and I think learning about the pitfalls from them would be relevant. By doing pilot programs, I think you will be lax in dealing with the urgent housing crisis and also interfering with needs of Oak Bay Seniors who want to age in place..we are many and cannot bare to think about ending up in a senior's home or worse, a nursing home due to the Covid lockdowns and isolation of vulnerable seniors. Many of us who are seniors are terrified as we contemplate the likelihood that more viruses like Covid, Sars, Covid Variants, and new viruses from countries who are sharing markets with live animals who carry viruses, lethal to humans will be a way of life. We must plan for our care and the care of our property when we are no longer able, and that means in our single family homes with a suite for caregivers. The alternative, care homes of any kind or cost means that we likely will experience the same lockdown and isolation that we have witnessed these past two years. It is not the way we want to die or simply exist. Please take these concerns very seriously.</p>	<p>doubling of property values in the last three years. Most people, young and old unless already property owners in Victoria, cannot purchase and never will be able .to do so. Offering rental accommodation is an obligation and a right in my opinion and to not do so will stifle business and services and hospitality industries,like restaurants, including Rec Centre Workers, Caregivers, Day Care workers, and minimum wage earners, and municipal Hall inside and outside workers. Suites are long overdue and needed now, not later. Trust the home owners many who have been operating secondary suites for years.</p>	<p>I believe that every home with or without a suite should be checked by Fire Department for Smoke Alarms, Radon and Carbon Monoxide alarms, as well as looking around and in the properties for situations that can lead to Fires or any other Dangerous situations like Gas Leaks, spontaneous combustion areas etc. These are the Basics that should be checked in a serious manner for the good of the Fire Department and Home Owners, and Tenants, along with Neighbours. These continued checks would give valuable information to Oak Bay about what programs need to be implemented in order to compel owners to make their homes safe.</p>
<p>Registered, parking</p>						<p>Owner occupied is necessary and parking on their street. Right now tenants from Monterey are parking on Hampshire at Lafayette park - and we see them walk across park to their suites. Users of the park are then parking in front of our houses on Hampshire.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I believe that Scenario A would allow for homeowners to easily provide secondary suites. With the other scenarios, many homeowners would not be able to provide secondary suites due to arbitrary regulations such as what neighbourhood they are in.	I think parking might be a concern on some busier streets. I use to live on Monterey Ave. near Oak Bay Ave. and parking was very limited on weekends due to many people visiting the avenue. On the contrary, I now live on Kelsey Pl. / Frederick Norris Rd., where parking spaces are abundant, as everyone has a large driveway and the roads are never busy.					I believe that secondary suites are strongly needed in Oak Bay. There is an immense housing shortage in Greater Victoria, and by allowing secondary suites in Oak Bay, there will be more homes available for renters. Furthermore, Oak Bay is within close proximity to Downtown Victoria, thus Oak Bay is a great place for professionals to live in. Finally, Oak Bay is full of large homes that can easily have a secondary suite, and it is far overdue to allow more people to live in Oak Bay.
increase affordable housing						
Secondary suites have the potential to ruin the character of OakBay and need to be either prohibited or very tightly regulated.			Not mine.	They are just a way of of creating a 'thin wedge' of getting something passed that the vast majority of people do no want.	It seems like the strongest way to limit secondary suites. I would first like to completely prohibit them, but if this is the only option, I suppose I would be behind this one.	I moved to Oak Bay 12 years ago and pay the high prices and taxes because of the single family neighborhoods. Yes, many people cannot afford to live here, and it took my wife and I, 20 years of saving before we could afford to live here. People who can't afford to live here need to find a cheaper alternative, and then save and sacrifice for many years (perhaps decades) before they can afford to live here. Allowing secondary suites will destroy the character of Oak Bay (single family homes) and needs to be prohibited or HEAVILY restricted.
Oak Bay holds owners responsible for managing the suites lawfully and how they impact the rest of the neighbour hood.	Parking is a major issue in South Oak Bay. Trades People already make it difficult for busses and locals to pass by. There appears to be little interest in enforcement in Oak Bay already, what will make it any better when dealing with the suite regulation issue.		Landsdowne Slope	Will enforcement and compliance be part of the pilot?	You get what you pay for. Don't cheap out on this.	Under certain conditions this could work. Parking will always be the biggest issue for the neighbours. For every one bedroom suite you will have two additional cars added to the area. Think about that!
The most fair option.	Additional parking required			Two biggest issues are noise and parking. If these are managed, secondary suites should be fine.		
Enforcement / Parking / Unit size						
Would offer the most flexibility to home owners, increase affordability, and increase housing supply.	Owner occupancy required and enforcement by municipality to ensure compliance			It's been studied for too long. Time for change is now.	Much too labour intensive. Those with deeper pockets would be advantaged and I don't trust Council or staff to be equitable to all applicants	It's been allowed in almost every other part of Victoria without catastrophic results. We can also make it easier for young people to afford to live in Oak Bay.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Will allow for the most properties to have secondary suites	Registration requirement. I feel that the only way to keep Oak Bay with the feel it has today, is to ensure that the suite are properly regulated.			A pilot program that requires a home owner to build a suite, but at the end of the program, not be able to use the suite, seems like someone hasn't actually thought through the process they are proposing. Is this not trying to create home security, and the above doesn't create that. The occupants of the suite don't know that they aren't going to be kicked out in the future, and the home owners don't know if they will keep getting the income from the suite.	This seems like a it would be very hard to council. How many SFD do you think will want to apply, how many does council think they can approve in a month?	There are so many non-legal suites within Oak Bay. I hope those people don't benefit unfairly from this process, and that all residents (those both following and non following the current rules) get to benefit from this process equally.
There are currently illegal secondary suites in our area and it causes parking problems. More suites and B&B will increase this.			Henderson as it is close to UVIC and Camosun. Student housing is in short supply.	Time to get with the reality OB. It's already happening	Parking!	Please realize that by not allowing secondary suites it puts a burden on all other municipalities and is ignorant to the fact it is already happening all over the district. Quit obfuscating and get on with it. Please.
Closest to the mix I picked	No additional parking required - many elderly may have only one car so new tenants just use available space. And business licenses so the district knows where the suites are and can tailor licences in the future to ensure success of the change while maximizing flexibility				Too onerous and will Mean people will stay below the radar	This is already happening in an unmonitored way. Before covid, there were dozens of Air B&Bs and other types of illegal suites on every street. Please permit this form of gentle infill
More flexibility						
There is a desperate need for affordable housing and densification in our community. Young people and families cannot afford to make ends meet. Scenario A best meets this challenge.				Don't do it. Actually implement them district wide. We need the housing.	This is so onerous and unnecessary. These suites already exist all over Oak Bay. We need the housing. Get it done.	This is an issue of equity and fairness. Please do this to help young people and families who are struggling to make ends meet. We would love to have tenants in our empty secondary suite.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot zones </u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Less restrictions to increasing resident density in oak Bay						This change is so important to allow greater diversity and inclusion into our community, especially in a time when one had to commit millions to own a home in oak Bay.
	Off street parking mandatory for existing suites as well		jubilee			Would prefer our municipal resources be put into locating and ending unauthorized suites rather than legitimizing them... changing the rules to suit the rule breakers is offensive. We sacrificed much to move here, and expect the character of our neighborhood to be protected rather than eroded, as it was the principle reason for choosing this municipality over others.
Maximizes gentle density without losing green space for parking.						We need gentle density, with no additional parking requirements so that green space is not compromised.
It's the only responsible option in a housing crisis.						This needs to be done. If isn't, this mayor and council will be ostensibly ineffectual.
Parking regulations	Land use changed to all lots with single family homes Boarders allowed				This would make it less likely for some homeowners to have a suite and/or do it 'legally'. We have a housing crisis in this city — let's try to make it better!	
			Carnarvon			
Provides the least barriers to increasing housing options to people wanting to live in Oak Bay and to homeowners struggling with rising costs of property taxes/utilities/and generally the high cost of living that is going to start forcing people out of this expensive area.	I do think there should be some minimum safety requirements/one off-street parking spot and voluntary registration. Suites need to be safe for people.			I cannot believe after all this time and all the existing information from every other municipality that Oak Bay is considering a pilot program. Please get on with the process and please stop wasting more time and money.		Existing homes in Oak Bay have always had suites. Houses are selling with suites. Houses are being built with suites.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>Yes. I would like to say this survey's questions display exactly the type of narrow minded attitudes towards suites that Oak Bay Watch harbours.</p> <p>The continued follow-up questions confirming whether somebody's house would comply with your previous question is not only a privacy invasion, it is a xenophobic paranoid pattern, and also happens to NOT BE RELEVANT to the outcome whatsoever.</p> <p>Get secondary suites legal already, and quickly. We have a housing shortage in the region while many of our neighborhoods are full of multi-million dollar nearly-empty teardowns.</p>
					Abstract Development has built secondary suites in all their new houses with small lot sizes already.	
				A waste of time.	This will make it so difficult and tedious that the secondary suites will only look good as far as optics (Oak Bay is doing its part) but get hung up in red tape and never actually happen.	It's about time. Let's get this ball rolling
Homeowners should basically be able to do what they want with their homes, provided safety is addressed						
			Estevan			
Easiest for all concerned, flexibility for home owner / occupants, least intrusive, relies on existing laws and codes.				We already have a pilot program in the form of existing secondary suites. We need more housing options now.	Overkill	In my experience visiting and living in various cities around Canada and the world, the more housing diversity in a community, the better it is for citizens, the community and businesses.
I think that the present ("underground") density is just fine as it is, but I do think that landlords/homeowners should pay property taxes based on the real/truthful occupancy of their properties.	For the increased parking requirements, I think some streets in Oak Bay should be made one-way, to allow the traffic to actually flow. E.G. Oak Bay Avenue/Cadboro Bay Avenue loop.	Wherever streets are wider, or where parking could be restricted to one side of the street only.				

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Living in this neighborhood is expensive and getting more so and suites can help defray costs. And increasing density can help people (especially younger and older people) remain in the neighborhood.	I would want to see an "owner occupied" provision in Scenario A			Secondary suites are not new. Why do we need a pilot program? This is something that goes on in every other part of the city and in every city worldwide. Just do it or don't do it. And I prefer that we do it.		Just do it already.
It will ensure owners who want to rent a suite make it safe for their tenants, and that the impact of suites on the neighbourhood is the least disruptive it can be.	The interdiction to use the same neighbour's on-street parking space multiple days in a row. (I feel the taxes I pay give me priority, over the illegal suite's tenant from across the street, on the on-street parking space in front of my house. I lost that space for about three years when a tenant commandeered that spot and just left her car there, sometimes for weeks on end, without using it.)	A link to a legend with zone definitions on this survey would be helpful. As it stands, even a google search doesn't easily yield that info.			I don't feel it's a good use of our Mayor and Council's time, and can lead to inconsistent re-zoning assessments.	This whole survey is done with the assumption that a secondary suite program is, in fact, going ahead. My understanding was that previous surveys showed a majority of residents are against this idea. Can producers of these survey tools provide more clarity (transparency) on previous efforts?
			Near village centres, e.g. Oak Bay village, Estevan.			More housing types are needed in Oak Bay.
Owner occupancy and voluntary registration.	Land use to all single family homes.			A pilot program cannot work because if it fails you would be kicking people out of their new homes. It makes no sense. Just legalize suites.	Way too much bureaucracy for this to be implemented. Too slow to fulfill housing needs.	Secondary suites are needed and Oak Bay has a moral obligation to help the housing crisis.
If Oak Bay is allowing suites, they should actively enforce them. Also, a suit is a business and a fee should be charged annually to help pay for that enforcement.	Suites would not be able to occupy 40% of home. It should be much less. Also, if it is 40%, the same calculation should be used for parking as it is for current homes. So we should have an additional 1.8 off street parking spots per unit that is 40% of the home. A suit that is 20% would only require 1 additional. Also, If we are enforcing covered parking requirements for owners, the same requirement should be used for suites. At least one of the spots needs to be covered parking		Lots should be large enough to accommodate additional parking spots. Since Uplands would allow this, we should have the pilot done there.			Parking needs to be addressed before moving forward. Most homes in Oakbay are small and were set up as single family or even cottages originally. Traffic is already an issue as well. We simply are not set up to accommodate more without major lot or road revisions. If, ultimately it is chosen to allow, it would be fiscally irresponsible to not have a source of funds for the city to support. A home that allows a secondary suite should have a tax increase in relation to the % of home that is now a suite. This additional cost should not be spread over all homes across Oak Bay. This could cover the additional use of all our infrastructure including sewer/water/roads as well as helping pay for enforcement of rules.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
It is most in line with what other municipalities are doing for secondary suites, and that seems to be working well.	I think we should allow boarding rooms in houses closest to the university.					
More housing options for everyone.						OB needs to get with the times and look at the housing crunch in Victoria. Young adults and seniors on fixed incomes can hardly afford to live here any more. If you want a vibrant neighborhood that supports people of all income levels, secondary suites are a must.
Will provide the most opportunity for additional affordable housing	Prefer either boarding or secondary suites, not both in same house				Absolutely a deterrent to increasing supply of affordable housing	
Mandatory compliance. Permits required. I did a minor renovation to my home and was required to get a permit and follow code, we had multiple inspections by the city staff. Certainly if you are creating a second home within a home you should be held to the same standards or greater.	I would change it to no minimum lot size. The lot size is irrelevant.... compliance to code, getting permits and government oversight is everything.			We don't need a pilot program. That's a waste of time and money. Secondary suites are commonly accepted form of housing density all over the world. Oak bay is no different.	Every secondary suite existing or not needs to be reviewed and held to the highest standards. Meeting all rules and regulations. If that can not be achieved then there should be no suite allowed.	
It has the fewest impediments to creating a secondary suite in a home while providing some control (owner occupied, parking) to ensure the neighbours/neighbourhood are not adversely affected.						
Unit size and compliance program.	Owners are not required to live in dwelling.			Limiting suits to certain areas will create parking problems, limit options for homeowners outside those areas and limit potential suits that could help with lack of rental housing in Victoria.		Pricing has become exorbitant. Consider a cap or coded system for determining price. One bedroom suits for single occupant should not cost anywhere near 2000\$ a month no matter what amenities it has and I have personally seen this is Oak Bay.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						As parents and grandparents are getting older it is becoming increasingly harder (and expensive) to find care options for them. By allowing families the option to live together (multi-generational housing), it allows for care options to be expanded and loved ones to stay home longer. Allowing the option for carriage homes allows families to stay together longer and Oak Bay to be an affordable option to live (this is said by someone who has stayed in Victoria her whole life and contributed to the community). Please consider keeping families together and allowing generations to stay in Oak Bay.
			N/A			
Voluntary registration	Size limits			I think that we need to have more density and opportunities for people to afford their homes. Housing trends are further widening the gaps between the haves and the have nots. Oak Bay can take a leadership roll in making sure that those raised in our community can stay in our community.	Site specific re-zoning has the potential to cause more problems than it's worth. We are at a housing crisis and more recently inventory is critical. Re-zoning could be expensive, slow, and hinder the development of secondary suites.	
Owner occupied, complaint based	Mandatory registration, neighborhood based and pilot program first before full implementation		North Oak Bay			
I think owners should be able to have a suite in their home regardless of lot size or house size.	I think it's important that the suites are safe for tenants (I.e. meet building code standards)			I'm not sure how a pilot program would be beneficial. There is already precedent for secondary suites in Saanich and Victoria (and other surrounding municipalities) which show benefits of suites for housing crisis.	I think this would cause significant amount of work for the city of oak bay and also for homeowners. It would give a large amount of approval to neighbors which could be very difficult for the city and homeowners to navigate.	I didn't buy a home in Oak Bay because of concerns around not being able to have a secondary suite. Thank you for considering them! I would also be very interested in laneway/garden suites in Oak Bay. They have been approved by Victoria and Saanich. Because Oak Bay has many laneways they could be a great alternative to secondary suites in houses.
More flexibility	No					
simplicity and greater potential for suites for more homeowners.	no	pilot program would not inform the decisions. the many successful operating suites now extant are in effect, pilot projects.	no pilot project required and certainly no prejudicial selection as to which neighbourhood or zone to be allowed to have sec suites.	It would be a complete waste of time and money and prove nothing.	Health and safety regulations, current District bylaws, Laws and the BC Building Code, cover all necessary aspects of suite operation.	Keep it simple and sensible.
	Secondary suites permitted in all single family homes			An unofficial pilot program has been going on for years. Get on with it!!!		Let's move on. Make it official and stop wasting time and resources in this issue

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Liveability	On street parking restricted to residents and passes		Any			
Best balance offered between positives and drawbacks of secondary suites	laneway/garden suites allowed		those with bigger lot sizes to start	parking is going to be a major issue. Noise problems also possible		While secondary suites are a long-awaited step in the right direction, garden suites and laneway housing need to be considered at the same time. Both Victoria and Saanich have appropriate bylaws already on their books so Oak Bay does not need to re-invent that wheel. With an aging population in OB, seniors could be able to age in place in a smaller dwelling with the across the yard support of family or friends. If a new normal is going to be better for all, this is a large step in that direction. Thank you
	Mandatory registration	Doesn't matter to me	Doesn't matter	Clearly defined and published success criteria		This is all for long term rentals yes? Not short term? My answers are for long term
Licensing, enforcement, max size, owner occupancy	New Off street parking not required so long as existing off street parking is available.	RS5				Regulated secondary suites are a preferred method of increasing OB density without sacrificing its single family appeal. Single family dwellings should not be regulated out of existence and replaced by duplexes/triplexes/pure rentals. Fernwood and Fairfield are good examples of how not to proceed as the parking congestion in those neighbourhoods demonstrates. Street parking overflow is dangerous for children and families.
					I feel this would consume too much time/money on the council's side when those efforts could be put elsewhere	There are suites already all over oak bay. I think all existing suites and new suites should be allowed. All existing suites should be inspected to ensure they meet code. My general concern is living conditions/safety are a priority not parking etc. Make them legal and safe.
Greater enforcement efforts to catch code shortfalls in legacy suites				Generally opposed to pilots since the noncompliant legacy suites in existence are presumably everywhere.		I feel that safety and complete code compliance are paramount. Anything less than full code compliance is short-changing tenants in my opinion and subsidising landlords.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
This survey is not designed well, it does not allow answers for those of us who do not support this initiative at all. I picked D because its the most restrictive of all the options, though if the survey allowed for inclusive responses that took into account all options then I would have answered no suites in our municipality aside from existing ones.	No new secondary suites.			No option for this answer, but no secondary suites aside from existing ones.	You could avoid all of this by not having secondary suites. Oak bay is a desired neighborhood because of the low density. People pay higher prices and taxes for homes specifically because its a low density municipality. If I wanted to live in a neighborhood with increasing density I would have paid much less and bought in Langford.	I think this survey was a bit biased, most of the answers do not allow the user to express an opinion of no support for increasing density in our municipality. I think the survey requires examination to provide more valid data for such an important issue.
Secondary suites allowed in all sized homes. Those living in larger homes probably wouldn't benefit from a secondary suit. Plus it would improve housing options for those looking for affordable housing.	Mandatory registration, and owner occupancy REQUIRED.			There will always be a group of people who don't want Oak Bay to change, and this includes secondary suites. I think a pilot program will allow them to derail the idea before it starts.	I'm not sure about rezoning. If it is so complicated that people don't do it then we will be in a neighbor, complaint driven, system. Which is already how Oak Bay functions. NIMBY.	We are in a housing crisis in this city. Both for ownership, and renting. We need to do something to help to solve the problem.
Mandatory business licence. Stricter regulation across the board.	Not fussed about lot size.			Pilot program district wide	Would each application have to go Council for approval or can the process be reviewed by an advisory committee?	
The required off street parking spot for all suites. There is an unofficial secondary suite in a house across the street. The tenants are fine, but they park their cars so that it is challenging to get out of our driveway. We can't see oncoming cars very easily and it is tight to turn out of our driveway onto the street. Not the end of the world but a bit frustrating as one day I am sure the restricted sight and tight space with result in an accident.		One of the RS zones. I have no real preference				I know it is not a popular opinion, but I am not convinced we need secondary suites. (We are a young family who bought an old house here 5 years ago after saving since we were teenagers to afford to live here—we are not old people with lots of money) I think it will drive house prices up higher and make streets busier and more crowded. I think it will compromise the quality of life here—that we worked hard for, planned for and lived frugally to afford.
Will allow more people to have suites that wouldn't otherwise which will provide more housing for those that need it.					Too many resources required and too many suites wouldn't meet requirements.	There need to be far more allowances for secondary suites and less red tape. As long as these suiteset basic health and safety requirements.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
It allows protection for tenants from slum lords. It also addresses the very contentious issue that we simply don't have enough parking in Oak Bay.	I would be careful not to try to pack a lot of people and vehicles in small spaces. One of the sought after attributes about Oak Bay is that we have single family homes and lower density than other areas. Oak Bay doesn't have to be 'everything to everybody'. We don't need to please everyone. And those who try end up like Victoria and what Lisa Helps has created.			I live on Henderson - the 2900 block. About 50% of the homes on this block have illegal suites. Parking is crazy at times. If a pilot project were started here - there wouldn't be any parking left.		It's great you are soliciting feedback. Are garden suites addressed here at all?
Rules are more strict.	You need a scenario choice for not wanting secondary suites at all.					Do not allow secondary suites in Oak Bay.
Owner decides	none			None	none	none
Flexibility as housing is crucial for a healthy community.	I would add that a business license be added.					Housing is key with regards to a healthy community. Options for our citizens is crucial as most are priced out of the housing market. No longer sustainable to zone only for single homes.
Allows people to have secondary suites without municipal red tape and extra costs in creating one. I believe this would help to keep rents with reach of middle/low income earners as owners would not have to pass on unnecessary costs to renters. Sine we are currently in a housing crisis, it is important to create as many affordable rental options as possible.					The less municipal interference, the better.	We need affordable housing in Greater Victoria. We have have an obligation as a community to support this.
						No suites in Oak Bay.
more housing for everyone						Laneway houses, please!
	I do believe there should be a mandatory registration for secondary suites				It seems like an unnecessary amount of work when there are already many suites in existence.	They are here, they are an excellent part of increasing population density, and they need regulation for safety of landlords and tenants.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
mandatory registration						minimize the number of secondary suites in oak bay period. regulate the ones that exist now. there isn't a lack of housing in oak bay...look at all the apartments along beach drive. keep oak bay for the current residents of oak bay. we like to be a nice leafy neighbourhood. why do we have to change it for people that don't even live here? if you want to build more housing then do so along major arteries (ie oak bay avenue, cadboro bay road) or where there are existing apartment blocks. don't plonk something down in the middle of single family housing - which is why the conversion of Oak Bay United Church never should have even been on the table...thankfully it was shut down.
Not having to try and take up more of the garden with a parking space! What is so wrong with street parking??? That's where cars belong...	owner occupancy: I would prefer that the owner of the property does have to reside somewhere on the premises. However, many people own properties within their corporation, so I don't know how you would deal with that scenario...			This is ridiculous to waste more time on a pilot program, unless it is just to mollify the naysayers who never want to see a secondary suite in Oak Bay	This is a huge disincentive for people to do anything that requires a permit...	Bring on the discussion about garden suites and laneway houses!!!!
Have as open a system as possible where people are allowed to have secondary suites, but have the suites registered (should not be a hindrance unless there is a huge fee involved) and thus enable the town to enforce health and safety violations	Add registration and enforcement from scenario D				Seems like a huge waste of everyone's time and energy	Let's recognize that many secondary suites already exist, the world had not collapsed, we are not overrun with problems. Get on with it and make it a simple process.
-One off-street parking space required for new and existing suites -Mandatory Business license	Secondary Suites Permitted in all Single family homes			No Pilot program needed, if you take the time and look around it is very easy to see where the illegal secondary suites are... So Oak Bay already have secondary suite, start inspection on those and you have your pilot program. You could see what illegal suite are and what we don't want...	Site specific rezoning program are to time consuming for owners and staff City Hall. I believe it is easier for all to have all of Oak Bay allow secondary suite or by zone.	My biggest problem with secondary suites right now are, first if your neighbors don't like you for any reason, they complain and you are not allow a suite but next door are, totally unfair. Second is parking situation, I go around Oak Bay and I'm able to see the number of illegal suite around town by the number of vehicle on the street. It is at a point that some street are dangerous for cycling and drivers. So most have off-street parking for the suites.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Allows the most flexibility for those wishing to have permitted suites	Enforcement - must have permit and or license			waste of individuals time and money	This would be cost prohibitive for the district of Oak Bay	We feel registration and enforcement should apply to ensure safety and comfort to everyone that lives in a suite and the surrounding area
Most flexible for families to be able to accommodate inter-generational living situations, and not being forced to move bases on lot size, parking requirements, etc. It would also accommodate rentals where a family may want to live in the same house as eg grand parent in separate suites, even though both may be renters.	Enforcement and boarding off street parking should be mandatory .. street are for travel, cars .. bikes.. people.. not parking			This study and a potential pilot program is taking too long, and feels like a delay tactic.		Please, let's get on with allowing secondary suites. Enough talk. Have you noted that house values are growing faster elsewhere because they allow secondary suites. Any house with a secondary suite sells for higher than others, because people can afford them better, and allow flexibility to have eg parents move in. This makes other house prices eg in Victoria go up faster than in Oak Bay, leaving us behind.
requirement for off street parking and either boarder or suite ..not both	Mandatory TDM features (eg: bike parking, car share membership)		Any - but the neighbourhoods should have the several different attributes	Ensure home owners and renters are included in the evaluation		Oak bay needs to contribute to housing crisis. Get on with it!
		Rs5	Oak bay Avenue		No	None
We would like to see flexibility for secondary suites but we also don't want people to take advantage and build suites that take up too much of the property. We also would not want rentals in both main and secondary suites. Only rental in secondary suite would be our preference.						
						We need more housing and the need will only grow. Secondary suites helps those paying a mortgage and those needing a home. Thank you.
Stringent measures are important when it comes to secondary suites as it protects homeowners, tenants, and neighbours						
good	no			This is a tax grab	creating more city jobs for no reason	It is my property to do as I please not an overbearing municipal government
Least amount of problems with neighbourhoods that have the suites.	Would allow the suite by neighbourhood not Zoning	Some area of all the zones are not suitable for suites.	Henderson or Canarvon Park		Would allow neighbours opportunity to explain objections.	Suites could be seasonal and available only to students. Would provide important housing and reduce pressure on rental market while keeping additional traffic down and preventing undesirable changes to neighbourhoods.
Provides the most flexibility	No					Try to keep things simple to keep costs and hassles down... allowing secondary suites shouldn't be such a big deal.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Single family housing is a terrible waste of space. It is an inefficient anachronism and I want to it eliminated as soon possible	Nothing					
It allows suites but places some regulations around size and parking. It also requires the suite to meet the building code, which we think is important.	It might be better to start with a pilot project in limited areas without parking issues.		Neighbourhoods with larger lots, such as North Oak Bay, or areas with less parking issues.		I think given how many suites there are, the amount of time and energy involved with doing this would be a waste of time for the district.	Its time for Oak Bay to consider secondary suites in some capacity and also time for Oak Bay to provide more housing options for new people to live in the community, as most other municipalities do. It also allows people to afford to stay in their homes and young families to more easily qualify for a mortgage.
It is moderate and reasonable for existing suites for homeowners.	No it is reasonable.			Allow all homeowners who want to offer affordable housing for some people should be permitted no matter where they live.	This should be for a whole zone if not the whole municipality, otherwise it would cause a very long approval process unnecessarily.	This is an opportunity to increase the rich diversity of the OB population and share the beauty and amenities of this beautiful place.
A moderate approach. It seems unlikely an approach with zero restrictions will be popular with Oak Bay residents, but too many restrictions creates an authoritative state. Have some basic framework and allow people to live a little!	No additional parking spaces which impacts lot usage. Simultaneously encourage/reward residents who use other means of transportation. le: support a bike lane infrastructure. Incentivize people to drive less and there will be less cars			A location-based pilot program seems like the perfect way to draw the suite regulation process out even longer. The fear surrounding allowing more renters in the community is classist and absurd.		Just. Move. Forward. Already. Oak Bay's population is ageing and desperately needs the community rejuvenation that a younger, more diverse population provides. We need to make housing more accessible to both home owners and renters. It's time to confront NIMBYism and recognize there's far more to gain than lose.
it mirrors the answers I gave in earlier questions EXCEPT I believe owners should live in the home. Scenario A doesn't include that requirement. Having the owner onsite increased accountability and upkeep. Awkward variable is the extreme tenant-favouritism of the landlord tenant act.	see #21				requiring site specific rezoning does not exemplify administrative fairness. Secondary suites should be grand-fathered and incentives provided to ensure that they are brought to code/improved/meet requirements. No punitive measures should be in place when a home admits/converts to providing additional housing.	Given the bias toward residential homes (single use) in Oak Bay, and the widespread housing issue not only in southern Vancouver Island but in other Canadian cities, there's a moral imperative to loosen restrictions against secondary suites, and to provide flexibility for housing more citizens.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
mandatory license and district-run compliance program	size of suite could be more flexible	I would suggest conducting a pilot program in multiple zones at the same time.	I would suggest conducting a pilot program in multiple neighbourhoods because suites already exist all over the district.		I don't think every site needs to be rezoned but I do think that every suite should be checked for safety.	When shopping for a home in Oak Bay, our agent showed us many houses and some happened to have suites. Most of the suites we saw were in appalling condition: low ceilings, moldy walls, uneven floors, and tight cramped spaces. Many looked like fire traps and it's just a matter of time before someone dies. I think regulation of these spaces is desperately needed. It's also not fair to families who do not rent out space in their homes. There is a clear added burden on garbage pickup and other services, which homeowners with suites need to chip in for.
Licensing and the district enforces the rules	Maximum number of suites per street and in district overall				There needs to be a budget to enforce the rules	
It's clear, realistic, requires the least amount of enforcement, and provides the flexibility necessary for the needs of homeowners and renters. It allows people to raise families and age in their homes by bringing in boarders and renters who can help with changing circumstances and financial realities of families. It keeps our neighbourhoods more vibrant and more full without measuring and checking looking over everyone's hedge and into their homes to see what rules they may be breaking.	Owner occupancy is a must for me. That keeps a home's connection to community/creates neighbourhoods. If suites in homes are entirely rented out it has more potential to change the fabric of our community to more transient and/or transactional. And thinking through the survey to this excellent question based on the scenarios above, I think suites should be registered for a very nominal fee to ensure Oak Bay has that basic info - not for checking up on homeowners/suite owners but to understand our community needs, changes, demographics, and to be ready/prepared for complaints based enforcement. We need to protect the people who are renting suites and homeowners have a high degree of responsibility to make sure their suites meet regulatory requirements, are safe, and that renters can pursue corrections when things go wrong.			No pilot please. We are so far beyond this. Looking to this council to finally help Oak Bay be a place that is vibrant and cares for its community of homeowners and renters - this is who we are, let's embrace it, let's make it work, let's allow families, singles, young and old to afford to live here. Please. We have so much here, and our building controls (floor space to property space ratios) will maintain the look and feel so many love about Oak Bay. Please let us move with the times and open our community to others and help those that live here continue to live here.	This would be an expensive (time and money) and unhelpful process for both homeowners and the municipality. And to what end. It serves no useful purpose.	Please make a change. Absolutely counting on this council to help us be the community we need to be, for us and for others who should be able to call it home. Thank you!
Its a combination of the different scenarios m.	It's not so cut and dry. Should have different combos to chose from			Pilot project is a waste of time and money		
Parking is an issue. Live next to a house with 3 suites.					Too costly and time consuming to undertake.	There are many illegal secondary suites. Those in owner occupied homes are seamless. Living next to a fill rental home with 5 pets is pretty disgusting.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I am all for secondary suites, but they should be registered and regulated.	They should be allowed in all single family homes.					It bothers me that residents of Oak Bay are generally against any type of duplex/condo/townhome development because of density and parking, and yet many of those people have illegal suites in their homes and extra cars parked on the street. I am a proponent of affordable housing, including suites, but it should be regulated.
Density control						
I prefer the absolute minimum number of such suites in Oak Bay and am actually opposed to the whole issue.	Yes. I would not allow secondary suites in Oak Bay. You are going to change your voter base, densify our community, and change its character in ways residents don't want. Ultimately, you run the risk of a voter base that will vote to change council, and the risk of a council that will permantly change the character of this community in ways that the current homeowners do not want. The community has spoken out against this. If you are going to do this at least do it in the strictest way possible, and enforce it.		Uplands	Please do not allow secondary suites in Oak Bay.	This would be by far the best option if you must do this. I hope you select it.	Please do not allow secondary suites in Oak Bay. The people who live here have sacrificed a great deal - in some cases far more than you realize, to live here, and we do not want secondary suites. We do not want them.
I prefer to totally disallow secondary suites.	Disallow secondary suite in the entire Oak Bay Municipality					Disallow secondary suites in Oak Bay.
Avoiding small and overcrowded secondary suits. Avoiding street congestion by excessive parking. Municipal oversight and compliance. Owners should pay an additional property tax. Preserving the value of the property by maintaining the status quo in out attractive neighbourhood.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Units with secondary suits should have pay higher municipal taxes

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
District Initiated Compliance program + parking for new and existing suites.	The suite doesn't have to be under 150 m2 as long as the home is owner occupied and there is only one secondary suite with a max of two adults living in it.			If we decide to allow suites, they must be allowed through the entirety of Oak Bay (not a particular zone or neighbourhood). To suggest that we try it out in certain areas (such as Henderson - near the schools) paves the way for different regulations in different neighbourhoods. This will end up devaluing our neighbourhood compare to other parts of Oak Bay. We must be very careful about an area specific approach (even as a pilot program)!!!		I can't emphasize enough the importance of owner occupancy! If this is not followed I would strongly oppose any allowance of suites in Oak Bay. In the Henderson area there are many homes rented to a large group of students with no owner present. I think they get away with this because they are renting the whole home rather than individual suites. These become noisy, poorly maintained eyesores with cars parked everywhere. How can this be regulated? The following rules should apply: Max 1 additional car for a suite - strictly enforced. We do not want cars parked all over the roads and front lawns. A suite can be occupied by two adults max OR a small family. I would strongly opposed suites rented to multiple students - 2 adults max!
						I believe people should be able to have a suite in their home if they need or want in_ There will always be noises cranky neighbours. If they have complaints speak to owner.
Currently rentals and suite are unregulated. Should be safe, of adequate standard, regulated and taxed accordingly				Equality forall.	There are many unregistered illegal suites, they are here, regulate them.	Suites should be regulated for safety and quality. Nobody should be living in a substandard basement.
Enforced regulation						Population density limit should be a primary and paramount goal.
I do not want any secondary suites in oak bay. There is no scenario which allows me to say this. How does this survey distinguish between unsure and prefer not to answer? What about the status quo as an option?	see 22 above			The pilot program would maybe become permanent with no status quo option		I moved into South Oak Bay with a reasonably clear understanding of what I assumed would be more or less permanent zoning regulations. The tone of this survey undermines this expectation.
						No suites in Oak Bay
Too few scenairos.	Separate the RS zones and neighbourhoods.		North Oak Bay			I am against secondary suites in Oak Bay. I fear encouraging secondary suites will only bring more cars parked on the streets, more noise, and more congestion. I also feel the quality of life will diminish.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
owner on property, parking off street, up to code for safety, not crowded space-wise	Mandatory business license not required	don't know how to find out about zone choices available.		increased street parking brought about by secondary suites is a big concern of mine, I feel that everyone should have off street parking for their vehicle		
Can be better controlled, less of a chance to get out of a control		A pilot program in all zones.		If after a pilot program and it was decided, not to allow Secondary suites, what would happen to the suites/neighborhood, of the pilot project. My concern is, that if after the project, it was decided to only allow suites in certain zones and the neighborhood would fill up, with suited homes.	I think it would be an added expense (if only minimal), added to the tax payers and I am sure a lot more to the homeowner.	<p>What I don't like about this survey. By answering these questions, it can be assumed and I am sure used by Council, that I approve of secondary suites, which is not the case by any means.</p> <p>I have seen over the years, homes rented out, not just in Oak Bay, but in other Municipalities, Secondary suites situation getting abused.</p> <p>I am aware of In Law type suites, but not secondary suites, in our neighborhood. I do know however, of several homes, where the owner does not live in the house and it is just rented out, sometimes up to 6 different people, over the years.</p> <p>I live adjacent to a home, where the owners do live it, but are renting out rooms, to 3 different people, all with cars, all smokers/drinkers and on many occasions, multiple groups, chatting/drinking until after midnight, waking my kids up. I am constantly sweeping up cigarette butts and occasionally empty drinking containers. When I spoke to the owner, they were not happy, seemed intimidated to speak to them and did not know what to do</p>
fairness in management of suites, possibility of providing accommodation for seniors, singles, couples	Max unit size 40% of GFA or 90 square meters			My concern would be that there would be a pilot program, the decision would be not to pursue suites in all areas and then the area containing the pilot program would be the only area in Oak Bay left with secondary suites		The area of parking has been somewhat covered. However, I'm not sure that 3 parking spots are enough. And how do you make sure that the spots are actually used? We already have parking issues in our neighbourhood. In fact, there is a house near us with 1 or more suites (on a very large lot) that only has 1 parking spot on their property.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
You have sacked the deck against those who do not believe that any further suites be added to the already existing legal/illegal inventory. Shame on you for the obvious manipulation of outcomes.	No more illegal suites over existing units. Of course people will just go ahead without approval as you have proven to be incapable of managing this in the past.			No pilot programs, no more secondary suites, the roads are already overloaded and street park is choking the flow even more. Why are you not asking the questions related to opinions that are against this not so well hidden agenda?	The house next door to be put in an application for a basement rec room, we didn't object to the plan but then their son and his family moved into what is now a secondary suite. I know, you will say immediate family is allowed but that is not the point, they did not stick to the intent of the approval. Since then further development has occurred including several sheds and structures in the yards that I am certain have put them over allowable limits. On top of that some of the structure in in the off road parking for 2 cars that was required as part of their original development request. The municipality drops the ball on this, it's easier isn't it.	Congestion on the street is horrible, noise from addition occupancy is resulting in loss of enjoyment, and the quality of the area has tanked. Questions should have been provided to measure opposition but you did not care to hear that. Past councils have allowed the erosion of south oak bays attributes and you seem to be intent on continuing the practice. This survey clearly displays your intent in this matter, all you are doing is building a shield to protect yourselves down the road, allowing you to say we did seek opinion (even though it is clearly one sided).
	Would not require additional off-street parking - will lead to uglier front yards (more pavement and less green space is not ideal). Parking is fine in most areas of Oak Bay. I congested areas around Oak Bay Ave, tenants are less likely to own cars due to availability of public transportation.				It's already takes way too long to have a permit approved by Oak Bay. How would the city facilitate this in a timely manner? And how would this impact homeowners seeking to permit work on their single family home. I do not want my taxes to subsidize more city staff to facilitate this process, for the benefit of secondary suite owners.	Highly supportive. Although I do not intend to develop a secondary suite, I would like the option to be able to utilize my property to its full potential. Allowing secondary suites will help to subsidize the very high cost of living in Oak Bay. Moderately increasing densification will help to support local businesses and will attract a more diverse population to Oak Bay, which is necessary to ensure that the community remains vibrant.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>I strongly prefer the current status quo in which secondary suites are not formally legal in Oak Bay. I know that they exist and I can see value for owners in having additional income in order to be able to retire in place in their present home and in providing temporary accommodation for students and those working on contract jobs for short periods, but I believe that legalization would present a whole new series of legal challenges if tenants or landlords were not a good fit for the neighbourhood and it was deemed that they should move on. All secondary suites should be subject to inspection for protection of both the Tennant and owner prior to their approval.</p> <p>Sub-letting should not be allowed.</p> <p>I think the decision on secondary suites should be delayed until post-covid we have open meetings which we can attend in person rather than just a Zoom meeting.</p>
<p>It limits SOME abuse that WILL happen when this ridiculous plan is implemented by the O B Council</p>	<p>YES... allow NO additional secondary suites in O B.</p>				<p>It is not the role of local government to cause harm to existing residents. Shocking to read the information presented here and in other publications about the Council even considering this initiative. Where is the section on how school taxes will be collected from tenants with children who will attend Willows / O B High ? Where is the section on how taxes will be collected from home owners to pay for increased wear on our streets? For more police resources? ..a long list</p>	<p>Council was NOT elected on a platform of ruining Oak Bay. Wait till Election Day. BTW this is the WORST survey I have ever seen in my professional career... what were you thinking in putting this in front of the public.. making Council members a laughing stock for not having better judgement than to PAY for this kind of sub-standard product? How many "have you stopped beating your spouse" questions make an excellent survey? The answer is usually NONE.</p>
<p>I want to be free to do with my property what I choose.</p>						<p>Victoria has a housing crisis. Oak bay needs to stop being so classist and let people make choices about their own properties.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I prefer that there is no additional parking required. I also favour allowing both boarding and secondary suites (they serve different functions, but both contribute to vibrancy of the community and supplement owner income)	I would suggest adding a requirement for the owner to occupy the residence, because the owner would likely be motivated to keep the residence well maintained and in keeping with the character of the community (which is quite quiet!)			I don't really understand the purpose of a pilot program. We can learn from the experience of neighbouring communities, and the lessons learned from those communities have been explained in the accompanying materials. Therefore, I see a pilot program as a measure to delay action on an important issue.	I am concerned that such a program would be resource intensive and could lead to significant conflict within previously content neighbourhoods.	I would welcome our community's contribution to address the shortage of rental housing, and I encourage Council to do what it can to allow home owners to house others by using secondary suites. Housing is very expensive, and many houses in our community are simply too big for single families. I have had positive experiences with my neighbours who are tenants of secondary suites, and I would miss them if they weren't permitted (or encouraged) to stay. I also worry about my carbon footprint living in such a large house, and I think one day I may consider it my civic duty to share my home by installing a secondary suite.
It is the least restrictive.						
there are some basic requirements	no					
Max unit size. Voluntary registration. Off-Street parking exempt for existing suites.	Allow boarding.		Estevan, Henderson		Too expensive & time consuming	Pilot project is a good start, in a few neighbourhoods
						I am against secondary suites in Oak Bay. They will cost all home owners more in taxes and overload our already crumbling infra structure.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Voluntary registration list	Provision for extended family members i.e. granny suite			I think we need to get on with the study and move things forward - many of us have been waiting years for Oak Bay to adopt an enlightened secondary suites protocol. Family demographics are changing rapidly. Many elderly home owners like myself would like to have a legal secondary suite in our home where we can have family members live with us. The old "nuclear family" is a thing of the past and many households today are multi-generational. It is so difficult for younger individuals/couples to get onto the housing ladder. Oak Bay is stagnating as a community and we need to attract younger families and especially children to our neighbourhoods.		I am a widow and I live alone in a large 4 bedroom home in Oak Bay. I pay more than \$8500 a year in municipal taxes. One of my children, her spouse and 2 young children would love to live in Oak Bay but they cannot afford to live here, so they have purchased a home in Langford. I have a 1600 sq ft finished area in my home that is unoccupied and I have lots of parking available. I don't want to charge my family rent as they are saving to eventually start a business. A secondary suite should not automatically be considered an income generator or mortgage helper. And secondary suites that are occupied by direct family members should not be charged additional taxes! As soon as Oak Bay approves a formula for secondary suites I would like to invite my daughter, her spouse and my 2 grand children to join me. This would be an ideal situation and would greatly improve quality of life for 5 all of us. I don't want secondary suites to be a tax grab for Oak Bay but rather a way to enhance our quality of life, and to help seniors like myself to age in place with family support and our loved ones.
Owner occupancy; provision of off-street parking.	N/A	N/A	North West Oak Bay	N/A	N/A	N/A
It allows seniors that are widows or widowers to stay in their home with some security and an offsetting of costs for taxes utilities etc.						There is a housing shortage in Victoria. University students are unable to find accomodation as well as young adults. With close proximity to the university it is necessary for Oak Bay to do their part to alleviate the situation.
Proper regulation of any new or existing suites so any suites that may be allowed do not become a problem in the neighbourhood ie: parking, noise, roomers, boarders, misuse, etc.	Stricter controls & cost recovery by Oak Bay. Why should owners generate income and not contribute to items like infrastructure which experience increased usage as a result of density increases.			Ensure it is truly a pilot & not a fait accompli.	With a part-time bylaw officer how is Oak Bay going to ensure compliance & who is going to pay for the enforcement. There should be a realistic ongoing cost to ALL suite owners to offset the cost of maintaining oversight of ALL suites.	I bet there will be no general suites allowed in the Uplands yet all Oak Bay residents are expected to contribute to sewer upgrades in the Uplands. Double standard but money talks & council selectively listens.
	One off-street vehicle per suite, no additional vehicles permitted. Offstreet means on a driveway, not on a lawn like we're seeing with all the suites on Henderson Ave. Henderson needs a major crackdown.	All or nothing, otherwise we'll have secondary suite ghettos				Owner occupied for all rentals, including Henderson Ave, which is becoming a major eyesoar. Also, houses with suites should pay higher taxes for the increased burden on the infrastructure and services.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Requires more monitoring thereby reducing social hazards and urban blight; allows for recovery of costs of monitoring.						Your survey begs the question that secondary suites are the wave of the future. It has not been shown that the Victoria hinterland has the carrying capacity to support greater densification. We are not self-sufficient in agriculture. Also critical chokepoints exist in our transportation grid and connectivity with other regions. Many landlords reap the benefit of social capital paid for by others. They should not be allowed to freeload.
No giant suites	Allowing boarding with suiting.	RS4	Estevan		This seems like a cheap way to say that council considered options to address the housing crisis and then will turn around and demand a huge tax increase to pay for it. To be clear this option is disingenuous and moral disgusting. It should not have even been considered. It turns my stomach.	
It will help avoid people who own properties abusing an honour system and just fitting in as many people as possible into their house to maximize income. Give some thought to not only parking, but traffic going in and out of Oak Bay and how congested the roads					You may find that it inconveniences people	Why do we need to provide affordable housing in Oak Bay???? I moved here because I like the space between lots, the relatively quiet neighbourhoods and access to amenities. Again, think about all the traffic volume increases with increased housing/residents, along with visitors who will be coming in/out of Oak Bay. I grew up in Dunbar area in Vancouver which was a great place as a kid; go there now and you have to wait in long lines of cars to get through intersections that were easy to pass through years ago. All due to density with basement suites and laneway houses. And what about access to places like Oak Bay Rec Centre - all those extra people wanting to use their facilities will make it harder for current residents to attend and use them. Why not just leave Oak Bay the way it is with it's current character and charm? If you can't afford to live in Oak Bay, don't come to Oak Bay! If you're looking for affordable housing, then Oak Bay isn't for you. If you are looking for cheap rental units, then Oak Bay isn't for you. If you want to come here, ride your bike or take the bus. If you can't make your rental or mortgage payments, then sell up and move somewhere else. I don't want to have to deal with congested streets for

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
and intersections will become. DRIVING WILL BECOME HELL. Not to mention if we keep putting in more bike lanes (good) it will make driving much much worse (bad).			Down by Oak Bay City Hall so you can suffer all the extra traffic and parking woes that will come with increased density.		to go to public hearings to voice their objections. Concern is people will keep pushing for approvals to bend the rules in their favour, and if we have a weak council homeowners will get their way.	parking or for driving places. If my house price goes down, so be it. if it goes up, then it means people like Oak Bay just the way it is. if it ain't broke, don't fix it. I vote no to any secondary suites in Oak Bay.
Since the assumption is that all suites must be created within the existing building envelope, all the additional restrictions in Scenarios B-D are unnecessary: what goes on inside the envelope should not concern us as long as the living space meets basic safety standards: leave it to the owner to determine how to create a livable unit inside the envelope. There is so much available curb space in Oak Bay it is not necessary to impose additional requirements, which would only be a deterrent to creating much needed rental housing.	Adding "owner occupancy" as a requirement. This makes the owner immediately accountable to both his/her tenants and neighbours. With the owner in-situ, there is likely to be more commitment to safety and neighbourliness.				Site specific zoning would be, effectively, the death of secondary suites. It is much too rigid and would present an unnecessary barrier to homeowners. Also, there could a host of unintended consequence for future purchasers of homes with site specific zoning that allowed a secondary suite, particularly purchasers who wanted to de-convert a home (e.g. a higher market value; a higher assessed value; difficulty getting a mortgage without a tenant in place). Would the zoning automatically revert to SF if the secondary suite was removed?	Oak Bay Council has been engaging the community on secondary suites for well over 10 years. It is time to end the consultation and pass a bylaw which allows secondary suites under the fewest restrictions possible. A pilot project would be just another way for Council to defer making a decision (an all-too-common strategy!) Oak Bay is blessed with a housing stock that is ideal for converting from single dwelling to principal dwelling plus secondary suite, so let's take advantage of this characteristic of our residential built form to permit more safe, attractive rental housing. In 2021, please!!!
Provides some guidelines without limiting factors that could impact those that need a secondary suite the most.				I pilot program seems like another way to drag out and stall an already long process. There is already a pilot program underway with the numerous unregulated suites that already exist. I would rather see Oak Bay get relevant data from those suites than invest time in a further study.	This seems like a major deterrent and will lead to the continuation and growth of unregulated suites.	I would like to see Oak Bay find incentives to promote positive behaviour rather than impose restrictions and enforce bad behaviour. Ex: instead of requiring additional off-street parking, why not promote active transportation or public transit and incentivize houses to have fewer cars. My family of three bikes most places and has one car that we share. We don't need to be forced into an additional off-street parking spot. Parking has been an often discussed aspect of this study. I'd like to see data on how many secondary suites (whether Oak Bay or elsewhere) are occupied by persons with cars. With only anecdotal information, most of the suites I've encountered are tenanted by people who don't drive.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>Thanks for asking. Be careful. Expect to see developers buying up parts of streets and also loading houses with extra people. Yes we are in a housing crisis. At the same time 95% of BC is rural and 85% is forested. Some areas like Qualicum, Parksville, North Nanaimo as well as much of the Fraser Valley are doing extensive residential building in what was rural land while Greater Victoria is extremely restricted by a vocal minority. Within the next 20 years Fairfield/Gonzales will become Vancouver's WestEnd of the 1960s and 1970s, and it will become the West End of the 1980s and 1990s, AND Oak Bay is right next door. Check out the history of the West End and Fraser Valley (Surrey, Chilliwack, Abbotsford, White Rock) yet Greater Victoria has a vocal minority creating our housing crisis. The original 1960s plan for UVic was to have 8-10 twelve to fifteen storey high rise student residents like Gage Towers at UBC. Students should be living on campus. If 75% of them were on campus, the secondary suites would be used by workers not students. The CRD and Greater Victoria has made this housing crisis much much worse than it needs to be. What are you going to do with the next 200,000 and 500,000 that will be moving here as it is one of safest places during pandemics. People will be moving here in droves. Be careful. Once it is gone it is gone. Suites need off-street parking and they need limit of 1-2 bedrooms. not 4-6 bedrooms with 6-10 or more occupants. How will you keep this out of Uplands and off the waterfront. It is now on our quiet residential waterfront which is no longer quiet due ot multiple motorcycles per household and 4-6 trucks per household, and you have no way to control it. No way. You really need to ramp up your bylaws and bylaw officers but they will not be able to do anything as you cannot limit the number of people per suite in a secondary suite.. Saanich has a limit on their primary unit (which is being questioned) but not on their secondary suites. So you can easily have 3-5 students in the main unit and 3-5 students in the secondary unit. Students CAN be great tenants or not. Camosun and UVic</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>It recognizes the values of the existing neighbourhoods and ensures that regulations are appropriately enforced. Other areas including are overrun without proper regulations</p>	<p>Any development needs to be respectful of the neighbours and should have proper offsets and setbacks from neighbouring property. If anyone is going to have a negative impact it should be the owner not the neighbours. Noise definitely needs to be considered and owner must be in primary or secondary. As well, limit the number of bedrooms. A 98m2 suite can easily have 3-5 bedrooms with 1-3 people in each bedroom. It does happen and is happening in other areas of Greater Victoria. Some of these suites have 4-6 adults each with their own vehicle. How will you handle this. It is already happening. And it is a business and needs a business licence which can be \$10 but does need to be there to ensure that property is appropriately maintained. Many absentee landlord dual rentals are completely overgrown with no yard maintenance in the 1st 6 months. This is happening in many areas of Greater Victoria. Also be careful of construction businesses buying houses and converting them to pseudo rooming houses for the construction workers - this results in 8-10 vehicles or more per household and once it starts it cannot be stopped.</p>		<p>Central Oak Bay, North East (imagine these houses being converted to student rooming houses with 10-20 or more students per house with associated vehicles. This has happened elsewhere.</p>	<p>Make sure that it is well managed. What ever is built will not be torn down. It is your new legacy.</p>	<p>be respectful of the neighbourhood. Consider what happens as a street is gradually purchased by developers and then they come back with mid-rise and high-rise rezoning. This is happening.</p>	<p>campuses both have extensive land for student housing but they are afraid to have too many students living on campus. Every building could have student residents above and every parking lot could have students above. If students lived on campus you would not need as much parking and students would have much shorter commute and potential for higher marks and better education without 1-3 hour daily commutes. UBC has an extensive housing plan for many years. Uvic has a couple of paragraphs. There are 30K students at Uvic and Camosun. That is more than twice the population of Oak Bay. Get at least 60% of them housed on their campuses. with NDP support.</p> <p>End of rant and ramble and thanks again for asking. I expect few will read this. and vocal minority will complain loudly.</p> <p>You can add an 98m2 controlled secondary suite with 1-2 offstreet parking spots on many properties in Oak Bay. Why not post maps of all properties with available setbacks and space for parking.</p> <p>Do not forget to have a required set of requirements of rental of property which includes property maintenance (biweekly not twice per year if at all) 2 yards across the street have had no gardening for 2 years and lawn only cur 3 times per year. These sued to be manicured well maintained waterfront homes. If owner lives in the house there is someone to follow-up with. Due to privacy laws municipalities will not provide name of property owner to neighbours so only way to get info is to put in a request to land titles which has cost. Imagine 4-6 vehicles without proper mufflers on each side of you. How many Oak Bay councillors are ready for this on their street. Once the street is full of vehicles, there is no going back as well. Residential parking signs just moves the problem over to neighbours street.</p>
<p>Allows use of suite for family - adult child or grandchildren - and provides some consistency on zoning and use</p>	<p>If used to non-family renters, should be registered as a business, and suites should be code-conforming.</p>					

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
it allows some flexibility but still some rules which may be a deterrent to everyone getting suites	fines for not registering if complaints are made	any area that has borders on a larger more commercial-type road/boundary				
						As little bureaucracy as possible.
Mandatory lot and unit sizes, off street parking, business license and district initiated compliance program			unsure			
Boarding and secondary suites permitted, no off-street parking required.	This is a very flawed and misleading test... as written there are things to like and dislike about each scenario. I'd add 40% max suite size to Scenario A, for example, and owner-occupancy should absolutely be required. However so should boarding. As written, there is no scenario that resolves that. Why didn't you have a selector grid so columns within each row could be selected independently of the scenarios?			Just make a decision, no pilot required and in fact lack of decision and slow process have been and continue to be to the detriment of the community. Just study how other districts have done this very successfully and implement that.	Just create a policy that is fair to the majority and then be consistent with that policy. Site-specific will be a waste of our council and staff's capacity and will pit neighbours against neighbours and encourage loud advocacy groups.	Go for it, make some decisions. This has been talked about for way too long! Also, study how other communities have done it successfully, we don't need to reinvent the wheel. And keep in mind: the sky won't fall for this change... :) Tons of other communities have implemented this and it works really well, lots of upsides like making housing more affordable for owners and tenants, adding security, increasing neighbourhood vibrancy, having more spenders to support local businesses and get us to critical mass to support businesses, transit, other infrastructure, etc. Definitely we need to prevent absent owner rental house slums. So enforcing owner-occupied is wise.
Most rigorous. Will also allow 'kinks' to be worked out prior to completely opening things up. It is hard to 'go back' once things are fully opened up, even if there prove to be problems.	I would prefer Scenario D, but without requiring off street parking. I am concerned that off street parking will mean loss of green space and trees. I would rather have an extra car parked on my street that is already paved than have more of my neighbourhood greenery lost.			I would find a pilot program unfair and therefore not supportable. I would rather that the District 'go slow' with opening things up by having the strictest regulations in place and potentially gradually opening things up over time everywhere. Unless there are highly localized infrastructure constraints that don't allow for more density, I think suites should be allowed everywhere (or alternatively nowhere)	I do not support public hearings for suite rezonings. It would pit neighbour against neighbour. It would make for long public hearings. It would take staff time away from more valuable pursuits. It would add to costs and that would negatively impact affordability.	Please do not make requirements less for those who already have suites (illegally) than those who have been waiting to put in a suite legally. This would be fundamentally unfair and encourage people to continue to break the rules. Please protect greenery and trees. Do not allow those wanting suites to increase site parking if it means removing greenery and trees. Better to have people park on the street which is already paved.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Extra off-street parking for new suites. Limit number of people living in a house...affects parking! Having owner living there and responsible. No regulations except complaint based.	Leave things as they are now!	No Idea!	No idea!	No	Not sure how areas/zones would be chosen. Historically owners will want NIMBY??	Leave things as they are and increase rental accommodation with infill around commercial areas.
It provides for my answers to the previous questions.	They are literally my answers to the previous questions. If I had to change one thing, it might be the requirement of a business license for previously existing suites.	Rms7	Uplands. North Oak Bay north of Cadboro Bay/Bowker rd	I generally think a pilot program is useless. Whether it's done with zoning or by neighbourhood, it just can't provide enough data to extrapolate municipality-wide. Oak Bay needs to hire a team of actual data scientists, not just consult with graduate students from UVic.	Why are existing and new suites lumped together here? New suites, in new builds, must be rezoned. Existing suites should not.	This will have a huge impact for years to come. It could double the population on our tiny side street. I personally believe that Oak Bay should be increasing population and tax revenues by increasing density along major and sub-major corridors. Multi unit and multi family dwellings (townhomes, duplexes, low rise apartments) builds are being neglected, while subdividing SFH properties by property developers and speculators runs hot and rampant. It's tough to balance being YIMBY while also preserving the character that our community has been known for —for generations. Allowing a 100 year old character home to be torn down for a glass box or two has got us where we are today: in an existential battle to preserve Oak Bay's charm while out-of-towners and the newly-relocated attempt to tear down the tweed curtain. Let them build their townhouses, triplexes or even communes, but stop them from "developing" our character into just another boring suburb.
voluntary registration list						Think we should make it happen! Oak Bay would greatly benefit from allowing secondary suites - from the business folks will bring who are staying in the suites, the fact that younger folks will be able to more easily afford purchasing a house, and will enable a more diverse and vibrant community.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Provides choice for all homeowners	No					If complaint driven enforcement is enacted/continued, there should be set criteria for a complaint to be accepted and a way to have the complaint resolved/removed to guard against vexatious "grumpy neighbour" complaints
My preferred scenario (Pilot Sites in the 3 areas referenced in an earlier question/min. lot size/40% GFA/1 parking space/Owner Occupied/Low Cost Registration -maybe declaration on property tax form with penalty for misrepresentation/low cost enforcement - perhaps on multi-year random sampling basis) is not listed. Advantages of this approach include: experience gained before full policy implementation, cost-effectiveness, and encouragement of citizen responsibility. Should be registered with the district to ensure compliance with by-laws	N/A	N/A, see Q#21	See Q#21	Length of pilot: 2 years Low cost registration and enforcement Results considered in context of accelerated Oak Bay Village Plan area process/report	Not totally opposed if a specific rezoning process could be designed to be rapid but thorough and time/cost-effective.	There should be a "Maintain Status Quo" scenario to allow residents to select this option should they wish to.
Complaint basis; owner occupancy required	Allow borders too (thinking of seniors who want to age in place); they could share main living space with friends and have their caregiver living in the suite. Also would prefer mandatory registration so that stats can be kept.		Doesn't matter where; what matters is that problems can be identified and addressed before rolling out to entire district. Perhaps start near Camosun/UVic to address the student demand?	Require registration in the pilot zone so that accurate stats can be tracked.		Allowing boarders and licensed suites would allow seniors to age in place by sharing their living space with peers and hosting a caregiver in the suite.
Provides control			North Oak Bay			
No boarding, off street parking, mandatory license, owner occupied, compliance program	Not sure why suites are only in certain zones-if they are such a good idea why not across entire municipality			Identify existing secondary suites and use them as the pilot program. Determine if the various rules and regulations actually work prior to having new suites constructed	why would you set up a new program without bringing existing suites up to standard first. If the costs of enforcement and staff time are too high this would indicate those problems. I believe Oak Bay is full of suites that are a hazard to the people living in them, they should be made safe prior to any consideration of building new suites	I do not agree with secondary suites. Think the municipality will find that requirements such as that the owner live on site will not be enforceable. But if we have to have suites then the first step should be to regulate those that are existing, before opening up new suites. Protect the people who are currently living in these substandard suites, make the owners bring the suites up to standard and pay for a license to operate.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I chose the status quo which should have been an option as the Survey states it supposed to only be "considering" secondary suites not implementation (which is what A-D scenarios are)			North Oak Bay			<p>This is a dishonest Survey. The preamble states we are looking at a Housing Framework that "considers" a range of housing options. The scenarios listed are all implementation scenarios.</p> <p>To be open and complete I ask the Consultant's recommendation include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Who is going to pay for the recommendation-startup and yearly costs-the community through taxes or the owners that have secondary suites; 2 A full statistical analysis of the survey- sample size, confidence intervals, all comments; 3 exactly what the recommended enforcement means; 4 A written report from the Engineer whether our crumbling infrastructure can handle more suites; 5 A written report from the CFO if the implementation costs will affect our ability to address our \$300 million plus infrastructure 6. A followup one question survey that ask the community whether they prefer <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A) consultant's recommendation B) status quo <p>NB It seems that anyone in the world can answer the Survey. As many times as they want? The property tax bill just went out. Why could a random number not have be sent out in the same envelope that would be required when one goes to fill in the survey? Then one would have an unbiased reading of the community.</p>
Off street parking required for secondary suite			South Oak Bay	I think off street parking is essential and also that secondary suites have good height ceilings and are to code	Ensures safety of suites	

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Gives flexibility and encourages additional housing options in desirable part of town where people want to live.	Anything with most flexibility would be best		Henderson given its proximity to Camosun and UVic	I think it is easier to bypass pilot since pilots will have to have very clear acceptance criteria which may take time.	I think if this will bog down council. Also might have people hesitant if they think their neighbours will complain and their rezoning request does not get approved. It would be better to have a checklist along with application (and fee if applicable) and then have complaint based process if people are not renting to people abiding by bylaws.	Really think it is time to formally allow suites. It can be done in a cost neutral way with minimal negative impacts while providing housing opportunities to those struggling to find places in nice areas. It may also provide revenue opportunities to offset municipal costs such as recycling, garbage, police, fire, and infrastructure. It may also offset high property taxes.
					Too much tax dollars and time	Consider multi generational families
Prefer Max 40% of GFA but also don't want to limit boarders or lot size.		Rs-5		May want to select zoning or neighborhoods based on interest from surveys	May take too long. Better to have a municipal directive to allow suites.	The province has leases that require landlords to maintain a minimum safety for dwellings in case people are worried about compliance
Parking off the road and on property	No business license required	All zones	All neighborhoods	Parking is an issue on narrow streets . Fire departments require access		
Owner occupancy required and mandatory business license	Existing suites first					We have turned a blind eye to all the existing suites, neighborhood complaints is only option for bylaw to be upheld. You must ensure existing suites follow the same rules as any new requirements and if we report suite to you that it will be investigated with anonymity to preserve neighborhood relationships.
I like owner-occupied. Also like a district-wide system that would ensure safe standards. Should not have to rely on complaints.	I wonder about "boarding." If an elderly person/couple want to remain in their home, which has a suite, can they also have live-in help or us that considered "boarding?" Or if there is a suite, could you also host international students — or would they be deemed boarders? I approve of both these scenarios and would not want to see rules that prevent them.		Would be happy to have it in our neighbourhood near Carnarvon Park in North Oak Bay. Perhaps could offer it in areas where secondary suites already exist and make sure they are at or are brought up to code, which would achieve two goals at once. Not mandatory, but offer a way to make existing suites legal.	Please don't stretch this out over an extended period. It's time to get this done.		Hoping for a balanced approach that won't take forever. While trying to deal with every existing suite might be ideal, might be better to make conversions voluntary and approve new suites that meet requirements. Also, big fines for illegal suites that are reported might spur those landlords to make changes.
Mandatory business license					Site specific increases costs and workload for district staff.	
Most flexibility for home owners, no risk of existing suites suddenly becoming illegal, adds gentle density					This seems like there would be a risk of existing suites being not approved, essentially evicting the tenants	

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
We need more housing - many Oak Bay residences have dead space to help housing, allow lone, elderly to have lodgers/tenants and people have spent large sums to live here - should be permitted within reason to fully leverage their asset.				Not necessary to spend another five years on this - there are many other priorities -this needs to be finalized and move on. Oak Bay always talking about action and years pass with none.	Publish the regulations and home owners need to comply.	Please explain oven or no full oven as seeing suites in Oak Bay advertised with and without. Thanks.
Let the free market decide, increase density and make living in oak bay more affordable for new families. Too many large homes are being occupied by a few residents. We need a vibrant community and the workforce required to service the needs of the community need places to live. Allowing secondary suites makes buying a home in oak bay more affordable. So many people who grew up here would love to raise their families here and need the income help for the first few years.					Adding more levels of review increases the complexity and cost of adding a secondary suite. Lets grow density, add to the value of properties and grow the tax base of new residents that want to move to oak bay.	Oak Bay Watch should be ashamed for spreading their propaganda. Thinking adding secondary suites will further the decay of our infrastructure issues is a joke. Add to property values, increase the tax base a d let's fix the issues rather than staying the same.
	It's a mix. We are in a housing crisis so let's make it easy to provide safe, 'affordable' nice places for people to live. Owner occupier is important as it will potentially reduce problems. Off street parking is only necessary if there are extra vehicle and lots of renters don't own a car.			Just make it district wide. It's not like secondary suites have just been invented.	The municipality has been discussing this issue for so long the landscape has dead changed. The most pressing issue in Victoria right now is the housing crisis and even if only for the 100% selfish reasons that I want to feel safe in my neighbourhood and also would like my children to one day be able to afford to move out. We need to do everything we can to find nice safe places for people to live. Let's make the process of building a suite in our homes as easy as realistically possible.	Please get on with it.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Allows flexibility	Unsure of the impact of the suite size restriction			More housing is required now - concerned about time pilot program will take.	I feel we need to action to house people - yes it should be thoughtful and controlled but not so difficult and time consuming,	<p>Most significant concerns have to do with the blight of many more cars parked on the street, and the possibility that a significant number of suites might be used for short stay visitors (eg Airbnb)</p> <p>In some of the established neighbourhood with large homes, there were historically people housed in secondary suites or bed sitting rooms - our home from the 1920s have the vestiges of this still - probably a domestic who worked in the house.</p> <p>As a family with several young adult children, we are hyper aware of the difficulties young people face to procure adequate housing in this region. We also acknowledge there are many people who sorely need to offset the rising housing costs (mortgage etc) with rental income.</p> <p>Creating great neighbourhoods with secondary suites to me is more than square footage or amenity rules - privacy, green space preservation, parking, adequate transit and services are just a few of the details that need attention.</p>
i don't agree with permitting secondary suites in my neighbourhood	No					This survey was not neutral nor did it allow for residents to respond with No.
Most restrictive						Very biased survey that doesn't allow for debate over whether suites should be allowed in the first place. It appears that the decision has already been to allow suites

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Supports seniors who want to age in place Provides affordable housing for young families Supports intergenerational living arrangements within the community Ensures essential health and safety requirements are met while minimizing regulatory burden Some restrictions required. Sounds like you are trying to turn Oak Bay into Saanich.						Secondary suites are already common in Oak Bay so legalization is inevitable. If a licensing or registration scheme is developed, properties where occupants are related should be exempt from any licensing or registration requirements. If possible there should be a requirement that a property with one or more secondary suites must also be the land owner's primary residence.
			Yours			
Need to have strict control on those homeowners wanting to have 2nd suites in their homes.			In neighbourhoods located away from schools, parks and hospital areas; and away from busy main streets of Oak Bay	Ensure that it is a 'true pilot' with results then provided back to residents who can then provide feed-back; and not 'piots' that then council adopts without consent of community members	Might be the best approach	Need to be careful that increased population due to 2nd suites do not impact communities financial/fiscal ability to provide needed services; hence property taxes must be increased for only those home owners that put in 2nd suites.
The protection of owner, renter and neighbours.						I wonder about the additional cost of garbage and re-cycling collection as well as the extra strain on the sewage system that secondary suites would bring. Or would the home owner be required to pay extra?
C covers most important issues, with the exceptions indicated below	Would add required business license, and 90 sq mt max, and district initiated compliance program					Major issues to be considered are parking and tree preservation. PLEASE stop the demise of our tree canopy
WE need to increase secondary suites and I think it is problematic to set up artificial barriers	no, though voluntary registration would be acceptable			no	no	no
That secondary suites would be allowed in all single family homes Off street parking required for new & existing suites	There should be a restriction on the unit size.			Secondary suites already exist in OB so a pilot program doesn't make sense. Seems like just a way for OB council to stall making a decision.	Agree on the basis that neighbours would hopefully have input or warning	Secondary suites already exist in the community and should be allowed in all single family residences with parking required and a max size for the suite. OB council has been procrastinating for years on making a decision on secondary suites.
	No mandatory business liscense	RSS zone	N/a	I think off street parking is crucial.		None

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I have 13 suites on my block alone. There have been no problems with them. These suites support affordability for young families to come in and revitalize the neighbourhood, using the revenue to help with mortgages. The suites support students at UVIC etc seeking affordable housing.	no			The suites are here already and there are many of them. They are not a problem. Such a fuss because of a few snobs.	Suites will just be driven further underground and the rezoning process would be divisive to neighbourhoods & become highly politicized. Leave it alone.	Some folks would do anything to stop the next generation find their way into home ownership. Just because I've got it made is no excuse to block an avenue to people achieving financial and housing security. The suites have been here all along, with far less fuss than one would suffer with a bad neighbour owning the home next to you. In fact we are more protected when it comes to suite occupants, because generally the owner will eject tenants if neighbours complain, but getting a nasty owner out is impossible. I'm really shocked that OB would get sucked into such a small minded discourse. The suites have been here for a long time - self regulating nicely. No homeowner wants to live above an unsafe suite, so safety takes care of itself. The rental of entire houses carries more risks than suites but you don't hear a fuss about that.
Secondary suites would result in the least change of character to Oak Bay.	No change				None	None
All the other options will reduce or limit inventory and green space and increase costs to the municipality.				No pilot programs, no more questionnaires or studies - housing is needed NOW!		Get on with it. Don't keep wasting my tax dollars with further delay. Oak Bay needs more housing options. Use existing by laws to deal with problems and don't single out renters. Stop dividing our neighbourhoods. Let's diversify and densify, it's the smartest move economically, environmentally and to build the social fabric of our community.
Most restrictive	Not allow secondary suites at all		Uplands	Don't think secondary suites should be allowed		Don't think secondary suites should be allowed. Oak Bay will lose its charm and community feel if suites are allowed.
I believe it will encourage a greater number of secondary suites in Oak Bay, which are sorely needed.						
Freedom for people to do what they want with their homes.						
						Stop the complaint based bylaw enforcement, which is a charter for disgruntled neighbours

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
The most regulated/hardest to comply with because secondary suites should not be allowed at all!	Scenario D should be an option where secondary suites are not allowed at all.	N/A	Uplands, Estevan, South Oak Bay	You will find the majority of Oak Bay residents will not like the outcome of a pilot program in these neighbourhoods. The overcrowding and drain on parking space will frustrate everyone who lives nearby.	Extra costs may be necessary to ensure residents don't lose peace in their neighbourhoods, but the costs can be avoided completely if secondary suites stay illegal!	Do not legalize secondary suites in Oak Bay. Our narrow roads and quiet neighbourhoods are not a good fit for suites.
will maximize opportunity					needs to be streamlined; speedy approvals are needed	I support expanding opportunities for people to live in Oak Bay. The total sq. ft of housing has grown much faster than the population over the last decades.
Most flexibility but still owner occupied, which helps prevent absentee landlords					Too bureaucratic	I think owner occupancy is the most important factor. And some basic safety and health compliance.
There are some restrictions but not extreme	Not making it zone based.					
Mandatory license and district inspect for compliance		Areas that are already High density				This assumed that secondary suites were progressing. Do not agree with secondary suites being allowed or expandedAllows go or individual/specific needs
Existing suites would have to meet more stringent requirements re safety, parking, etc.	I would allow the land use of scenario A					
Meets my preferences for allowing secondary suites					Parking is a problem already with properties not having the required parking for the residence never mind adding a secondary suite.	Secondary suites should not be allowed to be short term rentals. I.e. air B&B.
					Way too labour intense, creates financial burden on home owner and municipality	
owner occupancy				we already have secondary suites around here...so no more needed	A building with many suites should be re-zoned and taxed more.	The old Oak Bay Guest House will have too many people for one residential lot, so should be re-zoned and taxed more.
Opens up the community in the broadest way possible to expand densification and livability in Oak Bay. With help address the housing shortage.	I like having voluntary registration and business licensing and compliance as part of the mix.				Bad idea...will gum up the process that is well overdue. Secondary suites are and will continue to be a reality in Oak Bay no matter what Council decides. I would much prefer they be above board, regulated and registered providing protection to both landlords and renters.	
I don't want to see secondary suites allowed at all.	Same as answer 21					I am totally against adding additional density into Oak Bay.
			Eastdowne			

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
			Wherever there are the most applicants			I have observed that many people have secondary suites and quietly get on with life without parking problems or other infractions. Like noise or wrecking the ambiance of the neighbourhood. I think the key is density and parking. Home owners should be able to let a renter go if they don't abide by the rules.
No secondary suites should be allowed.	Again, no secondary suites.			There is no need for such a program. Use the areas which already have secondary suites.	Zoning is important. May residents moved to Oak Bay because they could live in an area where single family dwellings were the norm and likely to remain that way. Zoning should be changed for serious reasons, and, in my view, in order to increase population density via secondary suites is not one of them.	I spent part of my career working as a statistician. I hope no-one was paid to design this study. There is no option that allows those of us who wish Oak Bay to remain the location of areas of single family dwellings to express that view. What about those who like the status quo? Which I understand to be a few legal suites, many illegal suites. And being illegal unwelcome tenants can be made to leave with minimum fuss. It asks questions and provides answers that are not permitted under provincial law (eg. enforcing owner occupancy). There is no mention of the costs that suites impose on a municipality. More bye-law officers will need to be hired. And of course, the crumbling infrastructure will be subject to additional stress. My advice.....forget secondary suites and address some of the more urgent issues facing us, eg. said infrastructure.
All the other options will reduce or limit inventory and green space and increase costs to the municipality.						Please stop wasting tax dollars and dividing the neighbourhood by delaying this. Oak Bay needs more housing.
allows for additional suites, protects on street parking while accommodating existing suites/tenants					site specific is too dependent on the whims of existing council and staff; potential for inequitable results	
It has the greatest potential for compliance to the rules and regulatory enforcement.						If secondary suites are approved, the homeowners of the suites must bear the costs for the administration and management of the program through additional property taxes. A business license will not likely defray the costs. Homeowners who are not deriving revenue from suites should not bear the costs.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Oak Bay already has multiple secondary suites.... and this happened without encouragement, zoning, enforcement, or regulation by municipality. Too late to for municipality to have a role.				Why?? Oak Bay already has multiple secondary suites....and no role or action by Municipality. Don't start now.		Too late now to start policy, regulation or other municipal involvement. Just let noise, nuisance, abusive behaviors of owners, tenants, etc be controlled by residents, civil actions and police. Stay out of regulating property use. Too late now to for municipality to start controlling suites.
It offers the clearest solution and greatest flexibility.				The pilot program exists. Let's legalize the existing condition.		
No additional parking required, many do not drive and additional parking is against climate action and affordable housing goals	Registration is important to track increased housing and bring equity and status to renters.			We are in an affordable housing and climate crisis. Show leadership and do not slow down this overdue and needed change to legalize secondary suites.	This is a waste of tax payers dollars. We need housing, show leadership and do not consider this NIMBY option.	It is embarrassing how long this process has taken. Let's approve and move on. Please show leadership.
na	na			A pilot program seems like a waste of time. We need this additional housing now.		Rental units are desperately needed, and houses are so expensive owners almost have to have a tenant to pay the mortgage. The less red tape and pilot programs you have, the better. Although, I do agree that some oversight must happen for the safety of the tenant and the livability of the neighbourhood.
The best regulation addresses the need of landlords and neighbours. Currently the weight and lobbying favour those wanting to legalize the illegal suites. It is unfair and bad policy to reward illegal cheating.	Make tenants pay their per capita share of the sewage tax, instead of putting the burden of gardeners.	Oak Bay Avenue	Oak Bay Avenue	On qn 24 and 25=above , I should have said uplands as their lots could easily absorb tenants, and provide opportunities for UVic students with good bus access, and within easy cycling distance		Make the priority the interests of most residents, and don't reward those who knowingly operate outside the rules.
It involves the most flexibility in the growth of additional rental units in the municipality of oak bay. With a lowered regulatory burden on homeowners looking to add secondary suites, the municipality is likely to see the largest growth in new rental units. This is both good for the health of the community from a population perspective, as well as improving the affordability for both renters and owners.	I think a registration system would be help to enact in scenario A as it would allow the municipality the ability to track how many new units are added to better understand the impacts of this new bylaw. You can't declare the change a success or failure if you don't measure it.			A pilot program isn't necessary as secondary suites are a widely implemented bylaw in municipalities all across the country. Everything you might want to learn is readily available from other jurisdictions.	This is a large regulatory burden to place on what is considered a very normal urban residential addition. Council has better things to deal with than hearing the grievances of every person who doesn't like the idea of renters moving into their neighbourhood.	
Most controls	More consideration of lot size			Let's get on with this!	For fairness there should be consistency between old and new suites	This consultation process has been going on for years. Let's make some decisions.
Prefer something between Scenario A and B	Allow boarding					Secondary suites already exist in many homes. Let's make it a fair and balanced approach for all home owners. The cost of living in Victoria is driving the need for secondary suites and there is a desire for lower cost options in Oak Bay.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>There has to be some registration of suites, no registration and voluntary registration are, really, the same thing. Parking is an issue, I live on a street where 90% park on the street and there are numerous suites. Additionally the vast majority of garages (where not used as illegal suites) are used for storage, exercise rooms etc. Enforcement has to be District initiated. The system must be equitable and equitably applied otherwise we will be reduced to vindictive actions rather than mediative discussion.....I don't like where you park so I'll initiate a complaint about your suite. Owner occupancy has to be a condition. One of our neighbours had an Air b n b some years ago that resulted in a number of incidents including trash, noise and frequent visits by one night "tenants" and call girls.</p>	<p>NO</p>			<p>My concern with any program is, as stated above, that it be both equitable and equitably administered ACROSS THE ENTIRE DISTRICT. Confining it to one or more zones or districts will, no doubt, uncover a large number of by-law infractions of one sort or another which, no doubt, will need rectification at a cost to all those who agreed to participate while leaving the rest of the District untouched. By Law officials coming to look at a potential or existing suite should not be able to return later with an order to e.g. take down a greenhouse too close to a lot line or take out a driveway that is wider than it should be, unless the District is going to enforce those and other regulations across the board.</p>	<p>It's clearly a very complicated process, which I applaud the District of Oak Bay for beginning to tackle. I strongly believe that many of the issues should be dealt with by a Mediation Panel rather than be enforcement of, in some cases, outdated Bylaws. A prime example is the issue of garages themselves. We in this century, have enormously different lives to those even 40 or 50 years ago. Buy an old house in Oak Bay and you will have closet space in a "master bedroom" that has a coat hanger rack 6 or 7 feet long and no room for a king size bed suite. Children have more toys, we have more junk, we have more tools, we have more outdoor furniture than the average modest house in Oak Bay 50 years ago had inside! We put it in the garage, along with the absent child's furniture etc., and the workshop. We don't have snow or minus 25 degrees in winter. Enforcement of all the bylaws we have is probably impossible from an administrative and economic standpoint. Discussion and compromise will not only work but it will build a closer community. So will suites.....if we do it properly.</p>	<p>Thanks for all your hard work. Stay safe</p>
<p>Pilot project</p>	<p>Nothing really addresses the lack of parking issue where secondary suites are concerned.</p>	<p>Any one</p>			<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>I live in the Henderson area and there already a problem with UVIC students that is not well controlled.</p>						<p>Enforce your pre- existing bylaws before you go forward. Hire MORE bylaw staff not managers.</p>
<p>Everything but the Land Use.</p>	<p>Land Use would need to be Scenario A.</p>	<p>One zone that is big enough for the pilot program.</p>				<p>We are still unsure why unregulated secondary suites would comply.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I am not in favour of secondary suites, but that choice is not given.	Again, I am not in favour of secondary suites. On our street, three doors down from us, there are often an additional 4 cars parked on the street for one house that contains a suite.	It is unfair to do it by zone.	Again, it is unfair to do it by zone.			As I have stated above, I do not favour densification. We moved to our Oak Bay neighbourhood because it was quiet and suites were not permitted. Although illegal, there have been and still are suites around us, and it has changed our experience living here: cars parked in front of our house and a tenant arrested across our back fence. I am concerned that these types of situations will only increase with the allowance of secondary suites. I hope that the council will consider this opinion as we don't want our neighbourhood to become an unpleasant place to live and to feel we need to move.
This scenario provides the flexibility needed to enable this initiative to its full potential.	No	no	no	no pilot	no pilot	still no pilot
The lot and unit size restrictions and parking requirements seem unnecessary. Allows more housing & density.	Perhaps adding registration. Unsure about the benefits/drawbacks, but registering and paying a fee doesn't seem unreasonable if there are extra servicing or enforcement costs or even if it aids with data collection.			Only fallback on this pilot option if it is the only way to move this perennial issue forward.	Slow and burdensome for owners and council. Only the opposing neighbours will show up.	Let's get it done!
The closest to having no suites.	Not allow suites	langford		If they turn out bad, are they reversible?		They are a bad idea
Mandatory registration	Off street parking for all occupants or if not mandatory costly parking permits for street parking			Who would review the pilot projects or close suites after construction ?		Obviously, in North Oak Bay undeclared suites are prevalent. Fortunately some respectful Landlords provide on site parking or stipulate "No automobiles" Living on site, they are able to maintain gardens and encourage garbage/recycle disposal. However, Oak Bay's regulation enforcement is presently limited. If Secondary suites are established would funding from suite taxes provide enforcement funding or would this be added to all taxpayers?
Provides aging home owner the most flexibility to earn income from international students and lodgers as includes boarding. With the uniqueness of many older homes not limiting size would enable suites created to suit the house or garage. In addition allows home owners to advertise no parking provided so you are supporting the environment and hopefully attracting people who use bikes or Modo car share for transportation.	No for scenario A but I had hoped to see more scenarios with options for boarding (ie adds accomodation with shared Kitchen). We have an old garage we would like to use but under this study we would be limited to boarding use.			There is no need for a pilot program - it's been studied enough, the message was clear we want this. I want opportunities for my nieces and nephews when they are grown to move out while attending University and still be close to home. I know too many "former" Oak Bay residents who could have saved a family property if they had a way of increasing densification and funds that could be used for home up keep.	This is not required to my knowledge in other municipalities? We need enabling bylaws not more barriers.	Please move more quickly on the garden suites and lane way houses and granny cottages. We have some beautiful character homes on very large lots that would be perfect for a granny cottage. Having this as an option would enable me when I need single level dwelling to stay on my property and enable my son and daughter-in-law to live in the main house. I maintain my independence while they get an inheritance while I get to see grandchildren and help out with family finances.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I am opposed to secondary suites. However, if we do allow them, then they should be fully regulated and permitted, and meet all, holding code requirements. Our streets are already crowded with parked cars, so off street parking should be required.						
	type D with no parking					Id rather we not have secondary suites
It seems safe and regulated and suites would be an option for the majority of houses in oak bay.	I don't think owner occupancy is crucial. I have owned houses without and with owner occupancy and both were safe, didn't impact neighbours and were kept clean/maintained. It's really about being well managed not being compliant with rules. Except parking, which causes great consternation for everyone involved.			I think there is too much considering and not enough doing. There are suites now, let's get er done.		
Only scenario with no lot size minimum. A 6000 sq ft / 558 sq m lot size is too large to benefit the people who need it most - i.e. people in smaller houses on smaller lots!	Add requirement for one additional off-street parking for new secondary suites.					I appreciate the opportunity to provide input into a well-designed survey.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Business licenses, firm OB regulatory oversight as well as at least some kind of suite max size restriction.	When it comes to additional, on-site parking please eliminate the need for that parking spot to be a "covered parking spot" as was in the old bylaws. A parking space that is gravel, or paved, or somehow defined without actually being covered, or a formal carport or a garage should be satisfactory. Superfluous, additional expenses like a covered carport, for example, actually serve as a disincentive to owner suiting efforts.			The pilot idea seems to me a little unfair - and both my properties are "village-based," which is to say in easy 2m walking distance to OB Avenue or the Estevan Village, and even I think a pilot is unfair since all OB homeowners should be on an even playing field if their physical home size and lot size meets the criteria, regardless of where the home is located.	I see all sides to this - and I think the oversight and enforcement is so important, but if you make the application process overly onerous then folks just won't suite since they'll see it as too hard, too expensive, uncomfortable (ie public hearings etc.) pitting a homeowner against neighbors etc.	Keep up the great work. I am sure whatever you decide will be in the best interests of the District. Glacial movement and baby steps is definitely preferred over rushing into anything, so please continue to take your time but please make the process clear, enforceable but most of all fair to everyone in Oak Bay vis-a-vis and understand that we need some extra, affordable living options for folks in Victoria; many well-meaning, young or new OB homeowners might need a little extra \$ to help make a mortgage payment or some aging in place might like a suited caregiver. But with the cost of trades, materials, etc., forcing some of those old "extras" - like a formal, covered parking spot, is where I always saw a barrier and divergence of common sense, ie offstreet parking is important, does it have to be covered? Headroom in a basement suite is important, but if there is one header beam that is 6'2 instead of 6'4 or whatever the code says, do we really need to force compliance and require a homeowner to dig out their basement or raise a house to meet "X" height or can we forgive or relax a few of these items to make a suite work or fit an existing home. To sum, I would love a common sense approach that encourages homeowners to suite responsibly, rather than having so many onerous rules that folks just won't do it.
It is lightly regulated. It's not a perfect scenario. I don't mind what type of property a secondary suite is in, but would like an equal playing field around expectations for declaring income, capital gains -- which would require some type of registration to be managed.	Insure a registration process. See answer to #21			Please enough study, surveying, etc. Get on with it. Join the 21st Century.		
It allows housing to be creative. Too many rules restricts scenarios that could potentially be very reasonable. Ie. if a large home has a suite and only one person in main house, why not allow students to board as well?	Voluntary registration	Don't do this. It Jacks the value unfairly of some homes adding to our affordability problems. We are trying to house people and keep it reasonable. District wide is the most fair and most affordable. What are you trying to discover in the pilot??? Just do it.		Already said. Don't pilot! That's just delaying the inevitable. Make your decision and go forth!	Waste of time. Just implement/ update bylaw that supports all SF zones to allows secondary suites.	

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Limits secondary suite size	I prefer, limited suite size, appropriate to lot size, building code compliance for suite in regards to life safety issues, no requirement for additional parking, inspection of construction of suite, voluntary registration after that, owner occupied.	RS5 zone	zones closest to commercial villages and transportation plus properties over 743 SM (8,000 SF) in size	Make it above board, ie: explicit not too complex.		
Sensible.				Fraught with conflict. You cannot please everyone.		Secondary suites exist in many Oak Bay residences for many reasons. Time to make thrm legal with conditions.
no scenario with maintain "status quo"	address crumbling infrastruclero			status quo	address infastructure	maintain status quo
Least obstacle to provide more rental spaces needed.	None			Waste of time and money		All suites should be allowed. We have a lot of heritage style homes that new building codes would not meet regarding suites.
Most coosistent with my views				A pilot would just drag the process out more. It's time to move forward	Rezoning is quite onerous and people with existing suites will avoid it.	
Mandatory business license should ensure that all regulations are being followed and enforced. It is illegal to mandate owner occupied property and would be almost impossible to enforce. You need to quantify the number of people allowed per suite.	Only permitted in new construction unless existing building meets current building code regulations, particularly ceiling height and access and egress points.	Rs5	South Oak Bay			The owners of present suites are probably not declaring the income on their tax returns. Once you set regulations and units are identified then CRA, can go after this undeclared income. There will be many unhappy owners. There is no big issue with the current situation. If you research other areas where suites exist you can see the many "issues" that arise. You will need to hire at least one bylaw enforcement officer. Oak Bay does not even enforce bylaws at the moment. The present officer is also a building inspector and bylaw enforcement is a secondary function. I have zero confidence that Oak Bay will enforce suite regulations, if enacted.
Owner occupancy, minimum lot size, plus unit size.	No registration				I think it would be best to grandfather the many illegal suites, and move forward with guidelines for developing new suites in the most realistic way. These are so needed in our community.	Oak Bay needs to move forward on this urgently.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>The least restrictions possible as needed for safety for resident and tenant. If there is a yearly charge, I (at least) will have to raise the rent, which at the moment is accessible for students. There are dozens of existing suites in my area and no one complains. Don't make this into a big bureaucratic mess.</p>	<p>Seems OK as it is. New builds should provide off street parking.</p>					<p>I have provided a great space for my tenants for more than 20 years. I keep rent low and find students by word of mouth. Have helped some wonderful young people on their journey.</p> <p>If I have to register and pay fees, that will be added to the rent. The unit is safe and well made. If there are renovations I have to make to comply with silly rules, that will be added to the student's costs. Although I do agree that there may be some suites not safe and healthy.</p> <p>I am a single senior and cannot afford to live here unless I have paying tenants. They also provide company and safety for me as a senior.</p>
<p>This is the best option for the students.</p>	<p>Increasing public transit to the univeristy.</p>				<p>It seems like a waste of resources. You could rezone on a complaint basis</p>	
<p>it is the most permissive, and thus i believe will create the most housing possible</p> <p>victoria is experiencing a housing shortage that will soon become a crisis as the city grows, if housing density is not significantly increased in ALL neighbourhoods, right now! students, immigrants, and other low-income individuals need and deserve affordable housing, and i belief secondary suites can help increase the stock of affordable rental housing in victoria</p> <p>additionally, many of these individuals already live in illegal secondary suites/units within homes, and thus are subject to illegal or predatory renting practises, illegal evictions, and unsafe housing conditions. legalizing such suites and units can allow for regulation and the protection of these vulnerable individuals!</p>	<p>i think suites should be registered, so that the government can ensure regulation and safety standards for them!</p>			<p>if necessary, i would rather see a pilot program than nothing!</p>		<p>I'm not in favour of secondary suites in Oak Bay</p> <p>housing is a human right, and as such it is absolutely imperative that providing adequate housing for all citizens is a priority in every neighbourhood</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
These scenarios create a false narrative of choice which is not logical or useful. Physical constraints on suites may be less restrictive and still require registration and enforcement. Or vice versa or any combo.	A better choosing tool				NIMBY not welcome	
Makes it easier for people to provide housing and would allow secondary suites to become more affordable.					Requiring site specific rezoning would effectively make it impossible for secondary suites in any meaningful quantity to appear. Would subject secondary suites to less democratic public hearing processes instead of more representative municipal councillor approval.	Secondary suites in Oak Bay would help significantly throughout the CRD with the region's housing crisis by providing more homes for the higher end of the renters market to rent from. Instead of forcing them to compete for lower priced housing in poorer districts. This would help arrest the worst effects of gentrification.
I could not agree fully with the listed range.	Prefer most of A but would like owner occupancy somewhere on /in he site and registration and inspection required within a time range of completion of the suite . Building code security is for the occupant also.	All Oak Bay should allow suites.		Regulations need to be properly enforced under the bylaw no pilot program is necessary if you draw up a bylaw with the recognition it will be a living document that can be amended .It has taken too long to get this started already.	Any would lead to NIMBY I'm sure. Good requirements and bylaw enforced by staff is done for trees surely you have staff as competent to deal with housing. Forget specific zoning.	I hoped that the last election had some hope for getting on with changes in Oak Bay. Housing is one area of great need and nothing has happened. Very disappointing.
				You need to increase accessibility to housing options. This is not something you need to "pilot" - get on with it!		
Owner occupancy required	Prefer no minimum lot size, no on-site parking required, and mandatory license.			This issue has been going on for so long and is so common elsewhere that it is surely not necessary to study it further.		Question 3 asked about answering a survey in 2019 (I think). I was not sure, but I know I answered on in 2008 or 2009. This has been going on far too long and makes us continue to be ludicrously out of date on housing people who are not wealthy.
Voluntary registration and owner occupied						
Wow, is this survey ever 'biased' and narrow in scope...seems like a bad pill we have to swallow whether we like it or not. I'm more annoyed as the questions do not in any way allow for a true representation of what I want in my home town of many years!!	At this point,...scrap the visions the survey presenters are forcing down our throats in a subtle devious manner	No pilot program and DO NOT consider secondary suites on a district wide basis	No pilot program and DO NOT consider secondary suites on a district wide basis	No pilot program and DO NOT consider secondary suites on a district wide basis	No pilot program and DO NOT consider secondary suites on a district wide basis	This survey is flawed to suggest that anyone in my neighborhood would accept the notion of allowing secondary suites - I know hundreds of people, friends, neighbours and we all don't want it. Period. STOP
All existing and new secondary suites should have parking provided and be owner occupied. We recently had a suite on our street in which a couple had 3 cars and we could not park in front of our house		RS4		Suites close to UVIC and Camosun make sense		
Rental availability and affordability is most important						

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>We need more affordable housing in Oak Bay. More medium-density will be great for our community + local businesses. I generally support making it as easy as possible to have multiple families in one home, and as such am for reducing the difficulties/requirements as much as possible.</p> <p>As for parking - the last thing we need is to encourage more use of cars. We should keep green space + gardens and instead work to improve public transport, bike networks, car-sharing initiatives, etc.</p>	<p>I would include the necessity of having a business licence. I have a business licence for my home business; I don't see why making money via a secondary suite should be any different.</p>			<p>I don't think we should waste more time.</p>	<p>I think this is needlessly expensive and wasteful of staff time. It will massively reduce the creation of secondary suites - or disincentivize homeowners to declare them.</p>	<p>I strongly believe we should encourage the creation of secondary suites. They're a great way to add more homing to our neighborhoods without significantly changing their character.</p>
	<p>Parking is a problem on our street.</p>					
<p>Highly regulated which will limit population growth to manageable levels and ensure safety so as to not change character of the neighborhood. Also, I paid a million dollars for a house because I want to live in neighborhood of single detached houses occupied by people who can afford million dollar single detached houses.</p>	<p>No.</p>		<p>Uplands</p>		<p>Make sure the applicant has to bear all of the costs of the re-zoning process.</p>	<p>There should be a map available of all known secondary suites so as to reduce incorrect assumptions about their impact on traffic, etc, and to sid in complaint based enforcement.</p>
<p>Need to limit density in RS</p>	<p>No new suites</p>		<p>Neighbourhoods near oak bay borders</p>			
<p>The scenario allows for a more regulated implementation initially. Regulations could be relaxed/adjusted in future depending on lessons learned as the community implements the scenario. The cost of enforcement could be offset by registration fees.</p>		<p>RS1 and RS2 where the lots are larger.</p>				
<p>Mire</p>	<p>More regulation</p>					

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
There is more regulations to prevent misuse! But there is a cost to this scenario & if this would really take place.		No pilot program!			I'm disappointed that Oak Bay is allowing any secondary suites at all. What has happened to single family dwellings in Oak Bay. In certain parts of Oak Bay there are cars lining both sides of the street making the street dangerous & unsightly. We bought a home here based on single family homes with lots that are good size. Lots at least 10,000sq. Ft. The whole feeling of Oak Bay is changing with the increased density of the area. It is interesting that Uplands has not allowed smaller lots & secondary suites.	Secondary suites should not be in Oak Bay!
Less restrictive- creates more affordable housing opportunities for both families/homeowners & renters (especially students)						
Strict limitations on zoning and building makes Oak Bay the wonderful place it is to live						
Greater leniency and flexibility						
Because you don't provide an option of NOT having secondary suites at all!!		Put the secondary suite zones in every neighbourhood where a council member lives. Don't put them in other neighbourhoods.	Uplands.	It is very unfair to single out one neighbourhood to run a pilot program in. If you decide to do this, it better not be in Henderson!!!!		I attended the meeting at U Vic several years ago where the overwhelming majority of those present were strongly against secondary suites. Oak Bay is built out. New housing is going up in Langford and Colwood. Don't change the character of Oak Bay and plant the seeds for neighbourhood divisions. Keep yourself busy banning leaf blowers and restricting access to Willows Beach.
Don't want secondary suites, and the answers above presume I do.	have an option that states Status Quo, no more suites added. Infrastructure stresses.			No Pilot, not expansion	no expansion and all existing be reassessed for safety and compliance with parking and owner occupied at some proportion	Oak Bay is one of the last municipalities to not have legalized suites and it has charm. Allowing suites will make us a Fairfield or Fernwood, and if w wanted to live there we would but like the Oak Bay minimal, preferably none, secondary suites.
			North Oak Bay in vicinity of UVIC.			Effect on parking/traffic density must be taken into account.
More fair property taxation						Why is there no question as to property taxes? Our son is a city planner in Goleta/Santa Barbara, California and in order to have a secondary suite the owner is charged up front \$10,000 to have it licensed. Plus there is an annual property tax increase.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Only 1 suite permitted and owner lives there.	Not have the zoning restriction. Like all homes a reasonable size, business licences, parking and monitoring or enforcement. I'm for the general concept of allowing it to increase density and affordability for renters and owners.					we won't have a secondary suite but I support the idea of secondary suites, 1 per home where homeowner lives, to increase density and affordability for renter and owner. With licensing and monitoring and enforcement I think it could work. We had a secondary suite in Burnaby as did most of the home owners in our neighborhood to help pay the mortgage. It did not seem to create problems. We used our driveway to park and renter parked on the street. People here will have to get over the idea that they do not have to use their. LET'S CONTRIBUTE TO THE SOLUTION FOR THE HOUSING AFFORDABILITY PROBLEM.
This is not an ideal Scenario, but I like how it is low-barrier yet properly managed.	Allow boarding, require registration, add district initiated compliance, no additional parking required, and for it to be permitted in all SFD's.			If a pilot program area is chosen, the area should not be disclosed to the public to a certain degree. As certain residents who may be strongly opposed to the program may initiate frivolous complaints in an effort to discourage the program. Also when potentially selecting a pilot program area, ensure it in a 'supportive' area that would not have residents going out of their way to discourage it.	This scenario would be truly unreasonable for the municipality and residents. This is an extreme measure to take that it unnecessary and time and resource consuming. This scenario is the least realistic or productive.	I think this is a great idea! This can help provide and create a vibrant and inclusive community. With proper management, these suites could be a game changer for the community as it would likely bring in a younger population to compliment the aging population in Oak Bay. This would also give Oak Bay a much better reputation across greater Victoria, as our community can be perceived as elitist and exclusive which is really unfortunate and disappointing. This idea to include secondary suites is a great initiative that has the potential to create lasting positive change! :)
Seems to be the most controlled of the options. And the most expensive... argh.			in the University area?			Thanks for providing a survey. Suites are a good idea, but need to be strictly controlled.
Having a minimum lot size and keeping unit size down will hopefully help prevent a huge amount of congestion. Voluntary registration is important to have an attempt to keep track of things.	Not require owner occupancy (what if something comes up and the owner rents the main house to someone else and has a property manager?) or off street parking.				Could get out of hand too easily if there's a huge process to approve suites and you could encounter the same thing that's happening now with illegal suites.	
suits my choices best	no additional parking required - present bylaws restrict the width of driveways so we cannot expand to accommodate another vehicle			we are past pilot programs already with many homes having existing suites in place.	too expensive and intrusive to demand such a regulation. that will take too long and be very difficult to enforce.	

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I'd like the municipality to inspect units for tenants' safety and neighbourhood appropriateness, tax them, shut down problem units where owners are flouting the rules.	Less square footage allowed. Opening the possibility up is going to encourage more monster houses	Wide roads to accommodate extra traffic and parking, areas that already have apartments	Oak Bay Avenue/Estevan Village	You should be mindful that people have chosen to buy (at great cost) properties in Oak Bay for the ambiance: quiet neighbourhoods, ocean, trees and gardens, low density... don't muck it up and think that we have to be packed in like sardines. We're paying a premium for a certain feeling and it'll be ruined if every street is bumper to bumper parked cars and noisy renters next door...	Consult the neighbours. They are the shareholders here not the whims of temporary councillors.	I'm obviously not in favour of densification in quiet neighbourhoods. I don't think that the door should be thrown wide open with little control. Once it is permitted everywhere, it will be impossible to slow or halt if it's unpopular. I've lived next to renters here and it was a nightmare. I highly endorse owner- occupied rentals as then hopefully there will be natural oversight. Oak Bay doesn't have to be the same as everywhere else in Victoria - the quiet, leafy streets are its charm and its appeal.
We should do everything possible to ease the existing housing difficulties for people looking for rentals.	No			Keep it short and efficient.		Get it done.
						Unless it is proven that Oak Bay can manage a new system (within budget and manpower) for secondary suites, then nothing should be done.
None of the scenarios are restrictive enough.	one parking space is nowhere near enough as many renters because of cost and availability are now sharing rental space and each has their own vehicle. 2-4 vehicles are now not uncommon.		Not enough information to decide.			My concern is with traffic, parking and the ability of the current infrastructure to handle the increased load of a hundreds or perhaps even thousands of new residents. Currently we have a secondary suite next door and with the additional street parking (2 suites, 4+ extra cars) it is much more difficult to spot on-coming traffic backing out of the driveway. Although there is lane parking, it seems they find it much easier to park on the street. In addition, playing dodge-em with oncoming traffic is also becoming problematic (Hampshire Rd./McNeil Ave.) Frankly, I think the density is already over what is comfortable and I would like to see it limited to what we already have. If additional density is added, I would like to see those who benefit from the increased housing/rentals to pay for added infrastructure, rather than stick it to the existing residents. I desperately do not want a Kitsilano type density where an empty parking spot requires 15--20 minutes of searching.
Mandatory business license						Houses with secondary suits should pay higher taxes for the municipality extra services.
Street parking is already an issue outside my home and with off street parking it would be impossible.	This wording of this survey is extremely leading. The options are with respect to what kind of secondary suites should be permitted and not whether this makes sense for the community at all.	RS2 uplands	Uplands - large homes and sufficient street and off street parking.	Neighbours should have an opportunity to weigh in about how secondary suites might impact their quiet use and enjoyment of their property.	Neighbours should have an opportunity to weigh in about how secondary suites might impact their quiet use and enjoyment of their property.	This wording of this survey is extremely leading. The options are with respect to what kind of secondary suites should be permitted and not whether this makes sense for the community at all.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
			North Oak Bay			
Scenario D is most likely to preserve the existing Oak Bay single-family neighbourhood values and environment.	Limit suites to specific neighbourhood zones most suitable for them, such as zones in close proximity to commercial or high-traffic areas.				Personally, I would be willing to pay higher taxes to provide the resources for Scenario F. People who object to paying these taxes are free to locate in other jurisdictions where secondary suites are permitted, such as Victoria. If they reply "but I don't want to relocate" then they should accept the existing neighbourhood in which they have chosen to live.	I prefer the status quo, but with more aggressive enforcement of existing no-suite policies. Arguments in favour of allowing suites are fallacious. The "mortgage helper" argument is fallacious because allowing suites will bid up house prices, making houses LESS affordable: future suite revenue will simply be capitalized into house values. The "we must do something to alleviate the housing crisis" argument is also fallacious. The reason there is a crisis in rental housing is because of misguided provincial rent controls, security deposit limits, and impediments to eviction of bad tenants. The crisis in rental housing will not be fixed by permanently changing the wonderful character of the Oak Bay that we have been fortunate to inherit owing to the wise decisions of previous generations. Let's not reverse those wise decisions in a misguided attempt to address failed provincial policies.
We need more homes not more barriers.				Just make homes available now.		
No unit size restriction	Add voluntary registration					Please move forward with approval of secondary suites in Oak Bay. Thank you
						Why is the survey biased towards those wanting suites. There were no questions regarding whether or not people did not want suites. Parking. Although I park in my garage and my wife uses the driveway, visitors here often have to park a fair distance away because of tenants vehicles on the street. Finally I am firmly opposed to suites. I had neighbours who had them and the tenets treated the neighbourhood like they did not care about it.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
I would prefer NO SECONDARY SUITES, but C is the least odious alternative.	In scenario C I would NOT exempt existing suites from requiring dedicated off street parking space.	RS 1 and RS 2 ONLY		Keep it SMALL and run for 3 to 5 years to properly assess degradation to quality of life in the test area.		There is NO NEED (besides greed) for these suites. If prospective tenants can't find lodging in Oak Bay, go a mile or two into Victoria or Saanich and start there. There are many available suites, and it's really NOT FAR from Oak Bay. This proposal does not add ONE SQUARE METER of extra park or public space. Cramming more people into the area will inevitably erode property values and quality of life for existing residents. You are using the "housing crisis" pretext to shift value from owners who do not have a suite to those who want them. From the duplicitous design of this "survey" is clear that you are only looking for affirmation of your continued bias in favour of suites. Oak Bay has a unique and special quality of life that many of us cherish and it is not right to undermine and throw it away with secondary suites. Once lost, that "specialness" (part of which is low density) can never be recovered.
It provides the most freedom for both owners and those residing in secondary suites.					I think this is a good way of ensuring that any secondary suites are livable and meet health and safety regulations.	As we challenge racism and classism in our society more broadly, it is time for citizens and municipalities to investigate the policies that keep our societies segregated and inequitable. I believe that Oak Bay's ban on secondary suites is one of those policies rooted in historic racism and classism designed to keep BIPOC and low income individuals out of our community. As well, as the cost of housing increases, 2-3 bedroom secondary suites are quickly becoming the only option for working families. Allowing the kind of density that comes from secondary suites is also a more environmentally friendly option. I hope that Oak Bay can pass a policy that will allow our municipality to move forward in a more inclusive and environmentally responsible direction.
				If the pilot project has problems the problem can't be fixed where it was done and the results from one area may not be applicable in other areas.		There is not enough information provided on the underlying assumptions inherent in this survey to make any informed opinion. Implications on infrastructure, taxes, services and relationship to the current Oak Bay Community plan are missing. This survey is more PR than getting informed opinion

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Owner shouldn't have to live there. Zoning shouldn't matter. No registration.	1 off street parking spot per dwelling.	South oak bay because they are the biggest whiners. (u)	Same answer as 24. (u)	We are in a housing a climate crisis forcing urban sprawl to continue. We need to density and Oak Bay has NOT done it's part to do so. Current council is even more anti development than the last one. Creating some supply of rentals in oak bay will begin to slow the curve on Unaffordability in the region.	I've done multiple rezoning in Oak Bay and planning staff make it a torturous process. Please don't make an average home owner go thru this process. Nothing will ever get done if so.	Approve it now!
		Not mine				All owners of secondary suites must be on a register with Revenue Canada
I think it strikes a reasonable balance between control/compliance provides sufficient latitude to those that want an income suite.	Unit size maximum of 40% or 150 m²					I believe to make this successful, fair and supported within the community, owner occupied, compliance to building codes for everyone's safety, And off street parking will be critical. Thanks.
						I have a major concern around the total lack of infrastructure impact and costs associated with the survey and secondary suite proposal. I hope counsel is aware that the you have been telling residents that the infrastructure of the city has been neglected and is in dire need of repair and upgrades. Taxes have been increasing significantly to address this requirement. Secondary suites will only exasperate this problem. Increased population will inevitably put strains on all city services. The financial and infrastructure implications of the proposal have to be address as part of the exercise. At what point will-

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
				<p>I do not believe a pilot program would be beneficial enough to warrant the effort.</p> <p>The fundamental issues and knowledge associated with secondary suites is substantial enough to make informed decisions.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - additional garbage staff and trucks be required - a new fire truck and staff - increased policing be required - expanded or reduced recreational facilities be affected - increased city staff to handle complaints or inspection requirements - additional stress on water system or things like reduced service levels - impact on educational systems - impact on emergency services, access problems etc, etc, etc, <p>I fully realize not all these things will immediately be required but there is a tipping point at which very significant costs in any one of these areas can and over time will be incurred.</p> <p>These issues have to be address in any comprehensive analysis of the secondary suites issue.</p>
More regulated.						
Continue with the status quo.					Suite owners to pay annual fees (business licenses) which collectively cover all administration and enforcement costs.	
It's legally registered, the owner occupancy required, parking on street made available.	I think there should be mandatory registration and there should be unit size restrictions.					This has been studied for a long time with no changes. It's time to regulate these suites and make certain people who live in them are not left in the lurch if they need to complain about conditions. Not all owners look after the suites properly or safely.
						I don't want suites in Oak Bay
						no suites in Oak Bay

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Issues of parking, compliance, owner occupied	Parking must be off-street, independently accessible and the number of vehicles must be limited.			There is no do-over when 'pilot' suites are allowed. The neighbourhood is ruined and there is no point of turning back the clock.	Significant neighbours, not just those with bordering properties, must be given an opportunity to speak out regarding the potential for a secondary suite. A suite two or even three doors away can impact a street.	<p>I am against the proliferation of secondary suites in Oak Bay. To live in Oak Bay is not a right or an expectation, but a privilege that should be protected.</p> <p>This survey is flawed as Oak Bay homeowners are not given equal consideration to reject secondary suites. This is an Oak Bay home owner issue, not realtors and developers from anywhere in the region or world.</p> <p>I feel that the survey is developer slanted, supported and driven. Properties are currently being marketed as having full suites already in place (complete other than for the kitchen appliances). Realtors feign ignorance of current regulations.</p> <p>I question Oak Bay's will to regulate suites when they have failed to address the numbers of current illegal suites and multiple boarder situations existing.</p> <p>Oak Bay is already experiencing strains to existing infrastructure. This push for more people, more cars and allowing more stress to aging sewers, streets, power usage and transportation is not sustainable.</p> <p>Don't be swayed by the quick promise of developers and the misinformed. This rush is going to cost us all.</p>
						Please- no suites in oak Bay
						I don't want any suites
						no suites in our district
Must have off-street parking.		RS-1	Estevan	Firm timeline established		Secondary suites must meet all current building codes. If not, they should be given a specified time period to meet such regulations. Perhaps the municipality could partner with a government or private enterprise to provide funding by way of loans, not grants.
						we don't want suites

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						keep suites out of oak bay
						keep suites out of our district
						don't legalize suites in oak bay
						I don't want suites legalized in Oak Bay
						suites should not be legalized
						suites will be bad for Oak Bay, don't legalize them
						suites will ruin oak bay . don't legalize them
						keep suites out of oak bay
						I think developers and would be developers are really driving this whole issue. As soon as suites are approved the values of properties with suites or potential for suites will escalate to the market value of that income stream. So called affordability will not happen, it will actually get worse. Many homes that have been built in the past few years have secondary suites prebuilt in anticipation of approval. Once approved they will command a premium on the market, whether they are used or not. Future construction will also follow this pattern, and you will need to purchase a 'suite capable' home even if you don't need it, just to keep up with demands of the area.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>The scenarios also do not take into account the potential for changing demographics as the current group of retirees depart. Potentially a lot of housing will be freed up as the baby boomer generation moves on. Already we see a lot of younger families moving into Oak Bay.</p> <p>Parking is a significant issue. Renters are more likely to drive than anyone else. The prior surveys show that even if off street parking is provided, 70% of the renters don't use it. The parking must be independently accessible. Our street has four boarding/suite situations and few use the spots available because its easier to just use the street, even when they do not have space in front of their own houses.</p> <p>Public infrastructure costs are going to be significant. The influx of cars will cause greater wear on the roads, create more accidents, and make it more difficult for businesses to accommodate parking as well. Watch the sewer and water systems try to cope with what will become peak loads. How many extra garbage and recycling containers will need to be picked up.</p> <p>In the near future all cars will be electric. Suites</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>must provide for their charging in a safe manner. When the demand is increased, brownouts will be inevitable in areas with secondary suites. I have already seen extension cords running across the sidewalks. How sustainable is this?</p> <p>The regulation is presented as if onerous, yet it could be as simple as a nominal dollar amount and completed on line. Of course this ignores the actual costs of operating the program and support infrastructure. Do we really need to subsidize these suites?</p> <p>Ultimately, I think more secondary suites are a poor solution to a problem that has not been clearly defined. Largely driven by developers and homeowners who think they can make a quick dollar by exploiting misinformation about the supposed benefits they will bring to the community.</p> <p>I cannot over-emphasize that these plans will increase costs to homeowners and renters as the market will price accordingly. Since the extra suite potential of new homes will be a big selling feature, all houses will be priced based upon their suite income potential. Even if they do not have a secondary suite, the potential will be of</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Unit size capped. No boarding combined with suites. Parking still not strict enough. Owner occupied, mandatory license, actual compliance required.	Maximum unit size is still to large, should be limited to one bedroom sized units. One parking space per suite bedroom. Parking must be independently accessible and off street. Owner occupied for main space. Suites must be handicap accessible.			Put in a pilot and you would have ruined the neighbourhood, and it will never go back. People don't realize that pilot does not mean try it and see and then remove the suites if it doesn't work.	Rules should be in place so that approval is required from significant surrounding area, not just adjoining properties.	value. There will also be less incentive to renovate existing housing, as it will be more cost effective to build new, in order to accommodate the future 'secondary suite ready' criteria for buyers. I challenge you to ask the building permit staff what percentage of new builds already incorporate a secondary suite rough in? This survey and much of what has proceeded it are sufficiently flawed so as to be useless. The questions and scenarios direct towards certain conclusions and ignore the obvious - like no suites under any conditions. There is no control over who can reply or who would even know about the survey. A mailing to each taxpayer with a control number would have gone a long way to getting a more believable response (and it could still be anonymous). Did you capture the ip addresses of the respondents? How many used a VPN?
There is enough regulation without making it onerous.	Would the municipality approve an indent in the sidewalk to accommodate more parking if there is a sufficient municipal setback outside the property line?		North Oak Bay			
						I am frankly appalled that there is another survey being done on secondary suites two years after the last one. I am equally appalled that additional densification options are not being considered (e.g. lane houses, garden suites), particularly as this was an election platform of the Mayor's. These options should all be permitted in other to allow long-term residents of Oak Bay to 'age in place' as well as provide more affordable housing for younger people in our municipality.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Secondary suites should be permitted in all single family homes.	More regulation than in scenario A may be beneficial for the health and safety of tenants, but I'm also concerned it could lead to more evictions which are especially harmful to the tenants.				This is likely a big logistical obstacle to increasing the number of secondary suites. I believe it would work against the interests of both tenants and owners to add this step to the process of establishing a secondary suite.	
Equitable.						
I want safe suites that comply with code including existing suites that are currently illegal						
Registrations required or suite shut down so suite conforms to whatever regulations are applicable, ensures safety for tenant and consideration of neighbourhood by landlord.	No restriction on lot size as that will be fairer to all neighbourhoods and parking restrictions will self regulate appropriate size lot.	Not fair to saddle one area over others and either we are all in or none, should also include Uplands regardless of its special status		See 24	There needs to be some oversight on the registration of new and existing suites so the owner takes the process seriously.	It is quite apparent that government and the planning profession believe densification is the only solution for an expanding population. In order for this densification to not destroy the existing character of Oak Bay, one of the best communities in Canada we must proceed in an orderly and gentle fashion. Fairly strict conditions must be in place to restrict unfettered redevelopment if we have any hope of keeping Oak Bay a suburban community. So if we all agree that certain conditions will allow for a degree of densification then those who do not meet these conditions should have repercussion and their suite not allowed whether new or existing.
Parking restrictions/provisions. We have too much of our street taken up by renat parking.	I like the Voluntary registration but would be happy to see municipal I staff empowered to do spot audits - complaints-based or just municipal due diligence. Everyone needs to play on the same level playing field.			Legal or not - we've had secondary suites in Oak Bay for decades. Let's not be in denial here. We don't need a pilot. Just need to regulate what is already in place (a sort of amnesty approach) and new suites that might be under consideration .	I think Council needs to provide some amnesty for suites that already exist. I'm worried about seeding some uncertainty among current renters that their homes might be in jeopardy because of a zoning process. Worried that any costs associated with rezoning (i.e. consulting fees) may be passed onto renters as well.	Thanks for the opportunity to input. It's about time Council dealt with this. In general, I'm more in favour of introducing regulation and zoning processes and standards for any new suites and more inclined to grandfather existing suites in an amnesty approach based on voluntary registration. At the same time, municipal staff need to be able to address issues and complaints about existing suites that fall far short of meeting standards - particularly health and safety .
Land use should be in scenario A						

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
The regulation of a business license.						I have seen examples of secondary suites in Oak Bay that are unfit. One in particular (that is no longer existing ... the house was demolished) was housing university students in a very unsafe basement. No kitchen so hot plates being used in the furnace room. Not enough bedrooms, so walls being opened to accommodate students in hallways. Extension cords running everywhere. I was pretty shocked so I think it's important to take stock of what is out there right now. How you do this and where the money comes from is the big question.
Although I favour more open concept, it is a trade off to possible appease the neighbourhood and possible minimize impact by poor landlord oversight.	Option of either one off street parking space or "no vehicle permitted".	Waste of time do not do this	Waste of time they will say in someone else's backyard. Must include Uvic area.	Pilot only stops the clock. The pilot has already started and been successful for years.	Municipality can not handle the work load time wise or resource wise.	I think any consideration for a review, study, or pilot should only involve current suite owners to describe their measurements, code compliant etc. Then look at these stats to see if there are obvious shortcomings, or if all is well etc.
More restrictive			Recreation Centre area	The Pilot Program should allow taxpayers to have the option of say no to any for of secondary suites		I had difficulty answering many of the questions as it presupposed that I was in favor of an option to proceed. This is not the case and a yes/no to secondary suites question should be included in this program
						don't legalize suites
						don't legalize suites
						don't legalize suites in Oak Bay
						we don't want suites in Oak Bay
						Don't legalize suites in Oak Bay
						I don't want suites in Oak Bay
						Don't legalize suites

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
The scenarios presented do not reflect my views. I think providing off street parking is essential regardless of lot size, for both new and existing seconds suites. I don't think the size of the secondary suite should be regulated and I don't think here should be a boarding caveat. I don't think owner occupation should be required, but I do think there should be business licensing. I think enforcement should only be complaint driven.	See question 21			If there is to be a pilot program then my preference would be to permit 10 existing secondary suites and 10 new secondary suites. This would be based on the first who apply. They and their impact on their neighbourhoods would be assessed after a year.		Very disappointed in the design of the questionnaire, questions and answer options. When I chose "Unsure/prefer not to answer" it was only because "none of the above" or "not applicable" was not a choice. Many people I spoke with shared this view. The analysis must take this into consideration.
Business license will provide funding for bylaw compliance and illegal secondary identification. The great majority home owners do not have secondary suites and, therefore, are indirectly subsidizing those that do with regard to Oak Bay Services taxation equality. Will help counter Real Estate sales promotion of dwellings with illegal secondary suites as "mortgage helpers".	Not at present.	Portions of RS4 near U-Vic	See answer in question 24	Use the Temporary Use Permit tool as an initial legalization mechanization method; minimal renewal fees could be set for those secondary suites with no legitimate problems.	Not at this time.	Legalization of secondary suites will result in a gradual character degradation of certain older neighborhoods; increased parking demand for on-street, front yard, even in older areas with 16ft lanes which are used increasingly as walkways. On a block with 3 illegal secondary suites; one has 4 cars, another 3 cars, third 2 cars. Each of these houses have on- site lane rear parking that is seldom, if ever used. Result is crowded front street parking and multiple parked car front yards. Secondary suites are not a "one size fits all solution" for local governments' housing; end result could be homogenized characterless neighborhoods. Focus should be on Apartment housing along arterial streets, advocating Provincial and Federal agencies for funding such programs - such Federal ones in the late 70's to early 90's.
It tries to address parking but is still insufficient.	Minimum lot size should be greater 6000 sq feet with minimum lot frontage of 60 ft					
stringent rules						
						please don't legalize suites
						we don't want secondary suites in Oak Bay

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
It's the most likely to discourage secondary suites	A parking space must be provided for borders also			I would say No Pilot Program because I don't want any secondary suites. We had an Air B&B on our street for years. Because of the pandemic it turned into a rental with large numbers of people in it. It wouldn't have even with complaints from neighbours. Neighbours on both sides have now sold their homes. I don't think the municipality will be able to monitor and everyone will have suites before long.		The last council was voted out because they wanted to impose secondary suites. Please don't
						we don't want suites
						I don't want suites in Oak Bay
						stop the legalization of suites
						please don't legalize suites here
						I am opposed to the legalization of suites
It's permissive for a type of housing we desperately need.	Registration should be required.			A pilot isn't necessary- it's time to get going on something that will create new affordable housing in Oak Bay.	It's an unnecessary barrier.	The number of cars and parking may become a problem, and make our roads less safe for pedestrians, cyclists and pets, if there isn't something in place to restrict the number of vehicles that can be associated with a specific dwelling. Ie. if you want a secondary suite, you can't have three (or more) vehicles of your own. There has to be enough parking and breathing space for your whole neighbourhood. Restrict the number of vehicles that can be associated with one dwelling to three- one of which must be parked off street.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>Secondary suites are a business. They will make an annual income of at least \$12,000 (maybe more). That income should be reported to Canada Revenue and the business licensing would be a deduction, as would other costs incurred. Unreported income is against the tax law here in Canada.</p>	<p>If all of the other things are compliant, the off-street parking space for one car could be allowed</p>					<p>I believe in a user pay system and those with suites are not doing so and in effect are saying the rules are for others but not for them. What's to be done? If the municipality can't get income for infrastructure improvements that are needed, maybe we should be looking at staying with no secondary suites. More information on the financial status of funding for infrastructure would be helpful.</p>
<p>I think that scenario A provides the greatest flexibility for making use of existing housing stock potential to provide homes for more people.</p>	<p>I prefer mandatory registration of suites, and also that homeowners & tenants share existing on-site parking or that tenants without cars be accommodated if the homeowner was using both parking spaces.</p>					<p>I would support a permit application approach that incorporates the BC Building Code requirements to ensure the adequacy of the suite for occupancy, and sets out whether an off-road vehicle parking spot is included in the permit. The application fee should contribute to the extra staffing cost for issuing such permits. Some properties are large enough to put in extra parking or are designed, as in a corner lot, to allow more off-street parking. So this extra parking would be permitted depending on the potential of the property in question. Some elderly homeowners may not be driving a car any longer, and the suite tenant would then be able to use the on-site parking spot. I would not support the removal of trees for the purpose of more parking as a general practice. Trees are important. Homes on more congested areas of Oak Bay may be large enough for a permit for a secondary suite (i.e. that meets BC code requirements) but without a vehicle parking permit. This is a flexible approach that does not rely on zoning by region so much as the attributes of the individual property.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Could not chose one because minimum lot size was stated as 558m	Would have chosen scenario B, if lot size had been 5500 which is the standard size of many Oak Bay lots——50 X 110					Most of the suites that currently exist in Oak Bay, are heated using the main house heating system, which is commonly from a central gas fired or oil warm air furnace. If separate heating systems for suites is being considered, then you will never get “buy in” from existing suite owners. They will just continue to have a non registered illegal suite, which many have had for 20 and 30 years.
No off-street parking required - to protect trees and green space.	Require owner occupancy, which is implied by permitting boarders, to preserve connections to place and de-incentivize reno-viction.			The ideal (and more thorough) pilot program already exists: every other municipality in Greater Victoria has already experimented with and approved secondary suites. The lessons to be learned from a pilot program have already been learned! Oak Bay is not so distinct from other bedroom communities that quantifiable lessons would be significantly different. This is one wheel that does not need reinventing.	The original site specific rezoning for garden suites in the City of Victoria effectively neutered the program whilst expanding staff workload to no-one's benefit.	Expand the definition of secondary suites to allow a detached secondary dwelling (AKA garden suite) as an alternate, where lot size permits, to allow flexibility of options to best suit local circumstances. This will enhance aging-in-place possibilities by supporting on-grade accessibility and a higher degree of autonomy between principal and secondary unit. It is an inherently more suburban solution (ie following the established precedent of smaller buildings separated by open space) than the more urban solution implied by the current proposal where a single building mass is inflated to contain the maximum allowable floor area. Allowing secondary suites only, as narrowly defined, will reinforce the current demolition-and-replacement market forces. Allowing secondary dwellings as an alternate will promote diversity of housing options (for small family units) by supporting retention of small houses on large lots.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
To keep secondary suites regulated.	No	Foul Bay to Eastdown, Foul Bay to Elgin	Either	Should have a time frame and a survey after a nearby neighbours asking for their input.	This survey does not allow for home owners to make comments about whether they want secondary suites in Oak Bay. It is slanted towards the fact OB is going to allow secondary suites.	I am against secondary suites. The municipality should be looking for property to build low cost or below market accommodation. There will be an impact on sewers, more electricity and water usage, noise increase, and more transient dwellers. They don't pay taxes. Secondary suites means some home owners will vet renters and others will be just wanting a monthly income and could possibly have undesirable tenants which are very protected under the rental act. Providing accommodation could mean the unhappiness of long time Oak Bay tax payers. This survey has too many flaws and is not really asking the right questions -Oak Bay doesn't really want to get honest feedback. It is evident as to the questions being asked.
We need more options and many of the restrictions will make it difficult to enable secondary suites. E.g. Offsite parking would be very difficult considering how many residents either use their laneway or part on the street. Also, the minimum size lot is a big limiting factor. We need more density, period? Many lots are now being subdivided and limiting the size for secondary suites doesn't focus on the future of where housing is going.	I would restrict option A with a limitation on the number of units and having the district maintain the compliance program.			I bought my house nine years ago and it's doubled in value. I couldn't get into the market at today's values. Creating a comprehensive housing plan is vital, which should include secondary suites.	It will take 10 years to implement. I'm being a bit cheeky, but creating these kinds of limitations will cause slow adoption over too long a time period.	I've lived in Oak Bay for 11 years and there has been talk about secondary suites since I moved into the area. I would like to see more action and less talk. I want there to be more options for housing in Oak Bay. I want my children to have options down the road, so that if they want to come back to Victoria, they don't have to spend 5 million to get a tiny house.
	Scenario E... no secondary suites					I am not in favour of additional secondary suites.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Because it presents the most difficult scenarios to allow secondary suites						Mayor and council are not listening to the residents of Oak Bay who, in the results of past sales jobs, have made it clear they do not want secondary suites to destroy our quiet bedroom community. We need to stop wasting more thousands of dollars on these surveys that give false impression that suites are ok. Is there an agenda here?? What would that be?? Hmm?? There is only one question that needs to be asked...Do you want secondary suites in Oak Bay? The answer will be NO! We need our infrastructure fixed! It is falling apart! We cannot support more people using it! WAKE UP!!!
More regulation. A suite owner needs to be constrained and managed for the good of the community.	In many cases, you will need more than 1 car space per suite.		The Uplands	Suite owners and tenants need to be paying for admin, enforcement, & some level of extra taxes. Why should I subsidize this with increased taxes?	Suites benefit a few. Neighbours of suite owners needs to have a say in the process with some assurances (e.g., parking)	Yes - things are expensive, but there is no shortage of people who can live in Oak Bay without having a suite. This issue seems more ideological than practical. Suite owners and tenants need to be paying for admin, enforcement, & some level of extra taxes. Why should I subsidize this with increased taxes? This was a frustrating survey to fill out as all options are not mutually exclusive. This survey should have been delivered through our logins, like the marina survey.
Transparency						
off street parking is essential to preserve the street ambience and avoid it feeling like Fernwood			Henderson, Willows	Parking will be the single biggest irritant for those who are not in favour of suites as it a visual signal of increased density. People are willing to support increased density if it does not overtly change the look and feel of their streets. A number of additional cars parked on the street should be avoided. It is not fair to the single family homeowners to have to look out on a number of vehicles lining the street.		Secondary suites are a bit of a red herring. What is actually needed is downsizing homes (in the form of townhouses and small lots, bare land strata, etc) for seniors who do not want to leave Oak Bay. Some vision and leadership is needed on council in this area. This would be a much more meaningful area of concentration and retain our longtime residents who are so invested in this community.
						Don't legalize suites

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						retain the status quo. Don't legalize suites
					suites are ruining our neighborhood. Don't legalize them	suites are ruining our neighborhood. Don't legalize them
						Stop suites in our District
This scenario tries to keep congestion and parking controlled.					As stated above, a site specific zoning program would incur significant staff resources. As the neighbouring citizens for whom no benefit will be realised, it seems appropriate that these costs be borne entirely by those that would benefit from secondary suites.	
Mandatory district-initiated compliance	Parking will be a problem, you are presuming that a new suite occupants will have only one vehicle.	RS2...lots of parking space, wide expansive yards, room for occupants	Uplands		Enforcement...taxes collected to support the additional burden on existing infrastructure, building codes met	Limit the additional increase to Oak Bay's population to 5% of 18,000 over a three year period.
Owner occupancy means that the neighbours can hold someone directly responsible for activity in the rental unit. This is critical for good neighbour relations.			The realistic test is for one neighbourhood to be involved and it be restricted to owner occupied homes only. If done by zone, I believe the feedback will be uneven...complaints if it is not working but not sufficient to withdraw from this option and exceptionally positive feedback from the owners who only want to make money but not live in the area.	I have concerns about implementing this without open feedback at a public hearing. This issue should not be dealt with online surveys only. How do you require owner occupancy?????	See answer to item 26	Please delay any possible implementation until the community can gather and discuss in a public forum.
Addresses parking concerns and compliance	I would like mandatory registration not necessarily a business license but if licensed should be minimal cost of \$100 per year. Should be some flexibility around parking for existing but not blanket exemption. ie can only rent to person with no car. District initiated compliance should be a simple form filled out initially then something like every 5 years with a reminder notice			too onerous and slows down the process. Secondary suites are here and either can be underground (as all around me) or recognized	too onerous and waste of tax payer dollars and take too much time away from other areas that are so far behind (building permits even for tiny projects take forever so you just give up)	Get on it and make a decision and move forward
Assists with densification.				This survey and the torturous dragging out of this important issue is an example of how to ensure secondary suites will not come to fruition in Oak Bay. Or, if allowed it will be regulated to death and sparsely allowed.	Site specific is just another way to not allow suites. Yet another roadblock to densification.	I support secondary suites being allowed everywhere in Oak Bay - just health & safety considerations overlaying the allowance.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
It doesn't have everything I agree with I don't think you need additional parking and I think there should be a mandatory registration.	I would get rid of the mandatory parking requirements and I would add the requirement to have a business license. I think there could be boarding and a secondary suite.					
- off street parking (a must) - owner occupancy - business license as this is income generating - district enforcement as the regulatory there should be a responsibility to protect renters from unsafe (non code compliant) conditions	these scenarios do not address the land use zoning component	RSS	north oak bay		push these costs as fee's to the applicant, they will be profiting from the suite income and increase in resale value. What about off site infrastructure and development cost charges?	I would prefer and support alternative housing strategies consistent with OCP density areas not shifting the problem to single family dwelling areas, a health community should have density at it's core with access to public transportation and walkability not distributed through existing neighborhoods. I recommend an incentive program for reporting existing non-compliant suites. As a community I see it as council's duty to ensure this housing is safe and meets building code requirements for multifamily dwelling. Don't solve a crisis with a quick fix, pushing people into unsafe living conditions rather than properly planned developments that increase density near the village center and transportation and infrastructure corridors.
						please don't legalize suites
						I don't want suites in our District
					keep suites out of Oak Bay	keep suites out of Oak Bay
						don't legalize suites
						don't legalize suites . they will ruin oak bay
More protection for students and other low-income renters who might otherwise be at risk of being evicted						

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>If secondary suites are not regulated, you open it up to being the wild west. Have had an owner absent house rented on my cul-de-sac, up to six university students one year with four cars, another year a business was running out of the house, with two employees living there, plus receptionist working there Monday to Friday, plus trucks and other employees on site....called the bylaw officer, and could practically hear him rolling his eyes as I set my complaint. They even sublet bedrooms as well as using it as a base for their business. Shoddy enforcement in the past, does not bode well for the future. Too many people, too many cars destroy a neighborhood. If owner occupied is required, then it is a mortgage helper situation, with someone who can hopefully be answerable for problems, and not just a situation where a property is turned into an income generating asset for an owner who is who knows where.</p>	<p>Apply the new regulations to existing secondary suites, and not permit any new secondary suites</p>			<p>Don't the existing secondary suites amount to a pilot program. No more secondary suites are needed via a pilot program. Not in favour of secondary suites.</p>	<p>Staff should be up to the task. Did staff prepare this questionnaire? If so, they have no business slanting the question the way they did, ie., a concern they would have to do more work. If they are not up to the task, that indicates to me that Oak Bay is not an appropriate municipality for secondary suite expansion.</p>	<p>Nothing in this questionnaire as to damage to our urban forest that will be caused by adding onsite parking spaces, nothing about the inability of our existing infrastructure to handle increased population, nothing about the cost of having to support an increased population, which should be carried by the people who collect income from secondary suites.</p>
<p>Mandatory business license to recognize that it is a business. Rent is charged and so it is a business and not a charity. Also, additional costs on the municipality should be borne by those receiving the benefit of the business, not the general population of Oak Bay. Will the business owners (i.e. those receiving the rent from suites) pay additional municipal fees for sewer, garbage, utilities, law enforcement and fire etc?</p>	<p>More information on a district-initiated compliance program. How will it operate? Will it be self-financing? If not, how is this fair that I should subsidize others deciding to monetize their home? This is not about residents choosing to have additional family members living with them in a multi-generational house. It is an additional residence if there is a self-contained unit (i.e. additional and separate cooking facilities).</p>	<p>The Uplands. There is allot of space there and the impact would be less than in neighbourhoods with narrow streets and smaller lots.</p>	<p>The Uplands. There is allot of space there and the impact would be less than in neighbourhoods with narrow streets and smaller lots.</p>	<p>Why are so many smaller and regular sized homes in Oak Bay being demolished? They are replaced with very large homes. That does nothing to help affordability....</p>		<p>More information on cost and administration is needed. I'm wondering why it was not provided with this survey? If it is not available, then it is clear that that this information is needed as a next step before any implementation even as a "pilot".</p>
<p>I like that allows all houses the option to put it in however I would like that the owner lives on premise</p>	<p>It would be nice there's a path where suites that have been built a path to come up to code.</p>				<p>I think that it would cause major delays and anyone opposed would be over represented instead of the majority of people who support the measure</p>	<p>Yeah I have been waiting 20 years for this change can we get this done by the end of year instead of being stuck in the oakbay twilight zone.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Mandatory registration, required off-street parking	would add option of boarding or suites, would not use the business license process but a registration process.	I am unsure		homes with suites/boarding must meet building code requirements for "livable space" in addition to health and safety requirements		my concern is negative impact the the immediate neighbours as well as the community look and feel of Oak Bay. I see other areas of the CRD where density has had a negative impact such as congested streets with no visitor parking very little green space as gardens became parking and neighbours not knowing who lives on the street.
Each family/owner is comfortable with differing styles of living arrangements. Renters will choose if the arrangement works for them as well. The market will decide. Additional utilities usage will be covered with the owner paying additional costs to the suppliers.	We do not tell people how to live in their own homes, without renters. Home owners can choose which choice for renting is suitable for them in the layout of their house. Renters will make the final decision. The market will determine the validity of their offering and price point.			Home owners will chose if they want to have renters. Many homes in Oak Bay were built to house double or triple the number of people who currently live in those houses. Also, seniors who want to stay in their home could afford to do so with renters, as they choose. Perhaps, one of the renters may be one of their care givers - a nice convenience for both! There has been a severe lack of building permits for hourly workers and beginning workers. This opportunity would also serve them nicely! Oak Bay is not in a net growth population situation. The local businesses need a greater number and greater age range of people to build their long lasting service to the community.	Yes! Do not add more administration to Oak Bay. Let the adults who own homes decide how they want to live in their own homes. A home owner, as he/she ages may well live in the rental space, initially identified as such. So the original house space becomes the rental and creates a market place rate of income, especially helpful for people living only on a limited income/pension.	Provincial building, health and safety standards are all that is required. Do not duplicate services at the local level. Thank you for your consideration.
						keep suites out of oak bay
						no to densification including no suites
						I don't want suites in oak bay
						don't make suites legal
						Oak Bay is crowded enough. We don't want suites
Oak Bay has a housing crisis that needs to be addressed. This would increase density and affordability for Oak Bay residents and those looking to move into the area.						

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
More stringent control and compliance to limit abuse of the system, and to minimize negative impact to neighbours as well as a potential drop in property values	We personally feel that RS1-RS5 zones should NOT be considered for secondary suites in the first place.			We don't consider a pilot program much of an option to object to secondary suites in the first place. It shoe-horns in the expectation that secondary suites will occur either way.		Although we would have the lot size and floor size that would allow us to have a secondary suite in our home, we are very opposed to secondary suites in Oak Bay. As a third generation landlord and having personally dealt with tenants and tenancy laws for the past 37 years, I am aware that the laws cater to the tenant and not the landlord (or owner of the secondary suite) and even less to the neighbourhood that is impacted by the increase in density with noise and parking issues. Likewise, increasing density never reduces taxation rates as there is more draw on those services and resources. It should be mandatory that all income from secondary suites must be tied to an individual's income tax filing to prevent an underground industry that is a detriment to our municipality. In conclusion, I would like to say that it is a hard-earned privilege to live in Oak Bay, and NOT a right.
Secondary suites allowed but with some regulations				Pilot projects can sometimes feel like they benefit just a small number of people - feels a little unfair. We have been living with secondary suites in Oak Bay for sometime now. We would like one but don't want to break regulations. Many of our neighbours have them and we are very happy with that but we would like to even the playing field.		We are hopefully retiring soon and would love to stay in our home. It would be wonderful to share our home and have a secondary suite so we can afford to stay. Thank you!
						The citizens of Oak Bay have a responsibility to include a range of people housed within its borders, whether they can afford a single family home or not. This makes for a vibrant mixed community that benefits everyone, from the very young to the elderly. It is the way to the future!

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Provides ability to have suites that are reasonable in size without overwhelming the neighborhood	None			Would want to understand what the goal of the pilot program is. What are we needing to understand and achieve.	I think this could become a bit of a nightmare. A house is zoned for a suite, new people buy it and want it rezoned back to single housing (for taxes), etc.	The housing market has made it nearly impossible for younger people to buy without having a secondary source of income. With mortgages up near \$1million many could not even qualify for a mortgage without extra income. This holds true for seniors who want to stay but can't afford house taxes or who want to be able to create a suite to assist their family in having a place to live.
That suites can be in all homes and there is no owner required	Give additional parking and require registration					
						There is no density justification for allowing secondary suites for Oak Bay. Suites/ small apartments in single residential lots will be the death of our small sustainable community. No secondary suites should be allowed in Oak Bay. This survey is heavy on bias of allowing secondary suites. garbage in = garbage out.
We need to densify to reduce our carbon footprint!		Central oak bay				
	No additional parking required					

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Too complex a question-see previous answers for my scenario	You are trying to force me to pick your scenarios ie your combination of variables-I gave you my combo!			Yes find a neighbourhood were best fit/acceptance	Review each house individually prior to granting licence -non refundable application fee to cover cost if licence not issued that way you will have serious applicants	Yes parking on street suitability one of criteria for licence . On street annual parking sticker for one or tenant two vehicles only. We dont need to cover all our lots with paved parking.We are loosing too much land with homes to the lot lines.Build up! Improve infrastructure to handle extra loads -upgrade storm water practices /underground infrastructure particularly. Cost recovery from homeowner landlords for total cost of administration of licence/inspection. Cost out admin costs/cost recovery properly & the licence fee(ANNUAL renewable/complaint based) will be likely a few hundred \$ MIN-passed on to the tenants. Get an external economist NOT staff to do a proper program costing-it will not be cheap p.a. & start up & will be reflected in rents. Consider contracting out the whole program admin- the track record of local gov forecasting total program costs is generally not too impressive. How many NEW staff required ???????
My choice						please allow secondary suites . It really helps older folks keep their homes
I don't think secondary suites should be allowed.	1. These questions seem to be assuming that I agree with secondary suites, which I do not. 2. One parking spot off street is not enough. Most family's have 2 cars or more. 3. In-law suites for extended family are OK. 4. Densification negatively affects the peaceful enjoyment and safety of our community.	RS5		It seems that mayor and counsel has already made a decision about allowing secondary suites. Will counsel be transparent with the community with the results of a pilot project? Pilot programs are possibly a gateway to eventual approval. I don't agree with secondary suites.	I don't agree with allowing secondary suites.	Secondary suites bring higher density, resulting in a decrease in safety, walkability, bicycling, peaceful enjoyment, neighborly interactions, emergency vehicle access. Secondary suites will result in an increase in property crimes, transient population, noise and vehicle traffic, parking, idling (pollution), higher traffic flow causing safety issues leading to an increase in traffic controls (pollution such as the horrible flashing stop sign at the corner of Hampshire and Oak Bay Ave visible from Central St especially at night) stop lights and signs, crosswalks. The quiet peaceful parklike community of Oak Bay will be eroded with each addition of a secondary suite. Is Mayor and Counsel certain they want to hold the responsibility of this tragic 'potential' change. Secondary suites do not belong in Oak Bay.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
let people sort it out for themselves	no	no pilot	no pilot already done	no	no	get on with it
Parking requirement It captures all my preferences except boarding	You did not give an option for NO more secondary suites Boarding	Uplands	Uplands			I think it is a done deal and council is just going through the motions, I moved here 20 years ago from Fairfield due to all the cars and suites. It is a disaster and you are doing it again
It restricts the number of secondary homes in the neighborhood.						Secondary suites enable the people who own them to profit. The suites do not benefit or enhance the quality of life for the neighbours. Excess noise, difficulty parking, increased garbage, strain on the infrastructure (e.g., sewer system), possible criminal activities, etc. will all have to be endured by the neighbours. This situation is unfair and compromises the qualities that make Oak Bay so liveable compared to other municipalities.
Allows for secondary suites but only for serious interest. Requires home owner investment in order to satisfy the requirements.			RS5		This would be a waste of time and resources .	
I like the max amount of space that can be used in the home idea	Do boarding and secondary suites permitted					Housing costs are at an all time high and we need to consider a way to help house our next generation in oak bay affordably.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
A blend of Scenario C & D would be best. Mandatory business license pushed me to Option D.	Unit Size could be more flexible. And, since this BC Gov doc https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/housing-and-tenancy/tools-for-government/uploads/secondary_suites.pdf is clear that Owner Occupancy requirements will be hard to ensure legal enforceability, I assume Oak Bay will be using Housing Agreements (Sect 905, LGA) or possibly using Residential Rental Tenure Zoning (Sect 481.1, LGA?)			legally enforceable Owner Occupancy is the only way I would be OK with this major change to Oak Bay.	To allow use of Residential Rental Tenure Zoning, I presume Oak Bay will have to interpret a house with a Secondary Suite as "multi-tenant" - per BC Guide for LGs: "Several local governments consider homes with secondary suites to be a two-family dwelling or 'duplex'."	Legally enforceable Owner Occupancy is the only way I would be OK with this major change to Oak Bay. Also, no ability to use the additional space for Short Term rental (i.e. AirB&B). Housing Agreements seem to be the only way to achieve this, I imagine. Please clarify how Oak Bay will achieve these two objectives (Owner Occupancy - and any new rental spaces not given over to short term / hotel like commercial rentals. Finally, how will all this be self-supporting? I like how other LGs make Unregistered Secondary Suites pay 100% utility/garbage/recycling fee. The encouragement for registering could be to pay only 50% of this same fee.
Owners can make decisions	Off street parking would be best					
prefer no suites	please no suites			no pilot program	please no suites	The increased stress on infrastructure and police and fire services for the increase in population would be detrimental to our community plan and increase taxes again. Please do not let suites into Oak BAY.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Scenario D best protects what helps make Oak Bay a desirable community to live in. People value living here because there isn't high housing density and they can live in a single family home, the neighbourhood is relatively quiet, most streets are not overly crowded, homes have mature trees and gardens.			Not sure, but if council knows which neighborhood currently seems to have the highest concentration of legal/illegal secondary suites that might indicate an area of need.		Existing neighbouring homeowners owners/tenants have chosen to live in Oak Bay for its attributes and need to be respected and have some input to what is being developed in their neighborhood. Property values, quality of living, safety (crowded streets, extra policing/fire) and environment all could be negatively impacted once changes to housing density occur.	In our neighborhood there are numerous secondary suites, likely mostly illegal and some are also not owner occupied. Before expanding the current number of secondary suites I would like to see council enforce its CURRENT bylaws and ensure that illegal suites in Oak Bay and compliant with health, safety, parking, etc. Conscientious, community oriented and law abiding homeowners have legal suites and pay for the necessary permits, upgrades and taxes. They should not be at a disadvantage to homeowners who do not comply. The secondary suite study estimates 500-750 suites, most are illegal. This needs to be dealt with first before expanding the number of suites. Council needs to show that it has control and does enforce our bylaws. A suitable compromise can be found that doesn't displace current tenants yet forces landlords to comply.
I think no minimum lot is important the rest I would be differences would across each level	Yeah I allow a path for current illegal suites a path to becoming legal	I think a pilot program is stupid and completely unfair to rest of population in Oak Bay to denied this opportunity. I would never vote for any councillor/mayor which voted for a pilot program it should be district wide!!!!	I think a pilot program is stupid and completely unfair to rest of population in Oak Bay to denied this opportunity. I would never vote for any councillor/mayor which voted for a pilot program it should be district wide!!!!	I think a pilot program is stupid and completely unfair to rest of population in Oak Bay to denied this opportunity. I would never vote for any councillor/mayor which voted for a pilot program it should be district wide!!!!	I think this would delay each new housing suite by years and privilege people who have the economic resources to wait	We need suites there are currently illegal suites out there we need a fair system for all that allows everyone that opportunity to build a suite!!
	Land use, I would change to be any zone.	A pilot program is not needed and is a waste of municipal budget. There are many existing suites in our community with residents that we welcome as neighbors.		I would suggest you don't move ahead with a pilot and continue with community engagement which is more cost effective.		We have at least 4 suites on my quite residential street and there have never been any issues that I am aware of. We need to move ahead with allowing suites due to lack of housing and so that owners can use their additional space as they see fit.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>None of the options were matching how I answered the previous set of questions, actually. This survey is not well thought out. It was impossible to choose an appropriate option that met all of my preferences.</p> <p>Require one parking space for both the existing and future suites. Minimum lot size is good. District initiated compliance program is important.</p>	<p>Skip the part about only allowing suites in certain zones. Instead, require each new suite to apply for rezoning. Include the option for 40% size of the total house square footage, rather than the GFA or less option.</p> <p>Owner occupancy should not be required. That is totally draconian and an overreach of authority. Victoria doesn't have this requirement. Why should Oak Bay? A lot of students and seniors need access to affordable housing options in Oak Bay.</p>				Please be transparent	<p>There could be a cap overall. For example, find out and count how many existing suites there are right now, that are in use for rentals and live-in carers. Then decide what percentage of existing houses could have a new secondary suite for a total overall for Oak Bay within the next say, 20 years. Perhaps around 20 percent? This would help grow Oak Bay's population in a gradual way. Yes to cultural and financial diversity and different age groups living in Oak Bay and our children having options for rental suites as they become adults and want to stay in the community while they work and attend school.</p>
voluntary registration.	Land Use: All Single Family homes included. Parking: No additional parking required.					<p>Give home owners freedom to rent as they see fit, with safety and health regulations in place. Complaint-based cases can be looked into to make sure neighbours are not being disturbed , case by case as they might come up. No additional parking should be enforced. All SF homes should be equally included.</p>
						Don't legalize suites
						Don't legalize suites
						keep suites out of Oak Bay
						I don't want suites in Oak Bay
						I don't want suites in Oak Bay

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Owner occupied and voluntary registration list.	Remove complaint based enforcement					<p>1. Please allow secondary suites to provide a diverse population to include young single people and young families. It's harder than ever for young people to be able to get a leg up on the housing market, but by having access to affordable secondary suites in Oak Bay they might be able to save towards home ownership.</p> <p>2. By having secondary suites available in Oak Bay it will provide older people a source of income to help with their property expenses - especially property tax as their houses increase in value, but their social support or retirement funds do not increase at the same pace.</p>
	Add boarding allowed					<p>I do not think our crumbling infrastructure is capable of supporting new secondary suites. First upgrade our existing infrastructure. As a tax payer I do not want to absorb any infrastructure costs for new secondary suites..or compliance costs</p>
Owner occupied	Mandatory business license	South Oak Bay	South Oak Bay	<p>Prioritize new construction, eg duplexes, triplexes based on lot size, possibly lane way housing based on lot size.</p> <p>This would ensure building code compliance which is much safer from the fire point of view. This would avoid overloading already stretched utilities and the municipality could tax the property's accordingly. Street parking is a huge issue throughout Oak Bay which could also result in safety issues for fire access.</p> <p>We need a public hearing before embarking on such a major change.</p>		

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
See previous answers	Please add Mandatory registration, and enforceable Owner Occupied. I understand there is a 1997 BC Supreme Court case striking down putting this in the Zoning bylaw. Will you be using a housing agreement. I hope so.	RS-5	Each OB neighbourhood should be surveyed first.	Enforceable Owner Occupied is my minimum ask in order to get my support. P.S. I assume no short term rentals allowed at all. The idea is long term rentals? Please confirm, as this is my understanding.		Enforceable Owner Occupied is my minimum ask in order to get my support. P.S. I assume no short term rentals allowed at all. The idea is long term rentals? Please confirm, as this is my understanding.
	I do not like 'complaint basis' as it encourages people to spy on each other					
		What are zones - e.g I do not know what zone RSS is?			I did not see an option F listed - Shouldn't costs be provided by the applicant	As there has been no information there is a problem with the present 750 suites and if other District's, that has changed zoning to register suites, has seen a big increase in suites - almost all unregistered - I would prefer just keep the present 2-tenant situation. As it is not possible to tax suites Oak Bay taxpayers cannot support a new substantial no-revenue population
This is the only scenario which does not require owner occupancy or oft street parking, neither which I believe should be required.	The unit size should not be allowed to exceed the size of the main unit.			Many people in Oak Bay seem to be against secondary suites because they would attract a demographic that they find undesirable. By allowing suites in specified areas, I fear a "ghettoization" within Oak Bay. Oak Bay should be welcoming to everyone, and welcome a more diverse population. Oak Bay has become too elitist.	From what I understand there are already far too many bottle necks in Oak Bay for things the do require rezoning and permitting. We do not need to add to the work load of staff, nor do we need to spend on additional Human Resources for this.	Re Parking Requirements: Before considering parking requirements for secondary suites, look at individual home owners. Where I live, my neighbours own more cars than they have parking spaces. Garages are not used and multiple vehicles are parked on the street. Perhaps anyone, be it owner or renter, needs to purchase an annual permit to park on the street. If Oak Bay is really concerned about climate change, forget about gas powered leaf blowers, and look at the number of cars in Oak Bay.
Able to drive down the street old narrow streets with minimum parked cars.	Minimum on street parking					
More flexibility for home owners					This is unnecessary bureaucracy and expense for the home owners and the municipality and will significantly deter the creation of secondary suites, which we need.	

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
only the owner-occupancy. I'm concerned about the number of vacant units in Victoria, so I think this will help to ensure that people aren't just going to buy up homes and leave them empty. I think it facilitates a better community environment to have an owner and a renter on the property. other than that I think scenario A is the best.	I would prefer a mix of scenario A and B. I prefer scenario A for everything except that I do want owner-occupancy and I do want a voluntary registration.			pilot programs are fantastic and we should try MORE of them. living in a city, even a little one like Victoria, is an ever-changing experiment!	this sounds incredibly nitpicky and slow.	encourage more housing supply while maintaining thriving communities! this is a great idea (:
The way the scenarios are written leads me to believe Council already has their collective mind made up because otherwise there would be an 'Other - explain' choice. Allowing a description in 22 means nothing as Council could simply say 'X %age of surveyors chose option A,B,C or D'	Land Use: Case by case basis leaving existing suites alone except where complaint driven. Min. Lot Size - Scenario A Unit Size - Scenario A & B Boarding - Scenario B Parking - Minimum 1 stall off street parking for tenant plus minimum 1 stall off street parking where owner lives on property. Where owner does not live on site, minimum two off street parking stalls dedicated to tenants Owner Occupant - Scenario B Registration - Scenario D Enforcement - Scenario D			What happens if a pilot rental project is a bust? Given rules heavily favouring tenants, I am highly skeptical Oak Bay would be able to eliminate those tenants. NO PILOT RENTAL PROJECTS.	Oak Bay already added more staff during the pandemic thereby increasing property taxes where many other districts were able to get by with existing staff as well as decreasing taxes! NO MORE STAFF or increase in staffing hours.	The environmental impact on increasing density any way you can without factoring in the toll it will take on existing infrastructure is obscene. Council has already kowtowed to developers to the point I can only presume this is developer driven for new builds.
District initiated compliance program						
						we don't want any suites
						keep suites out of oak bay
						Don't legalize suites
						don't legalize suites
						don't legalize suites

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
	<p>Lot size bigger per earlier response. We are not in favour of blanket RS-1 to RS5 being the allowable location. We want select neighborhood(s) first in a trial, then perhaps expanding based upon TBD criteria. A neighborhood with sufficient space per lot should be the target. Uplands fits the bill completely.</p> <p>Frankly we are not in favour of secondary suites at all. After Covid-19, am not keen on any stranger living in the neighborhood. Would think an owner would not want to mix constantly changing renters into their family living mix/group should pandemics continue and worsen. Work from home trend post covid-19 might take away the need/desire for an owner having a secondary suite. I have yet to see a market study identifying the kinds of people "needing", not "desiring" to live in rental accommodation in Oak Bay. UVIC and Camosun should be creating their own housing rather than relying on the community to pony up. Young adults would prefer we think to be around young adults like in the Cook St. area of Victoria, not middle age and seniors, who dominate the housing scene in Oak Bay</p> <p>Lastly, introducing 1,000+ new renters into the community could result in a voting block that becomes a controlling factor in the development of Oak Bay .</p>		<p>Uplands and/or Oak Bay North due to larger property and house sizes, availability of off street parking, closeness of parks and schools, space between neighbors mitigating impact of a rental population.</p>			<p>Adding an additional renter population to Oak Bay would surely impact the cost of services delivered by the municipality/CRD and in some cases provincially. Cost of secondary suite garbage collection as an example - surely should be clawed back from property owners in the form of municipal taxes. First the municipality needs to know who has a secondary suite or suites in their home.</p> <p>Increased population, increases the competition for a disappearing critical resource - family doctors - as an example. Long time existing Oak Bay residents like ourselves are without a family doctor, since our long time doctor just retired. Impossible to find a new one given the influx of people continuing to move into the CRD.</p> <p>Recreation Centre overcrowding would become more depressing than it already is. Post covid, fitness space has/will become a premium luxury. Particularly if new renters are young adults. Need for new rec centre facilities at a cost.</p> <p>Same for school classroom seats, if the renter population are young families with children. Pressure - pressure, pressure to school youngsters in a more crowded space with adequate teaching presence.</p> <p>Ad additional concern is that adding a new population of somewhat transient Oak Bay citizens, with perhaps different voting and programme priorities could create a block vote that would trend to a bigger block over time, forever changing this special community that has been nurtured since its inception by citizens invested in Oak Bay's quality of life .</p>
I think we need to maximize the potential for more suites and population in Oak Bay	I would prefer that buildings be owner occupied so they are responsible for maintenance and quiet occupation			This issue has been studied to death and council needs to get on with allowing it.	As noted above, this has been studied to death and requiring rezoning is just NIMBY.	With climate change, we need greater densification that allows better use of public transit and community services

<p>Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)</p>	<p>Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)</p>	<p>Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)</p>
						<p>1. Suites do not improve affordability or aging in place; houses with suites increase in price in proportion to the suites and all financial benefits are offset. The greatest benefit goes to developers who either, building new homes, or renovating old ones can recognize a substantial profit from a small investment in making a suite as they can increase the price of the home in proportion to the amount of mortgage that the suite will "carry." Suites are not necessary for aging in place. Both affordability and aging in place can be met with two boarders- which allows for extra income. Studies have shown that suites have a substantial negative impact on their neighbourhoods. Suites increase stress on our infrastructure. Suites increase the degradation of our parks. Suites increase the noise in our neighbourhoods. Suites increase the number of vehicles in the area and onstreet parking leads to lack of space for cycle commuting and walking. As for "owner occupied" regulating problems with crime and noise - the "owner occupied" requirement has proven unenforceable in other jurisdictions.</p> <p>When UVic residences (that pay no taxes to the district) are taken into account, Oak Bay has one of the highest of rentals available in the C.R.D. If Oak Bay wishes to provide more rental in the district, let them do so along Foul Bay and Cadboro Bay and Oak Bay Ave. in zoning that would allow for the construction of apartment blocks. The district needs to stop hiding behind the magical thinking of "affordability and aging in place" as the reason for secondary suites. Having been involved in the mortgage and housing industry, I know that in Victoria, these reasons are, in almost all instances, blatant falsehoods.</p> <p>Leave our single family neighbourhoods alone. There are plenty of other places to go if you</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
		<p>If we must increase rental, then it should be in designated apartment blocks along major thoroughfares like Foul Bay Road and Oak Bay Avenue and Cadboro Bay Rd.</p>	<p>Along major roadways as stated in 24</p>			<p>have bought into the myth that suites are a benefit.</p> <p>It is time for council to correct the community plan and eliminate the drive towards secondary suites. The initial survey under Nils Jensen, as part of the present community plan, was blatantly biased and created/drafted to provide a positive spin on allowing secondary suites-even when most of Oak Bay strongly disagreed.</p>
<p>Owner occupied, extra parking space, business licence, enforcement initiated by municipality, no borders.</p>	<p>Require compliance with building code and extra fee for services.</p>			<p>There is no value in a pilot... the issues with secondary suites are known:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased cost of living Decreased character Degradation of the urban forest Increased street congestion <p>And this is why Council should not proceed with legalizing secondary suites</p>	<p>This would allow community input and ability to maintain "some" street character... protect the urban forest and ensure a manageable pace of change to ensure enforcement.</p>	<p>Legalizing secondary suites has no benefit to the community and only creates issues ... including destroying the wonderful, safe community we have now! Oak Bay does not need secondary suites!</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>This scenario protect tenants health and safety as well as maintain the desirable characteristics of Oak Bay neighbourhoods that have attracted owners and tenants over the years. Operating a rental suite and receiving Income on a suite is like having a business operating from the home and should be regulated with bylaws, business license, etc. Extra enforcement will increase costs to the municipality but if a decent living standard is to be achieved and neighbours' right to quiet enjoyment of their property protected, then this is a necessary cost of providing additional housing and costs should be covered by those who profit from having suites.</p>	<p>Off street parking must not only be provided but actually utilized. Garages are being converted to suites and parking several cars in tandem on a driveway everyday is not practical. Its been our experience that a house with a suite can easily have 4 or more cars. Two or more for the homeowner and two for the tenants.</p>					<p>In attempting to make Oak Bay more affordable for some, please don't do it at the expense of the current residents who have chosen to live here knowing it might be more expensive than other areas but that the lower density, quieter streets, long term neighbours, etc. are worth the premium.</p>
speaks for itself	no, no change			waste of time	too much bureaucracy	Please allow so people can also live in Oak Bay, not just the privileged few.
<p>The listed restrictions don't actually change whether or not someone will have a suite, just whether someone will actually register it, nor will it lessen the impact substantially for neighbours. The goal should be for people to register existing suites so the District can ensure they are safe, track how many there are, and provide a pathway for people with new builds to do the same.</p>	<p>I would prefer mandatory licencing, even if it was as simple as a sheet of paper to be filled out in the property tax notice.</p>		<p>While I would not prefer a pilot program, I believe doing a secondary suite pilot in the Estevan neighbourhood makes the most sense. It encompasses two of the three major schools in the municipality where parking would be an issue, while also is a desirable area for people with young families to either rent a suite or use one to be able to purchase a home.</p>		<p>The rezoning process is onerous as it is. I can't imagine the pressure that would put on council if everyone came forward to legalize existing suites. If it was only for new suites, it would be likely that new builds would not include them and older houses without suites would build one illegally and claim it was done beforehand.</p>	<p>I'm excited to see Oak Bay move forward with this issue and look forward to the next steps.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Allows suites but with more oversight and reasonableness for density and preserving neighbourhood character.	Ensure that suites are strictly controlled so they do not turn into AirBnBs.	One close to central cores like Oak Bay Ave with good transportation and walkability to amenities.	As above.		I don't think this is viable unless the process can be setup for efficiency.	Strictly control so short term vacation rentals are prohibited (this happened next door to me). Charge those with suites for the extra costs to pay for district management, enforcement, and extra infrastructure demands. Strictly enforce for issues so livability isn't negatively impacted. Ensure landlord responsibility for tidy properties, noise and parking issues. All of these are or have been a problem for existing nearby suites.
For us the off street parking and owner occupant are the most important. Many streets near us are difficult to drive down already with cars parked on both sides.	I would add suites allowed in all single family dwellings. And we are not so worried about lot size and size of suite.			this has been looked at for a long time. I know just from looking at Open Houses (pre covid) that there are many existing suites and without regulations some did not look safe to me. Its time to deal with this.	Requiring rezoning for all suites again slows down the process even further. I think we need regulations to deal with the parking issues and the safety issues.	Its obvious we need housing in Greater Victoria. Secondary suites, complying with safety regulations and well regulated fitting into the neighbourhood are a great non invasive way to increase housing. Not to mention making our impossibly priced houses somewhat more affordable. We would really like to see this process move ahead.
						don't legalize suites
						don't legalize suites
						don't legalize suites
					don't legalize suites	don't legalize suites
						don't legalize suites

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>Keep it Simple. Over regulating will become a administrative nightmare. People need places to live, other people have space that they would happily give up to someone for an additional income to help pay the taxes or the mortgage. My bottom line is that if you have a suite you should also live in the home. RE Parking? It is already an issue because people have "illegal suites". Making them legal won't make those cars go away. At the same time, many people that need a rental home don't have cars - this is true for some of the suites on my block. Growing uses of bike lanes and e-bikes can help.</p>						
<p>My biggest reason for being pro-suites is that it allows young, middle class people to gain access to a mortgage to buy homes. More and more we are seeing perfectly solid Oak Bay homes torn down to build "dream" homes which are then only affordable by the wealthy. A legal suite allows a young couple to gain access to a mortgage based on their combined incomes + the income from a legal suite. This is not true if the suites are illegal as the banks do NOT recognize that as a solid income.</p>	<p>Owner occupancy required.</p>			<p>Pilot programs will simply delay access to housing for people that need it. Oak Bay is a wonderful place to live - I don't see that allowing people to share their homes with others (Owner Occupancy restriction in place) will change that. Without Owner Occupancy requirement I would change my views. In essence, the existence of so many illegal suites in the community is already an informal pilot program ... lets stop deliberating and move on this now.</p>		
						<p>don't legalize suites in Oak Bay</p>
						<p>don't legalize suites</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						I don't want suites in oak bay
						I don't want suites in Oak BAY
						keep suites out of oak Bay
to protect renters we need compliance	off street parking - lots of people do not own a car			so many people cannot afford moving out / living in our area - let's get going to provide housing and share the land	is feels like an obstacle to prevent higher density - we should focus on not allowing houses to stay empty - higher taxes if you don't have your primary residency as hoarding land is not ethical	We need to understand that we had to share the homelessness load within the CRD. Unless you inherit money or land, you cannot afford to live here. Who will take care of you when you grow old? is it fair that workers have to live far away from their workplace?
mandatory business licence and owner occupied	no additional parking should be allowed or permitted					I don't believe it is Oak Bay's responsibility to provide housing for people who cannot afford to buy a house here. These people should save their money or live in a community where housing is less expensive. Additional traffic will be detrimental to the quality of life in Oak Bay
	Water, sewer, parking all issues that need to be addressed. Too many issues with sewer system for increased used and roads are becoming too narrow with the amount of cars parked on both sides of the road. Emergency vehicles are having difficulties fitting through.			Water, sewer, parking all issues that need to be addressed. Too many issues with sewer system for increased used and roads are becoming too narrow with the amount of cars parked on both sides of the road. Emergency vehicles are having difficulties fitting through.	Water, sewer, parking all issues that need to be addressed. Too many issues with sewer system for increased used and roads are becoming too narrow with the amount of cars parked on both sides of the road. Emergency vehicles are having difficulties fitting through.	Water, sewer, parking all issues that need to be addressed. Too many issues with sewer system for increased used and roads are becoming too narrow with the amount of cars parked on both sides of the road. Emergency vehicles are having difficulties fitting through.
						Generally I am not in favour of secondary suites anywhere in Oak Bay. NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY
minimum lot size, secondary suite only						NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY
only secondary suites permitted + owner occupancy, off street parking exempt for existing suites	all single family homes, no minimum lot size				Get on with it!	How long are Council going to procrastinate? The future is clear. NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>We moved to Oak Bay from Saanich over 40 years ago because there were no suites allowed and all bylaws were strictly enforced. We have been paying for this suite debate for over 10 years. Let the people who have and want suites pay all the costs involved as they are the only ones who benefit from them.</p> <p>NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY</p>
It provides some gradual transition for Oak Bay, while also providing housing.	More engagement from District in terms of compliance. I would suggest an approach which is encouraging and learning focused. That would help people to engage - if people think they may be identified for being against regulations, they won't participate. I think we know from experience that it is better to integrate different kinds of housing across the community?				There are suites already in existence, and these are needed. We need to be careful that any process doesn't take housing off the market and encourages landlords to be open and collaborative.	<p>An appeal to the need of the community at large could be an approach.</p> <p>Could Oak Bay look at a way to promote suites as a mutually beneficial option for people to age in place?</p> <p>NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY</p>
						<p>I feel that secondary suites is an option to be considered. Can we learn / gain information from other municipalities or communities? Surely Oak Bay doesn't have to "reinvent the wheel"! We are our own community, but concern for adequate housing for all people should not be overlooked!!</p> <p>NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY</p>
Mix of Scenario C and D. Make it work long term.	Regulate the 600-1000 suites out no BEFORE expanding. If you cannot regulate what's there, do not expand the program.	Too hard to follow map. Need more details of condition of housing, lot size, etc etc.	see above	Deal with the existing suites FIRST. If you cannot manage those, do not expand a failed program.	What about status quo? Before expanding, please demonstrate ability to bring 600-1000 suites into conformance at reasonable cost and effort. IF NOT possible, do not proceed.	<p>There is a compelling need to prove you can do this. Start with existing units and clean up the rules. If you don't, you are making a mockery of this whole process! Way more public information and consultation is needed! Your 2 1/2 hour open house in 2019 is a joke.</p> <p>NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY</p>
Mandatory Registration						

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>As a small municipality, Oak Bay cannot accommodate a larger population and even more vehicles. I have lived in Oak Bay for 67 years and am so sad to see the direction it is going with monster houses being allowed to be built and cover the land. Change will happen, but changes to Oak Bay should have been more sympathetic to retain Oak Bay's character. We will soon look like every other municipality with congested streets and no green space.</p> <p>NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY</p>
<p>We're in a housing crisis, could you please make it easier to build small, non-invasive housing types in our existing neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>Scenario A but also waive all development fees to incentivize new construction AND allow a grace period for existing suites to get permits.</p>			<p>Don't pilot it, just allow them.</p>	<p>If I want to add a rental unit in my basement why should my neighbours waste our local governments time at a hearing? Doesn't the mayor and council have better things to do than hold a public hearing for each new home?</p>	<p>Please allow them everywhere. Oak Bay is a beautiful place to live and we should be allowing more people to live here. Garden Suites and Laneway houses next please!</p>
<p>It provides potential to increase this important component of the housing spectrum within appropriate zoning</p>	<p>I recognize that sometimes owners may choose to live in the smaller unit and rent the larger; this should be an option, but I am not certain if it is with a "max 40% unit size"</p>			<p>I think the need for action on increasing housing options trumps any need for a pilot. Oak Bay is already behind the curve on this</p>	<p>There is a genuine need to increase supply and expand housing types. I would hope the District would provide rules and guidance, enforce where necessary, but keep the red tape to a minimum</p>	<p>This is an important initiative; hopefully the District can find the right balance between providing adequate limits & enforcement with allowing homeowners to create additional home spaces</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY - ADDITIONAL LETTER PROVIDED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One Family Residential Use (RS5) 2. Condos 3. Townhomes 4. Long Term Care Facilities 5. Apartments (for people who like to rent or cannot afford #1/2/3/4) <p>All of the above have parking.</p> <p>I am not in support of secondary suites. Most of the homes in Oak Bay are built on postage stamp size lots (your have 5 ft on either side of your house to your neighbours). The homeowners who live in the mansions in the Uplands have large lots. Oak Bay is a small community of 18,000 people, we are filled to capacity. After I bought my home, I learned that Oak Bay has some older homes that have suites & that they are 'grandfathered'. If you drive around Victoria, whether you are in Saanich, Victoria, View Royal, Colwood, you'll see a number of cars parked on properties and one the streets. I've seen as many as anywhere from 2-8 cars, and this is after 6 pm. Some are cars, vans, or trucks advertising businesses, or old cars, RVs, boats, junk, or signs on the lawns</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>advertising businesses. Thank goodness we have bylaws!</p> <p>"Cons" of Secondary Suites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your increasing the population of an already small community of 18,000 people. 2. Parking will be an issue. The homeowners (parks on their property). The tenants (street parking - shared with neighbors? What about the friends or family, or visitors of the homeowners and the tenants? Where do they park? 3. Increase of noise in neighbourhood, more people = more noise. 4. Increase of garbage 5. It decreases the resale value of other neighbors properties (we want our properties to go up in value!) 6. Is there a limit to the number of tenants in a secondary suite? What about their friends or family or out of town guests staying there? 7. Turning a home to "revenue property" to generate income is not right or fair to the neighbors of Oak Bay. 8. The revenue generated - is that to be declared on your income tax yearly? (as any other source of income ie. interest or term deposits). (If you want to make money, then open up a business in town and abide by the rules of running a business). Or buy a hotel or motel business.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>9. Oak Bay has one bylaw officer, I believe its a part time position.</p> <p>10. Monitoring secondary suites. Will this increase the bylaw officer's hours, or add a second bylaw officer to Oak Bay staff? Who pays for this? It would not be fair to the homeowners who don't want secondary suites in the municipality, to incur any costs related to the monitoring of secondary suites (complying with local bylaws; ensuring compliance with secondary suite regulations, enforcement actions, responding to complaints, initiates actions to ensure compliance, etc)</p> <p>11. I don't have a problem with homeowners who take in a university student for the term (it's about 8-9 months). They live with the family in their home. The student is hardly at home / tends to study at the university) are quite and take the bus, a taxi or ride their bike. You hardly know they are there.</p> <p>So these are my opinions for the secondary suites survey. Glad to participate.</p> <p>NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>A district initiated complaint system would require additional municipal funding, although I would be OK with voluntary registration, I sometimes think restricting suite size could be a challenge - especially if one considers allowing owners - perhaps a grandma and grandpa living in it. I would not like to see a house with a whole lot of renters - boarders and suite - too many unrelated people...parking can be a challenge with smaller lots.</p>	<p>I would be fine with voluntary registration - with some benefit - for enticement to do so. Perhaps an open registry for renting....showing it had been safety approved.</p>			<p>Some people may spend money to create a suite - or rent their suite with the expectation they could continue to do so. Allow them - and just get on with recognizing the reality that there are already multiple suites in our municipality serving many people for many reasons and not changing the fabric of our our community! The concern are those homes that are rented to multiple people - 6-8 that all drive cars and whose properties are not maintained by the absent owner. Yes - look at Henderson road area for glaring examples of this. They, sadly, give a bad name to suites and renters. - concerning nearby property owners that their property value is being devalued - and the results are unsightly when so many home owners take pride in keeping nice looking properties. So having it owner occupied is very important to many of us.</p>	<p>Why the expense?</p>	<p>They exist - they are needed - they just need to not upset neighbours - keep the yards tidy - have a homeowner living there so as to reduce the dereliction of property - ie: bottles piled high in the front window - or garbage strewn over yards - weeds growing unabated in rarely cut lawns. Loud parties....stuff an owner is unlikely to put up with. RESPECT of neighbours. It is possible.</p>
						<p>I prefer no secondary suites in any area of Oak Bay - all you have to do is go down any street and see the clogged roads with parked cars half the houses have no driveways (back lane only) (nobody uses them). Our roads are like the Mayfair Shopping Centre now and I don't want more. Thank you. NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY</p>
<p>Owner Occupancy mandatory; business license; enforcement</p>	<p>Parking not a big issue for existing suites and as long as the suite is safe, codes not a big deal.</p>	<p>RS1 - 5</p>		<p>As stated above, Owner Occupancy must be mandatory.</p>		
					<p>Yes, this survey is biased. There is no question of having no suites.....all questions are based on having some form of suites approved and asking questions as to where/when/how to implement approving suites. WHY IS THERE QUESTION FOR NO SUITES???</p>	<p>Since Oak Bay cannot tax suites, all infrastructure, roads, sewer will have to be upgraded and costs born by persons who have residences with no suites and no extra cash from their rental. Still in doubt as to which moron decided that suites are going to have any affect on the availability or pricing of housing.</p>

<p>Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)</p>	<p>Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)</p>	<p>Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)</p>
<p>This option keeps everyone honest. Those who choose to use their home to derive income are treated the same as any other person wanting to run a business.</p>	<p>I would like to see some mandatory reporting of income from rentals of secondary suites to CRA and increased property taxes for homes with suites.</p>			<p>I would like to see all existing secondary suites identified and applicable standard and safety regulations applied along with business license fees applied prior to any new suites being considered.</p>		<p>Oak Bay currently has around 2000 illegal suites many of which would not meet basic health and safety standards and many of which provide their owners with undeclared income. Further more the district is not collecting any additional property or business taxes from these property owners. I think the district will have a hard time incentivizing most of these people to register their suites so if you want t have a pilot project start by regulation the 2000 suites that currently exist in Oak Bay and see how that goes. Being a legal landlord is a tough business.</p>
						<p>This survey is not only biased in promoting suites, it runs counter to prior surveys where residents CLEARLY were not in favour of suites. Council should focus on running the municipality facilities and services and not embarking on housing.</p> <p>Having experienced both good and bad (unsavory and threatening people) in suites in adjoining houses, we speak with experience and authority. Council must ensure residents are PROTECTED. This means some form of redress, appeal and withdrawal of a suite licence and rezoning. IT IS ESSENTIAL. Enforcement of regulations regarding suite size and number of persons allowed in secondary suites per square area is ESSENTIAL. Why would Council allow only two boarders but unlimited numbers of persons in a suite. It simply does not make sense.</p> <p>We are seriously concerned with the level of</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Without regulation, Oak Bay residents who do NOT have the ability or desire to have a suite will subsidize the people living in the suites. Suites need to be part of the taxation system so the cost of municipal services are borne by all.	Number of people per suite needs to be limited to avoid overcrowding.		The area bounded by Cadboro Bay Road and northward.	The program must be limited to a few blocks (3 blocks) and the residents MUST have an opportunity to VOTE (60% majority approval) on whether they want it or not, not imposed on them. There MUST be a detailed ongoing assessment by an UNBIASED consulting firm as to the effects and costs to the municipality of Oak Bay.	This option applies the same rules to suite development as any other type of property development and is in keeping with our democratic process. To allow suites without rezoning consideration would be a DISASTER, allowing unscrupulous developers and homeowners to impose their views on Oak Bay residents without control.	District Taxation. When the population increases so does the demand on Municipal services. ALL persons living in Oak Bay MUST CONTRIBUTE to the cost of running the municipality. This should be accomplished through a Tax on Suites (significant licence fee) commensurate with the number of persons in the suite or floor area. (In communication with the BC Assessment Authority, we know that a suite only attracts a very minor increase IF AT ALL, in the assessed value, thus suites currently do not contribute to the tax base - it is a FREE RIDE to the homeowners as well as the suite occupants. An assessment could be through a licence which would be a proportion of the property tax (based on area of the suite as a proportion of the house).
Allows more people the option of building a secondary suite, and helping pay a mortgage	No			Will make home ownership for younger people possible in Oak Bay. Currently, I have to move out of our home due to the fact I cannot afford the mortgage		
Without stringent regulation, secondary suites are/will be a total nightmare. Consider Oak Bay's current draconian Tree Protection Bylaw (never mind that THIS Bylaw is a direct assault on gardeners' freedom of artistic expression when it come to landscape design)--any Bylaw(s) regulating suites should be equally strict (or even stricter) to ensure legal consistency.	Do not permit suites in the first place--or at least not when those parties occupying the property are not related, and not when rent in the form of money is being charged for that secondary suite.		The areas bordering the Oak Bay Village, Estevan Village, and Recreation Centre (I suppose) are the logical areas for pilot programs(?)--although the areas' residents may feel differently!	How do you terminate it? Once a 'suite' is installed, it is very difficult to press the 'undo' button.	There is no gain in making the process easy here--allowing suites for rent does not reduce the cost of housing. Vendors can simply sell for more--a lot more--leading to every bigger mortgages for buyers.	Why Oak Bay needs to follow/allow the situations seen in Victoria, Saanich, Esquimalt, etc. is a total mystery. If someone wants a suite, why does he/she not just buy a house with one already built, in those other municipalities? Or maybe some people find streets endlessly clogged with parked cars safe and attractive? Can the readers of this survey even remember the last time they drove down a major (or even minor) Oak Bay street and NOT played a game of vehicular hop-scotch?
		R1-R5				I hope that 'secondary suites' could include lane-way houses as well.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Any scenario that requires maximum controls is my choice. Unfettered development by owners does nothing to enhance quality of life for all residents. I am talking about infrastructure costs, parking, policing, fire protection, parks, recreation, environmental damage through more people/dogs/cars/activity, etc.	My understanding is we cannot mandate owner occupancy so this condition cannot be met so it should not have been include in this survey!				If people don't identify a secondary suite in their home it is impossible to do sight specific zoning. So far we don't seem to know 100% where secondary suites are located.	Until we address infrastructure deficits and parking issues as well as usage of all common areas including the massive increase in the number of dogs in our municipality and then damage to parks, beaches, other public areas I think we are wasting our time, energy and money!
None of the scenario above. Terrible , biased survey that has NO option for no suites.						This has to be the joke of the century. Who wrote this survey? Biased survey as to the assumption that secondary suites are needed or wanted. No secondary suites in Oak Bay should be allowed. Already existing suites should be mandated to pay part of road, water and sewage costs. Garbage collection and all other services that the single home owner forks out every year. Allowing illegal suites to continue should be taxed 50% of all earnings.
		RS2				This is a completely pointless exercise. When did OB taxpayers agree to secondary suites? Note the attached item from Oak Bay Watch and other material from that organization. NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Gives flexibility to property owner to build a suite that suits the land and existing house / not mandating a certain % of home, or requiring a lot size. This enables homeowner to state if garden is shared or off limits (no garden = no dogs) so prefer this option.	Not allow boarding & secondary suites.			Please - just do it! If secondary suites were allowed in Oak Bay - we would have been able to keep the home I grew up in - in the family. As we could not afford home w/out "mortgage helper" - even with inheriting part of it. After my mom passed we had to sell and the home has been torn down. A beautiful 1950s/40s build - gone. It had a walk out unfinished basement - ideal for a secondary suite. Was located in south Oak Bay. Neighbours do not like "modern flat roof" lot to lot new home built by new owner, but we had no control when you sell. Maybe if this was in place new owner would keep the beauty of older homes.	It is hard enough getting information in a timely way from planning so strapped are they (my cousin has been trying to get a meeting for 4 months). So do not create added steps.	I would like to move back into Oak Bay one day in a secondary suite! Secondary suites are needed for affordable housing and to keep the elderly in their homes. Without a secondary suite we had to move my mom from her home. She passed away shortly after. We had home care coming in daily and were able to keep her in the home with care from 9 am - 9 pm and family support until she needed round the clock support. If there was a suite we could have had a live in caregiver, and she would have passed at home. She passed 2 years ago and was in favour of secondary suites. She lived her entire life in Oak Bay. Her grandfather built homes in Oak Bay in 1890s - pre WWII. I cannot afford a home in Oak Bay without a secondary suite for mortgage / upkeep help. Looking forward to seeing them soon. NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY
Least bureaucratic and restrictive. Lets me decide on size. Could limit tenants to those who bus / students.	I am not sure about needing to have owner live in home -do like that idea.				Too restrictive and resources in Oak Bay stretched. Would prefer to have advice by staff in planning.	Please move on other aspects - I had hoped to see aspects of carriage houses. I have a detached garage that would be an ideal suite for my grandchildren when they attend university. Garage not being used. NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY
						No secondary suites should be legally allowed in Oak Bay
	Preferring Option A, I would require owner occupancy in either the primary or secondary residence, and I would provide voluntary registration.					A number of questions asked if I could comply, in my own home, with the response I had given to the previous question. I live in a strata, so I did not respond to the question: my inability to comply has nothing to do with the size of my home or the size of the lot. Coop owners would be in the same situation, as would apartment renters.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>By eliminating the parking requirement for existing suites, it will not exclude them. It's important to provide affordable housing and there could be a requirement in some cases that the tenant not have a vehicle.</p>	<p>Boarders should be allowed as well to provide more affordable housing. Building code compliance should be FLEXIBLE enough to allow for suites in heritage and character houses. I think there should be a publicly listed mandatory lisencc. That would help enable complainants to identify problems with compliance.</p>				<p>Please factor in that parking is a problem on some streets, and cycling is increasing. In Fredericton, NB, a large heritage home was subdivided into 5 suites, conditional on tenants not owning or using a vehicle.</p>	<p>I once opposed secondary suites, but as housing becomes extremely expensive, affordable rentals are important in creating an inclusive sense of community. I'd preferred boarding arrangements, with a shared kitchen and sense of family. By seeking tenant/housemates with common interests, it's possible to have a Home Care/Home Share agreement. It can enable numerous other Oak Bay widows to remain in their homes. (In my situation, there is an understanding that the next owner, the Victoria Native Friendship Centre, will offer the upstairs and my current mainfloor quarters at affordable rates, if needed, preferably to Indigenous occupants. As the house will not be owner occupied, the intent is to appropriately rezone - with the understanding that programs related to cultural understanding will be low key and respectful of the neighbourhood, and preservation of greenspace.)</p>
						<p>Unfortunately, this process is based on a false premise. Allowing secondary suites will not increase affordability in Oak Bay. On the contrary, as experienced in cities like Vancouver, housing prices will rise substantially as the land value increases due to the ability to get a mortgage helper through secondary suites.</p> <p>Allowing secondary suites will increase density, putting pressure on existing sewage and water pipes, roads, parks, etc. but it will not reduce house prices or rents in Oak Bay. It will alter the very factors which make Oak Bay such a wonderful place to live- quiet, green, walkable, small community look and feel.</p> <p>As long as people with the financial means want to live in desirable areas like Victoria, they will come and outbid the locals, driving up prices.</p> <p>Three ways to maintain affordability and a</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>I would like to limit the number of secondary suites and ensure they are subject to rezoning and public hearing so overall density can be carefully managed and controlled.</p>						<p>diverse population in Oak Bay:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) subsidize housing and rental costs for newcomers, including the cost of maintaining and upgrading existing stock (very complex to do social engineering of this kind, assuming taxpayer are even willing to consider the idea); 2) keep and maintain the existing stock of older rental apartments, which are more affordable than new buildings or condos; and, 3) save the smaller (starter) homes and older homes from the demolition wave currently underway all over Oak Bay, which has resulted in our most affordable homes being replaced with significantly more expensive homes.
						<p>Bay dwellings are multi-tenant. It is quite legal to have two boarders in a home. How is this not working?</p> <p>Council was elected to preserve Oak Bay's charming leafy character, and to deal with ancient infrastructure that is costing us a fortune to continue putting band-aids on with every leak and flood. Our taxes are skyrocketing and secondary suites do nothing but put dollars in the pockets of developers and homeowners while both lowering the quality of life of other residents and costing them more money in increased municipal services - increased garbage, use of aging infrastructure Has anyone spoken with the fire chief about getting down Oak Bay streets with all the anticipated extra parked cars? Or.... are you planning on allowing yet even more beautiful greenery to be clear cut to make way for parking lots?</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>This survey is developer-driven and of course they can increase their bottom line in preferred neighbourhoods like Oak Bay. APARTMENT BUILDINGS ARE AFFORDABLE HOUSING. Nothing has changed people are born, they get older and die. I remember living in an apartment and saving for a single family home. Elderly people would sell their single family home and move into an apartment.</p> <p>Not any more. Developers don't get cash up front for apartment buildings, but they do for condos. Developers are also responsible for future construction problems with apartments. Greed makes condos the size of chicken coops while strata fees never seem to go down. The Province of Manitoba has figured this out and for years has been promoting the construction of 1960s-style and size apartment buildings with studio (780 sq.ft.) and 1,2 & 3-bedroom apartments and no strata fees. People are streaming into them. When is the last time an apartment building was constructed in Oak Bay?</p> <p>Oak Bay taxpayers are not being told what it will cost for enforcement of secondary suite bylaws.... so the neighbour runs a business with</p>
<p>Avoids health, safety, and parking problems. City can keep track of locations and condition of suites. Not all single family homes should have a secondary suite.</p>				<p>For both existing and new suites, some attention to garbage, recycling, water use, number of animals, and parking on streets would assist in assessment of impacts on neighbourhoods and provide information in reviews of current by-laws.</p>	<p>If Oak Bay is proactive in regulation which would also require increased staff time, site specific zoning wouldn't be required.</p>	<p>In much of Oak Bay, many home owners have several vehicles and small garages so that on street and laneway parking is common. Even if some occupants of secondary suites do not have cars, the streets need to accommodate guests and service visitors.</p>
<p>Lot size, parking, and landlord onsite</p>						
<p>Greater oversight of suites allowed</p>						
<p>Best solution to the present chaos, lack of enforcement and violations of building code</p>	<p>There are many other scenarios, why limit peoples votes to these chosen four??</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>unknown. How about FIRST telling us where the 500-750 unregulated suites already exist?</p>	<p>see response to 25</p>	<p>How can we pretend to regulate a land use presently occurring in unknown/unspecified locations?</p>	<p>There should be a firm requirement for all existing suites to be identified...before proceeding with any attempt to regulate or legalize them.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
The "complaint-based" is not fair to all secondary suite owners - all owners should have to register their suite. Scenario D ensures less conflict over street parking spaces.	I would change the "maximum unit size" - does it matter, if owner-occupied, the size of the suite or the owner-occupied area? I am interested in hearing why it matters - I am not an expert in this field, just a neighbour who will be impacted by these decisions.		You will laugh...as I would choose "not in my back yard"! How fair is it to choose a neighbourhood as long as it is not where you live?		A rezoning program would invite much conflict, time, and money spent by Oak Bay municipality and also by the Oak Bay resident applying for a secondary suite. It also would pit neighbour against neighbour (having witnessed a similar situation in Victoria)	We must be very careful to preserve, and not do away with, the good qualities of Oak Bay, which tax payers happily pay for. I fear much conflict could erupt and monies wasted if secondary suites are not handled carefully and efficiently.
more standards and some oversight	Off-street parking should not be required			I prefer a period of review to a "pilot program"	too much oversight -- too much Council involvement	I think there should be secondary suites allowed in Oak Bay. There are quite a few now anyway. Better to have some agreement about standards and some oversight regarding suitability.
I think secondary suites should be generally permitted; my real concern is that suites meet full building code requirements. My worry has always been for people living in accommodation without appropriate health & safety as well as heating, ventilation, plumbing, etc. I don't find anything compelling about limiting them to certain RS zones.	Reference to building codes.			We appear to have enough informal suites to know how the District fares. Let's get on with it!	The OCP process has become so arduous that we are seeing more and more individual applications for variances or "spot zoning." This site specific idea seems like more of the same -- while I will support some specific proposals, I mourn the inefficiencies involved.	
Its openness.	No			Don't do it.		Let's get with it, and deal with the situation as it already exists.
						please don't legalize suites
						no suites in Oak Bay
						stop suites in Oak Bay
						keep suites out of oak bay
						keep suites out of oak bay
						don't legalize suites
						I don't want suites in Oak Bay
						keep suites out of oak bay
						I don't want suites in oak bay
						don't legalize suites
						don't legalize suites

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						keep suites out of our district
I would prefer less regulation and more flexibility for individual homeowners.				It is important that we proceed with a bylaw for secondary suites. The housing needs study has produced acceptance by the majority for implementation of a bylaw. This is another delay, and Oak Bay needs to implement this immediately to ensure compliance for health and safety for the tenants who reside in Oak Bay. Also we have committed to the CRD growth strategy and we need to implement this as a sign to the wider community that we care about the housing crisis in the CRD.	Tenants living outside the protection of the provincial regulations for Landlord Tenant regulations is unacceptable. We have an OCP that speaks to providing "housing options" This is one option that may be included in a wider housing framework that should be implemented immediately. There is no reason to delay and every reason to proceed immediately with the drafting of a bylaw. It is embarrassing as a resident of Oak Bay to attend public meetings on housing in other areas of this city and hear our our Minister of Housing David Eby, tell other citizens in the CRD that that Oak Bay is not "doing our part" .to help the wider community with the current housing crisis. Lets just get on with this. no more studies.	
						don't authorize suites
						don't legalize suites
						please don't legalize suites in our district
Lack of strict regulations	No off street parking necessary				No	Having lived in South Oak Bay as well as the Henderson area for over 30 yrs., I've known of suites (commonly basement) all over. Unless renters become unruly and misbehave causing unrest in the neighbourhood, kick em' out. otherwise it appears to working just fine. FYI, there are a lot of good folk who can't afford big apartments or just want the privacy and usual quiet of a separate suite...Let 'em be... leave well enough alone!
Minimizing the damage that Secondary suites do to Oak Bay's character.	Make these suites even more difficult to have/maintain		quite frankly, those neighbourhoods that have the lowest property values	the project ought to be very stringently monitored		The additional vehicle traffic caused by s. suites is the most pressing issue. Without a practical and enforceable plan to deal with that, then OB council will be approving this s. s. scheme that will permanently disfigure the face of our lovely municipality.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Restrictions and Compliance Required, otherwise Oak Bay will no longer be a special place to live!!	No extra parking space on the street ... there is not enough room on most Oak Bay streets as it is: consider homeowners' trades workers, postal workers, workers, extended family members, visitors	Neighbourhood within South Oak Bay - North Oak Bay is already dealing with intense traffic issues associated with the corridor servicing Cadboro Bay residents, UVIC and Camosun College students/staff. Parking on neighbourhood streets by UVIC staff/students has caused significant problems and upset for North Oak Bay residents - trash left on lawns, parking in front of driveways, etc.	South Oak Bay Neighbourhood		The attitude by many moving into Oak Bay is that they care less about the beauty and tranquility of the region and are more intent upon taking advantage of the region and using whatever means they can to expedite their ability to own their own home. e.g. "Mortgage Helpers". They are not contributing to the community nor preserving its tranquility or unique identity - features which have long been appreciated and preserved by most of us who have lived here for 2+ generations!!	If secondary suites become commonplace, Oak Bay will change permanently ... and for the worse. If some people cannot afford to live here just yet ... maybe they will be able to after another 10-15 years of employment. Short term solutions, such as adding many secondary suites, in order to placate those who want to be able to live here NOW will make Oak Bay a semi-urban, congested, grid-locked and fragmented region - no longer special. Welcome to Vancouver, Esquimalt, Gordon Head.
Owner occupied and additional parking required	Feel strongly owner occupied in the main part of the home is essential if a secondary suite is in the house. Can this actually be enforced?			No pilot program		Feel strongly the home should be owner occupied if a secondary suite is in the home, and additional on-site parking should be provided for the suite. Question: can OB actually enforce this? if not, this is a major issue.
I want Oak Bay to take a gradual approach, any wholesale change will only make Oak Bay a builder/developer mecca - with shoddy workmanship the result. Our housing stock quality will decline in the pro-cowboy atmosphere Oak Bay seems to be wanting.	I think we first need to see how many suites we have, and bring them up to code. District compliance should come first, before we move on to adding more housing.			We all know it won't be in the Uplands. North Oak Bay will be targeted, as usual, for secondary status, filling us with suites while leaving the rest of Oak Bay alone.	Find out by doing this how much enforcement will cost - and make sure it is paid by those with suites. They are a business like any other.	The whole idea of increasing the number of suites in Oak Bay will create a race to destroy homes, trees, green space, gardens, and to build more monster homes. Inspect and control what we have, and bring it all up to code. Then talk about adding more housing - the municipality should build some low cost housing - as I have been suggesting for many years. Stop unloading your responsibilities.

<p>Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)</p>	<p>Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)</p>	<p>Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)</p>
						<p>As with the first survey, these questions are loaded in favor of choosing some sort of secondary suite option. For instance, Question 4. I do not agree with secondary suites at all. Your answers are biased so that all answers make it look as though we want some type of secondary suite. That is devious and unfair.</p> <p>Question 5. Again, you answers all indicate that I would choose secondary suits are allowed in one way or another, and I don't agree with this. ... and so on</p> <p>I am very disappointed in your lack of transparency and your willingness to trick your population. If you allow secondary suites in Oak Bay, we and many people we know, will rent our house out and move away. We chose to live here as it seemed to be the one municipality that was holding out against selling out to developers, and keeping the neighborhoods quiet and safe. I turn a blind eye to suites on my street now (there are many) but if they were</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>it is the one which will limit the most suites. We do not want secondary suites in Oak Bay.</p>	<p>I would add a scenario with no suites. I will be looking for this in your summary.</p>	<p>There should be no suites. RS5 already has the least parking and the least space on the streets and the smallest lots. You should not pick RS5, just because it is the least entitled part of Oak Bay. If you MUST grow the population, you should allow more apartments on the main avenues and leave our quiet streets.</p>	<p>Main Roads, and not secondary suites, but regulated apartments.</p>	<p>You should not allow secondary suites during a pilot program or otherwise</p>	<p>All suites should be eliminated, and all zones should be not allowed to contain suites</p>	<p>problematic, at least I have bylaws to rely on to get rid of them. I don't recall in the news any safety incidences with any of the hundreds of people living in suites now, and so that is a red herring too. If you find any that are unsafe (you act as though you have proof) you should shut them down, as they are illegal. Alter the intersection at Oak Bay and Foul Bay so that people can safely cross, if you really want to put your efforts into making a safety difference to the community.</p> <p>The instant you allow secondary suites, the mortgages will go up between \$200 and \$300k in Oak Bay (from a mortgage broker), and so you will just be making houses even more unaffordable here. It will be only the very wealthy who will be able to buy houses and then suite them out. The overcrowded schools will become impossible, the streets will become more clogged. Your argument that not all people in suites drive cars is weak. Many people living in suites in Oak Bay drive cars, and have friends visiting in cars. On our street, probably 8 out of 10 do (so not all, as you argue, but is still clogs up our street). Leave the community alone, as we all had decided we liked when we grew up and moved back here. If Oak Bay allows suites, then we have lost something very unique. I think you are not telling the full truth to the people of Oak Bay in pursuing this, either the municipality has something to gain financially, or suites are being mandated on you or something even more insidious that could cause you to pursue this with such vigor. Who/what is forcing you to? You certainly are not allowing us to express our wishes in your fraudulently concocted survey. Shame on you and your expensive consultants.</p> <p>In case my ranting gives you the wrong impression, I am left leaning politically, and I am deeply concerned about finding a solution to the homeless issue in Victoria. I don't think overpriced secondary suites in Oak Bay is solution to that. I would like to see some lower income small apartments and also some regular income apartments on the main streets of Oak Bay. I just don't see why developers and municipalities have to set about wrecking all the streets in the name of progress and money.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
The rules are tight and clear, giving city maximum control and (hopefully) enforcement of uniformity among suites.	I would add a system of permits to strictly limit on-street parking.					
Regulations strictly enforced.	No on-street additional parking - already too full.		Oak Bay South			No more secondary suites in Oak Bay. Streets are already congested and traffic is already heavy most days/times of the week. Construction noise is awful. People who live in secondary suites are not contributing to our neighbourhoods.
Housing shortage, creating zones is arbitrary and could prejudice some neighbourhoods. What would be the criteria for the zones? How would you choose??				Oak bay needs to diversify and be welcoming to people that are in desperate need of housing. Many young families cannot afford to get into the housing market without the benefit of having a suite.	Cost to owners and cost to taxpayers is prohibitive and will encourage suites to stay underground	This is long overdue- if safety can be managed why is the community opposed to proving housing opportunities and chances for you g families to be able to afford to get into the housing market. If you dont make this a flexible policy suites will remain underground and unregulated
Secondary suites should be discouraged as much as possible		nowhere in oak bay	nowhere in oak bay	I'd like to understand the objectives of the pilot program. I'm not sure why it has to be done.	If secondary suites need to exist, they should be of high enough quality so that they don't put extra strain on municipal services, like fire, police and such.	Secondary suites should be discouraged since it makes the neighbourhood look bad-- lots of cars in the road, noise levels, etc.
This will allow more flexibility/workability for families. It is less restrictive than the other scenarios.	I would add voluntary registration. Add Voluntary registration			Please, no pilot program.		Dozens of families we're connected with in Oak Bay would eagerly welcome approval of secondary suites here. These families carry big mortgages and big financial burdens. Please move swiftly to approve secondary suits in oak bay.
People need a place to live						
least amount of possible negative impact/change to neighbourhoods.	Control the number of cars allowed to park on the street. Even if additional off street parking is required, there is no limit to the amount of parking on the street and that could negatively impact/change to neighbourhoods.				If there is a cost to it, then the total cost should be borne by the applicant	I am against legalizing secondary suites in Oak Bay. I think that the current structure makes it such that suites have to have a low impact on a neighbourhood or they risk being disallowed. Legalizing of suites will increase the beurocracy and lead to neighbourhoods with more change, decreasing the feeling of knowing your neighbours and feeling comfortable in your neighbourhood.

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
More regulated and better living space, less crowding		Any zone, up to Oak Bay Municipality				I would prefer suites to be legalized
I like that an owner lives onsite and has the ability to manage the property and be hands on with tenants.	The only issue I dont like about C is the parking requirement; if we are trying to reduce carbon should we not be reducing parking requirements? 3 cars per property seems like a crazy number of parking spaces for a single family home, with a suite. between requiring two parking places and the existing street parking, there is more than enough parking in our neighbourhood, and we live on a fairly busy street. Requiring 3 parking spaces will potentially turn front yards from green space, into parking spaces. Not optimal.			<p>I dont believe a pilot program is necessary. There are numerous other municipalities where suites have implemented and many learnings available to government and the public. We have waited sooo long to allow for gentle densification to happen in Oak Bay. It seems insane to wait even longer to test a theory that is already being inadvertently tested without regulation...</p> <p>The other reason I do not see the requirement for a pilot program is that boarding is already allowed in most RS zones. This is, actually, already testing the idea of legal suites in that two boarders can reside in a SFH, with almost all of the same living standards as a suite would have. If the only difference is separate entrances and stoves, how is that all that different? Boarder already bring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - density - additional vehicles - additional strain on municipal services - additional noise etc etc etc. <p>By regulating these spaces all we are doing is improving occupant health and overall safety, and livability while increasing diversity in our community.</p>	This is what is currently in places and not a solution for the growth our community needs to go through in the coming decades.	<p>Make them legal, safe and accessible. We are living in the dark ages and dragging our heels based on the opinion of a very vocal few. If we are to remain progressive and open to developing our image as inclusive, safe and friendly we need to act.</p> <p>One other comment that I have is around ceiling heights; our garden suite is an inlaw suite that has drop beams, like many houses in Oak Bay. This would disqualify us to have a legal suite at a ceiling height of 6'8" as the beams are a 1/2" too deep. However, I believe that if the remainder of the space (say 90% of the GFA) met the ceiling height requirements the program would have a better uptake and more people signing on to regulate them (which is the point). Would there be a way to implement this?</p> <p>Thank you for conducting this study.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
It is the closest choice to prohibiting secondary suites and makes it more difficult for people to have them in our neighbourhood.	Make secondary suites only permissible in South Oak Bay and require a public hearing for each suite with a unanimous vote of neighbours within one block to allow the suite after it passes all the regulatory standards.		South Oak Bay only	Have suites only in places that would attract families and young working professionals. Do not allow the local post secondary Institutions to download their lack of on campus residential planning to the neighbourhoods in their vicinity.	To allow suites in a residence they should be required to meet every building, safety, and fire code and pass a neighbourhood referendum.	I do not want any more secondary suites in North Oak Bay. There are too many unregulated and illegal suites already. In addition, there is insufficient by-law enforcement of the current illegal suites as one by-law officer can not enforce the current ban. How can the municipality possible expect to regulate any expansion of secondary suites when they can't and won't even enforce the current by-laws. The street parking in our neighbourhood is already an issue due to UVic students and faculty. In addition, the vehicle noise and speeding transient vehicles are excessive without any enforcement available by the municipality. We liked our quiet and peaceful neighbourhood and the council's lack of enforcement of the current regulations has allowed absent non- resident homeowners to ruin our neighbourhood by: Renting out houses to several student (frat houses) without enforcement action. Allowing those unlawful residents to park on the street without enforcement action. Allowing BNB's to be developed and run in our neighbourhood. Having no police presence to enforce the excessive vehicle noise bylaws breached by the above mentioned students and their vehicles that disturb our peaceful evenings.
Good flexibility and available housing within our community... time for change is now get it over Oak Bay let's move ahead !	I'm good with it for now					Please let's move ahead and have affordable housing for everyone, including homeowners who need the additional income to meet the demands of the present economy.
We have a housing crisis; an extreme shortage of affordable and available housing of all kinds but in particular rental space. Let's find some solutions relatively quickly. More stringent regulations means more time to get units to market. We can always add more "rules" if we find we are experiencing hardship or difficulties but let's be solution oriented not NIMBY oriented.	Planning help and resources that are user friendly for those who wish to consider adding or building secondary suites or adding boarders. Everything is very secretive now (because we are a complaint driven community).			Fine but make it district wide.		
Land use, minimum lot size, unit size, enforcement and parking	Owner to occupy at least one of the parts of the house.					
It should be treated the same for everyone.						

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
						<p>This is a poorly designed survey and should have been reviewed before going to the expense.</p> <p>I am unable to properly answer questions four through nine because my choice is "none of the above".</p> <p>In question 20, an important scenario is missing, NO suites. But to put it in terms that fit table 2, I suggest a minimum lot size of 5000 m², a maximum unit size of 10% of GFA, two boarders should be allowed provided they do not own vehicles, all parking for secondary suites should be off street and there should be twice as many off-street parking spots as there are beds in the building, All homes which have secondary suites should require occupancy by a bylaw officer, registration should be via business license for which the fee should be equal to the property tax assessment (in other words double taxes), enforcement can best be handled by having a</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
It is the most restrictive. I would prefer no secondary suites at all.	Yes. Land Use = Secondary Suites not permitted.			We already have a pilot program, the illegal suites. Fix that first.	Re-zoning for every suite application would be a bureaucratic mess. Instead, simply don't allow suites at all.	<p>member of council occupy the building.</p> <p>How should oak bay proceed?</p> <p>Owners of property should be asked which housing option or to be studied, not just secondary suites.</p> <p>Before any action decision is taken, we need an environmental impact statement which would include an assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extra water and sewage requirements Additional traffic Additional parking Loss of green space Loss of trees Cost of sewers, water, electrical, roads, sidewalks, and staff. <p>There should be an assessment of the effect of secondary suites by Oak Bay fire, police, bylaws, health agencies, engineering, parks, and animal control (unless pets are prohibited, which seems like a good idea).</p> <p>In particular there should be an assessment of the effect on climate change of the extra traffic created by secondary suites.</p> <p>Property tax forms should include a statement "I do/do not have a secondary suite in my home". The penalty for a false statement should be severe.</p> <p>What is the problem that secondary suites are supposed to solve? Has there been any study of this?</p> <p>Any approval of a secondary suite should require a fee that is 100% costed for the extra expenses to our community.</p> <p>Our top priority should be managing what we've got now. Fix the zoning problem first: good houses are being removed, lots are being stripped, and monster houses shoehorned into our neighbourhoods</p> <p>In my opinion, taxpayer money is being wasted.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
Registration of suite	All homes					
Owner occupied				a waste because the cost of building a suite on a temporary basis is prohibitive if you want quality suites and then disallow them		Must be owner occupied
It is the most restrictive of your options	No annual fee for business license - simple registry But in general I do not support official acceptance of secondary suites.	I do not support official acceptance of secondary suites	I do not support official acceptance of secondary suites	I do not support official acceptance of secondary suites	I do not support official acceptance of secondary suites	I do not support official acceptance of secondary suites I favour the status quo - not officially allowed, only complaints investigated.
Rigor and transparency	Additional parking should not be required	RSS			Too much of a barrier	Let's go for it
						<p>1. I like the idea of secondary suites in owner-occupied homes. I have read the "Secondary Suite Study" (DEC 2020). I do not agree to a subsidized and systematic expansion of secondary suites sponsored and supported by the Council of the District.</p> <p>2. The idea of "illegal secondary suites" is a contraction for civil management of the District, and it is unacceptable. Without adding more, EXISTING secondary suites must be identified and licensed, taxed, monitored, and regulations enforced....just like everything else in a small community. Of course! That should be sufficient to keep the Council busy.</p> <p>3. A LIMITED mandate (2014) was given: " a community survey found that 78 percent of respondents felt that secondary suites should be permitted and regulated, with standards put in</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
most restrictive	Larger lot size, and required compliance program		Doesn't matter. If I was forced to choose, then I choose the commercial district of OB.	The key to acceptance is: published standards; licensing; monitoring, evaluation, REALLY transparent monitoring and evaluation.		<p>place to address issues such as health and safety, parking and owner occupancy."</p> <p>4. That solves the problem without any further ideological issues of "increasing density" for the benefit of society, etc.</p> <p>5. Instead, over the past 7 years (since 2014) I have watched the Council conflate their responsibility for simply LEGAL housing into an ambitious, expensive, contentious and lengthy five-stage process to increase the number of secondary suites. Why? Just solve the LIMITED mandate.</p> <p>6. You have ruined a simple, modest idea (secondary suites) with an elaborate and divisive expansion program. I think you're on the wrong path. Consequently, you now face the resistance of many citizens of the District.</p> <p>7. The problem with secondary suites is</p> <p>7.1 a modest increased demand on municipal services. So, the District has to collect extra taxes to pay for it.</p> <p>7.2 a large increase in traffic and parking. The context is a large, observable traffic congestion in the District and severely limited parking in the neighborhoods of the District.....ALREADY. (I live in a neighborhood where my neighbors have 3, and 4 automobiles/vans. I know what I'm talking about.)</p> <p>7.3 an unknown threat/liability to neighbors and the District due to the unknown violations of safety codes on property that hosts secondary suites.</p> <p>CONCLUSION -- The Council would be wise to address a more limited objective for illegal secondary suites, and seek to reduce the consequences of taxes, density, traffic. Period.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
creates the maximum number of suites	Yes: dd registration to scenario a			pilot program is simply a delay tactic, and is a way to prevent a reasonable response to a social need.		The municipality needs to pay for professionals to create its surveys. This one is not well designed.
						<p>I have many, but as a summary I don't buy into Council ideology that we are in a housing crisis in Oakbay. Is affordable housing an issue across Canada especially urban areas. Yes it is. I have read council and other resident comments that we need growth in the community. That the number of residents has essentially stayed the same over the last decade. Some long term residents and young families are finding the cost of living high and unaffordable to live in Oak Bay and others their children with university education cannot afford to buy a home in Oakbay. These issues effect everyone and as we compare Oakbay to other communities on Vancouver Island we are all in the same boat.</p> <p>It's a double edge sword with supply and demand also impacting the cost of properties. Oakbay other than Uplands houses are comparable in cost to other communities with a desirable community, such as Brentwood Bay, Bear Mountain, Broadmead, water accessible pockets including View Royal, Sooke and many more. People make choices on what is best for them now and in some cases invest in something for the future, hence a lot of houses here are being lifted for additional living space.</p>

Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)	Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)	Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)	Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)	Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)	Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)	Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)
<p>The suite would also allow a minimum GFA. Off street parking. Owner occupant will hopefully improve renters taking care of the property.</p>	<p>Two off street parking, as many families need more Than one car for work and activities. Also, take into consideration visitors and young adult children have cars.</p>	<p>I chose zone over neighbourhood as this is an ambiguous question. Considerations should be proximity to public transportation, schools, parks etc.</p>		<p>A pilot program should be small enough to evaluate for meeting criteria and impact on neighbours and community. I.E noise, parking, the length os stay of renters (transient) and renter satisfaction. Suites allowed in a pilot program must not be used as precedent specifically to approve future suites.</p>	<p>As a pilot program there is lots to learn by putting theses resources up front. Also, will reduce the perception that only selected builders or residences receive preferences.</p>	<p>The idea that our children have a right to own a home in their childhood neighborhood is absurd. We have had our adult kids and grandchildren move back with us on different occasions until they were back on their feet. I have heard this in other areas as well. Many people work more than one job, commute over an hour for work, cut down on unnecessary expenses for themselves and their children. Not keeping up with the Jones and forget about the private club expenses. There is nothing wrong with hard work and a university education may not be the guarantee to get the high priced home you want. Start small and work your way up, unless theses parents want to lend their children some money from their home equity and that would solve that argument.</p> <p>The idea that residents don't want suites in their neighbourhood because they don't realize the issues is wrong. We, as fellow residents chose this neighbourhood for the walkability, community spirit, the quiet family atmosphere, beautiful green space and people that for the most part respect each other and understand the cascade of the suite proposal. There are many examples across the main land where the essence of what was is lost. My son in Coquitlam can't find parking on his front street for all the renters, their cars, their friend cars etc. The cost of the municipality infrastructure will go up and also need to be considered. I say no to secondary suites, but if Council is so inclined do this in a well regulated pilot project.</p>
<p>This is the only hope of enforcing and regulating and fixing the mess now. If you allow existing suites to continue you are rewarding breaking the law. This one might not impact the stand of living so much. I prefer this option for all the items. Business license should be very expensive.</p>	<p>Please off street parking is not in the front lawn. You'll need a lot of muscle behind this law to make it work. As it is now, people build suites into their house and you cannot do anything about it. What hope do you have of enforcing any of this.</p>	<p>zones with high density buildings in them</p>	<p>where there is already commercial renters or condos</p>	<p>This questionnaire should only be for homeowners and owner occupied here. Being mailed out to each one for a view that reflects the citizens of Oak Bay. Not open to anyone - what business is it of theirs. I did not even know about this questionnaire til late.</p>	<p>If you make requirements stringent enough. How can you expect highly functioning citizens to live here when you are encouraging crowding and the problems that brings.</p>	<p>Noise - with suites is much increased. Double the back yard get togethers, music blaring, guests over. Parking - renters often have two or more cars of their own in addition to the 2 cars of the owner. Parking becomes a war in the neighbourhood. COVID-19 has now enabled stay at home situations so now everyone is on top of each other and we all want more space, more quiet - increasing density will make matters much much worse.</p>

<p>Q23 (<p>What do you prefer about the scenario you chose?</p>)</p>	<p>Q24 (<p>Is there something you would change/revise for the scenario you chose? If so, what is it?</p>)</p>	<p>Q28 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific zones</u> for question 23, please specify which zone you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q29 (<p>If you selected a <u>pilot program within specific neighbourhoods</u> for question 23, please specify which neighbourhood you would choose for the program</p>)</p>	<p>Q30 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a pilot program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q32 (<p>Are there any other comments you would like to provide regarding a site specific rezoning program?</p>)</p>	<p>Q33 (<p>Do you have any additional comments you would like to provide regarding secondary suites in Oak Bay?</p>)</p>
<p>I am concerned about who bears the costs. The owners of existing or new suites should have to pay for any additional costs to the District. It should not be a cost for others (ie. those who benefit, pay).</p>						<p>Neighbours put in a secondary suite several years ago which has resulted in more noise, less privacy. I don't think we should encourage more suites. Regulating existing ones on a complaints basis may be a good start. NOTE - TRANSCRIBED FROM HARD COPY</p>