NEW TOOLS FOR VIEW CONTROLS
IN CANADA’S CAPITAL
APPENDIX A: POLICY
### APPENDIX A: POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Policy Title (Year)</th>
<th>Support for View Protection Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Capital Commission (NCC)</td>
<td>Canada’s Capital Views Protection (2007)</td>
<td><strong>Strong Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;Outlines current view protection policies that are intended to protect and enhance the symbolic primacy of the national symbols. It explains the significance of the symbols as a means to represent the Nation’s identity and values (democracy, justice, and natural environment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Study for Hull (1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strong Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;This strongly supports view protection. However, it should be noted that this document was prepared as a proposal from the NCC to the Ville de Hull (now Gatineau). It outlines how view protection policy should be implemented through zoning by-laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Heritage Places (2010)</td>
<td><strong>Strong Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;This set of standards and guidelines outlines the best practices for protecting the integrity of cultural landscapes. While not specific to the national symbols, this document strongly advocates for the protection of viewsheds, sightlines and development of controls, which impact the setting of the cultural landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services and Procurement Canada (PSPC)</td>
<td>Good Neighbour Policy (2011)</td>
<td>N/A&lt;br&gt;The <strong>Good Neighbour Policy</strong> ensures that local urban development priorities are considered by the Public Services and Procurement Canada, when making Real Property decisions on behalf of the Government of Canada. The policy does not directly relate to view protection of the national symbols in the National Capital Region, however it does advocate for cooperation and collaboration with local/municipal governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary and Judicial Precinct Area Site Capacity and Long Term Development Plan (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weak Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;The policy includes a brief excerpt outlining Canada’s Capital View Protection Policy (2007) developed by the NCC. Otherwise, the policy does not specifically discuss view protection. It does however outline the visual power associated with both the Parliamentary and Judicial Triads, which overlook the Ottawa River and the ‘wild escarpment’, which collectively form the essential components of the national symbolic image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Investment Strategy (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A&lt;br&gt;There is no mention of the Parliamentary Precinct. The Strategy does suggest that PSPC work in partnership with local governments and integrate sustainable development principles into decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Policy Title (Year)</td>
<td>Support for View Protection Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The policy includes a brief excerpt outlining Canada’s Capital View Protection Policy (2007) developed by the NCC. Otherwise, the policy does not specifically discuss view protection. It does however outline the visual power associated with both the Parliamentary and Judicial Triads, which overlook the Ottawa River and the ‘wild escarpment’, which collectively form the essential components of the national symbolic image. |
| Community Based Investment Strategy (2012) | | N/A  
There is no specific mention of the Parliamentary Precinct. The Strategy does suggest that PSPC work in partnership with local governments and integrate sustainable development principles into decision-making. |
| Federal Sustainable Development Strategy 2012 Progress Report | | N/A  
The Federal Sustainable Development Strategy states “all newly constructed federal office buildings are required to meet the LEED Canada New Construction Gold level of environmental performance.” Shortly after the Strategy was adopted by Public Services and Procurement Canada, the private sector was very quick to respond by upgrading the environmental performance of new buildings and buildings that were being modernized. This demonstrates the strong influence the federal government has over the private sector. |
| City of Ottawa | Zoning | Strong Support  
In the zoning by-law, blocks are individually zoned in the central area with site-specific schedules that enforce height limits in order to protect the visual integrity and symbolic primacy of the Parliament Buildings. The height controls in the site-specific schedules (Schedule 12 to Schedule 53) are largely controlled by height (listed in metres above sea level) that cannot be exceeded. |
Policy in Section 3.6.6 strongly support the protection of the visual integrity and symbolic primacy of the Parliament Buildings and other national symbols. This is completed through the implementation of angular planes, height limits and identification of key viewpoints. This is further supported through Annex 8A, 8B, 8C, and 8D.  
Section 4.11 further protects views of the national symbols from two locations in Beechwood Cemetery. Section 2.5.6 states that areas where 30-storeys or more are permitted a view and skyline analysis must be completed to assess the impact of the proposed building on the views and skyline. |
| City of Ottawa Official Plan Amendment 150 (2013-2014) | | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Policy Title (Year)</th>
<th>Support for View Protection Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Ottawa</td>
<td>Central Area Secondary Plan (2009)</td>
<td><strong>Strong Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;Support for visual integrity and symbolic primacy of the Parliament Buildings through height limits and protection of views from the pedestrian level in the downtown. This is enforced by the Secondary Plan (Section 1.3.3 Policy f). Similarly to the Official Plan, the Secondary Plan’s policy I in Section 1.4.3 states that the City of Ottawa shall protect the views of the Parliament Buildings from two viewpoints at Beechwood Cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Guidelines</td>
<td>Downtown Ottawa Urban Design Strategy 20/20 (2002-2004)</td>
<td><strong>Strong Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;This document shows strong support for view protection controls by recommending the views identified by the NCC and the City of Ottawa be safeguarded. Additionally, the Strategy recommends the height controls in place do not need to be revised and recommends built form guidelines that respect height controls in order to protect the views of the national symbols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Design Objectives (2007)</td>
<td><strong>Moderate Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Urban Design Objectives document recommends the preservation of distinct views as they are important for the community and for way finding; however the document does not clearly recommend controls and tools that can be used in order to protect views of the national symbols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ottawa Transit Oriented Development Guidelines (2007)</td>
<td><strong>No Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;Despite encouraging density at transit stations, the Ottawa TOD Guidelines do not address view protection controls of the national symbols. TOD Guidelines are created in conjunction with the Official Plan and all other applicable regulations, therefore, Official Plan height restrictions protecting the views of the national symbols over-rule the guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | Urban Design Guidelines for High-Rise Housing (2009) | **Strong Support**<br>The Urban Design Guidelines for High-Rise Housing strongly supports the protection of views of the national symbols through its built form guidelines stating that high-rise developments must protect the views already created and must contribute to the skyline of Ottawa. For example, guideline nine states that high-rise developments should preserve and enhance views and vistas and must not block or detract from views to landmarks such as the national symbols. These Guidelines are created in conjunction with the Official Plan and all other applicable regulations and strengthen the support for view protection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Policy Title (Year)</th>
<th>Support for View Protection Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| City of Ottawa  | *Transit Oriented Development Plans: Lees, Hurdman, Tremblay, St. Laurent, Cyrville, and Blair (2014)* | No Support  
Despite encouraging increased density at transit stations, the Ottawa TOD Plans do not address view protection controls of the national symbols. The density zoning regulations for the TOD Plans consist of three zones:  

- **Low TOD Density Zone (TD1):** a minimum density of 150 units per net hectare for residential or a minimum Floor Space Index (FSI) of 0.5 for non-residential land use. Buildings in this zone shall range in height from two storeys to six storeys;  

- **Medium TOD Density Zone (TD2):** a minimum density of 250 units per net hectare for residential or a minimum FSI of 1.0 for non-residential land use. Buildings in this zone shall be no more than 20 storeys in height; and,  

- **High TOD Density Zone (TD3):** a minimum density of 350 units per net hectare for residential or a minimum FSI of 1.5 for non-residential land use. Buildings in this zone shall be no more than 30 storeys in height.  

As the Lees and Hurdman Stations are closest to the project study area, the height and density targets for these TOD Plans were further analyzed. **The Lees Station TOD Plan** consists of all three density zones. However, the TD3 zone, which is to consist of maximum 30 storey buildings, has exceptional spot heights of 35 and 45 storeys for the Lees TOD Plan. According to Section 10.1.7, if a building more than 30 storeys is proposed, the building design would have to demonstrate how it contributes positively to Ottawa’s skyline with attractive and distinctive building tops.  

The **Hurdman Station TOD Plan** also consists of all three density zones. Different from the Lees Station TOD Plan, the TD3 zone height limits are to respect the 30 storey limit, with no exceptional spot heights. While identifying height limits and requiring buildings that are higher than 30 storeys to demonstrate that the proposed buildings contribute positively to Ottawa’s skyline with attractive and distinctive building tops, the TOD Plans do not outline view protection policies of the national symbols.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Policy Title (Year)</th>
<th>Support for View Protection Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Ottawa</td>
<td>Strategic Plans</td>
<td>N/A Supports city-wide planning and development initiatives, and establishes a plan for the current council term. The Strategic Plan does not specifically outline height or view protection controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Ottawa Strategic Plan 2015-2018</td>
<td>N/A Supports city-wide planning and development initiatives, and establishes a plan for the current council term. The Strategic Plan does not specifically outline height or view protection controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Land Strategy for Ottawa (2006-2031)</td>
<td>N/A The Strategy does not discuss or apply to view protection controls of the national symbols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Design Plans</td>
<td>Centretown CDP (2013)</td>
<td>N/A Not within project study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Particulier D’Urbanisme: Le cœur du centre-ville</td>
<td>The plan has moderate to weak support for view protection as it mentions the showcasing of views, but never alludes to specific policies protecting them. Below are the policies that outline views:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 756.1 Quartier de la chutes des Chaudières supports view protection in part. This is a vision statement rather than a policy, that outlines that it wants to favour planning of public and private space on and east-west axis between le point des Chaudières and the Portage Bridge to showcase important views.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 756.7 Section de la Rive delineates a development on the ride of the Outaouais River. This would permit pedestrian activity along the banks of the river to allowing the public to enjoy the view. On the other hand, it describes that they want to delineate the entries to downtown through the establishment of taller buildings on the boarder of the corridors of the Portage and Chaudière bridges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Pole Ludique Section, it describes a wish to preserve the character of Portage, reducing the maximum height for frontage onto la promenade du Portage and Laurier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Policy Title (Year)</td>
<td>Support for View Protection Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ville de Gatineau</td>
<td>Part 2— “Le parti d’aménagement” Orientation d’aménagement et actions (Section 282)</td>
<td>No Support There is no support for view protection in this part, however, the section emphasizes cultural identity and introduces view protection of the Gatineau Hills. The policy is described below: Policy 3 (Section 295) pertains to the valorization of cultural identity within the Ville de Gatineau. However, the word ‘encourages’ is used rather than a more enforceable term when it comes to their criteria. Action 3.3 specifically states that to maintain cultural identity, they should “protect and frame the views of the Gatineau Hills”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Particulier D’urbanisme Centre Ville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak Support There is some mention of supporting view controls, however, it pertains to the Portage Bridge. The by-laws have not been changed or amended to comply to this. The policy is described below: In the Pole Ludique Section— it seeks to preserve the character of Portage, reducing the maximum height on la promenade du Portage and Laurier St. The plan notes that the maximum heights were revised to implement the Secondary Plan. However, the zoning by-laws need to be changed in order to adopt these modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réglement de Zones Sous Section 5 (611)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Support Height Limits are defined by zones in the Ville de Gatineau, however there is no mention of view protection in this document. This section provides a table and outlines the maximum height limits in the downtown core. In Section 612, the amendments are noted [these zones are in the Domtar Lands]: Zone c-08-259: one building can have a height limit of 75m Zone c-08-264: one building can be over 99m Zone c-08-264: one building can be over 71m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX B: STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Action Channels</th>
<th>Action Channels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Communities</td>
<td>• Crown land</td>
<td>• Access to court challenges</td>
<td>• Public consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognizing their symbols as national symbols</td>
<td>• Local knowledge</td>
<td>• Court appeal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Media appeal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Canada</td>
<td>• Preservation of the symbolic primacy of the Parliamentary Precinct</td>
<td>• Significant land ownership</td>
<td>• Political influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>• Scenic views</td>
<td>• Planning and development expertise</td>
<td>• Development partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tourism</td>
<td>• Occupant of the area</td>
<td>• Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Political influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Federal spending power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Capital Commission (NCC)</td>
<td>• Protect the views of the national symbols to maintain the identity of the area</td>
<td>• Planning and development expertise</td>
<td>• Political influence and partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preservation of both built and natural heritage</td>
<td>• Land ownership</td>
<td>• Land use planning approval on federal land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhancing the national capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services and</td>
<td>• Preservation of symbolic primacy</td>
<td>• Main custodian and occupant of the area</td>
<td>• Land use planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Canada (PSPC)</td>
<td>• Managing and maintaining diverse real-estate portfolios</td>
<td>• Significant land ownership</td>
<td>• Development partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Political influence</td>
<td>• Political influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Large renovation budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Ontario</td>
<td>• Public affairs and infrastructure</td>
<td>• Political influence</td>
<td>• Legislative process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Infrastructure funding</td>
<td>• Tourism agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tourism funding</td>
<td>• Provincial policy guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouvernement du Québec</td>
<td>• Public affairs and infrastructure</td>
<td>• Political influence</td>
<td>• Legislative process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Infrastructure funding</td>
<td>• Tourism agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tourism funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Ottawa, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementing Official Plan, secondary plans, urban design guidelines and zoning by-laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintaining and protecting the identity of the national capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal authority for policies, plans and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create and enforce policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build and maintain infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protecting and enhancing the quality of life of residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protecting and enhancing the reputation of the City of Ottawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Representation of councilors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approving or denying development applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning Committee approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City Council approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation with residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ville de Gatineau, Département d’urbanisme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementing Official Plan, secondary plans, urban design guidelines and zoning by-laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain and protect the identity of the national capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal authority for policies, plans and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create and enforce policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build and maintain infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conseil Municipal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protecting or enhancing the quality of life of residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protecting and enhancing the reputation of the Ville de Gatineau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Representation of councilors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approving or denying development applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning Committee approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City Council approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation with residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Community Groups</td>
<td>Tourism Industry</td>
<td>Development Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impacts on surrounding neighborhoods</td>
<td>• Impacts on surrounding areas</td>
<td>• Enhancing the national capital to promote tourism</td>
<td>• Increasing commercial real estate development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintaining an attractive community for visitors</td>
<td>• Maintain or increase value of real-estate</td>
<td>• Increasing interest in the area through views of the national symbols</td>
<td>• Maintaining or increasing the value of real estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintaining views of the national symbols</td>
<td>• Protect and/or enhance the National Capital Region</td>
<td>• Maintaining scenic views</td>
<td>• Maintaining or establishing exclusive access to views to improve real estate value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local knowledge</td>
<td>• Local knowledge</td>
<td>• Local knowledge</td>
<td>• Planning and real estate expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media outlets</td>
<td>• Local lobbying</td>
<td>• Marketing and tourism expertise</td>
<td>• Local knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public consultations</td>
<td>• Media outlets</td>
<td>• Advertising</td>
<td>• Access to capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public consultations</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to local lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ontario Municipal Board appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Following policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# APPENDIX C: EXISTING CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint # and Classification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Control Viewpoint            | The Centreline of Sussex Dr., where it intersects with the centreline of Macdonald-Cartier Bridge | ![Viewpoint 1 Picture](image1.jpg) | - Foreground view disruption from vegetation and light posts to the eavesline of Parliament  
- Spires of the Peace Tower, National Gallery and East Block are visible  
- Foreground and background distracting, National Symbols overwhelmed  
- Important view for the scenic approach route offered by Sussex Dr. | C  
‘Weak’ |
| 2 Key Viewpoint                | Midpoint along Sussex Dr. between the Macdonald-Cartier Bridge and Boteler St. | ![Viewpoint 2 Picture](image2.jpg) | - Foreground view disruption, primarily by vegetation and light posts. Background view disruption from Central Business District (CBD) to the east  
- Spires slightly more visible than viewpoint 1, National Symbols overwhelmed  
- Important view for the scenic approach route offered by Sussex Dr. | C  
‘Weak’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint # and Classification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 Key Viewpoint               | Sussex Dr. at the forecourt of the National Gallery | ![Picture](image) | - Foreground view disruption to the ridgeline of Centre Block  
- Obstruction by vegetation, street lamps, and Three Watchmen statue  
- Silhouette of Centre Block visually dominant  
- Important cultural viewpoint from National Gallery | B  
‘Moderate’ |
| 4 Key Viewpoint               | The summit of Nepean Point | ![Picture](image) | - Background view obstruction behind East Block and east side of Parliament Hill  
- World Exchange Plaza visible over the ridgeline of Centre Block  
- Background of East Block obstructed, but Parliament is not overwhelmed  
- Clear views of Ottawa River and Escarpment, foliage well managed | B  
‘Moderate’ |
### Viewpoint # and Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint # and Classification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 Key Viewpoint               | Ascending ramp of the boardwalk along Alexandra Bridge, just east of Rue Laurier in Gatineau | ![Picture](image1.jpg) | • Centre Block visually dominant  
  • Background view obstruction on east and west side of Centre Block  
  • Vegetation obstructs the foreground view of the escarpment | B ‘Moderate’ |
| 6 Control Viewpoint           | High point of the ramp of the Alexandra Bridge boardwalk. | ![Picture](image2.jpg) | • Centre Block visually dominant, however the dense built form to the east of parliament detracts visual attention  
  • No foreground view disruptions  
  • Background view obstruction behind West Block  
  • Chateau Laurier silhouette enhances vista | B ‘Moderate’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint # and Classification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7 Key Viewpoint               | Mid point on the Alexandra Bridge | ![Image](194x299.jpg) | • Centre Block visually dominant  
• No foreground view disruptions  
• Built form to the east is visually distracting and overwhelming for Parliament  
• Château Laurier silhouette complementary to the view | B  
‘Moderate’ |
| 8 Key Viewpoint               | Mid point on the Alexandra Bridge to the viewing platform at the south end of Alexandra Bridge | ![Image](194x101.jpg) | • Very similar to viewpoint 7  
• Centre Block visually dominant  
• No foreground view disruptions, slight background disruption to East Block  
• Built form to the east very distracting | B  
‘Moderate’ |
| Viewpoint # and Classification | Location | Picture | Notes | Silhouette Rating
|-------------------------------|----------|---------|-------|-----------------
| 9 Key Viewpoint               | Viewing platform at the south end of the Alexandra Bridge | ![Picture](9) | - Centre and West Block have unobstructed foreground and background  
- Confederation and Justice buildings obscured by background development  
- Slight vegetation overgrowth  
- Elevation is favourable to enhance view | B ‘Moderate’ |
| 10 Key Viewpoint              | Terrace level in front of the Museum of History in Gatineau | ![Picture](10) | - Foreground views unobstructed  
- Elevation allows for clear silhouette  
- Library prominence enhances view  
- U.S. Embassy clearly visible  
- Slight background disruption to the east of Parliament, by the Bell Building  
- Righthand shoulder of the view slightly detracts from prominence of Centre Block | B ‘Moderate’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint # and Classification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **11** Key Viewpoint          | The viewing platform in front of the Museum of History at the edge of the Ottawa River in Gatineau | ![Viewpoint 11 Picture](image1.png) | - West Block obscured by vegetation. Foreground vegetation strengthens view  
- West shoulder commercial buildings do not detract attention from National Symbols  
- Elevation of Parliament makes the Centre Block and Library dominant | A  
‘Strong’ |
| **12** Control Viewpoint      | The intersection of the Portage Bridge and Rue Laurier in Gatineau | ![Viewpoint 12 Picture](image2.png) | - Foreground view disruption  
- View completely obstructed by trees  
- No view of National Symbols | D  
‘Lost’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint # and Classification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13 Key Viewpoint              | The midpoint of the Portage Bridge, between Gatineau and Victoria Island | ![Image](image1.png) | • Main building form is still legible but most of East Block obscured  
• Dark and dense built form in the foreground of vista is visually distracting  
• National Symbols have to compete for viewer’s attention | B  
‘Moderate’ |
| 14 Key Viewpoint              | Portage Bridge, south of Victoria Island | ![Image](image2.png) | • Fully legible silhouette of the Centre Block, Library and West Block above the tree line  
• National Gallery visible  
• No background disruption from this view, foreground is also clear | A  
‘Strong’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint # and Classification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15 Key Viewpoint | Eastern end of Victoria Island | ![Image](image1.jpg) | - Silhouette obscured up to the Centre Block roof Ridgeline  
- Parliament is barely visible  
- Foreground foliage view obstruction  
- Dark built form in the foreground of vista competes with National Symbols |
| 16 Key Viewpoint | Point on the Ottawa River Parkway, overpass above the CPR tracks | ![Image](image2.jpg) | - Parliament barely visible  
- View is overpowered by the Central Business District (CBD)  
- Important view point for drivers, however commercial buildings are the focal point of the view  
- Function of parkway has changed. Increasing speed of cars affects how National Symbols are seen |

**Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan**

- C- 'Weak'
- D- 'Lost'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint # and Classification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 17A                           | Nicholas St. & King Edward | ![Image](image1) | • Only the Peace Tower spire is visible  
• Foreground view disruption from vegetation to the west, DND building to the east.  
• Peace Tower overpowered by the DND building  
• Important viewpoint for when people are driving into the city using Nicholas Ave.; should be better views of Parliament | C  
‘Weak’ |
| 17B                           | Nicholas St. between Somerset St. E. and Osgoode St. | ![Image](image2) | • Views are completely blocked by vegetation and construction  
• Peace tower not visible  
• Walking north on site, tree cover increased  
• Important viewpoint for people driving into the city using Nicholas Ave.  
• Temporary ‘lost’ view | D  
‘Lost’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint # and Classification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18 Key Viewpoint              | Viewing platform on the Mackenzie King Bridge above the Rideau Canal | ![Picture] | • Middle of Mackenzie King bridge offers the best relative views of National Symbols  
• Views improve while walking east on the bridge  
• Foreground view disruption by National Art Centre and vegetation  
• Centre Block is visually dominant | B  
‘Moderate’ |
| 19 Key Viewpoint              | York St. at ByWard Market St. | ![Picture] | • Foreground view disruption by cars, vegetation, street lamps  
• Obstruction to the ridgeline of Centre Block  
• Peace Tower and Library spires are visible  
• Complementary surrounding built form  
• Important view point considering the popularity and vibrancy of Byward Market | C  
‘Weak’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint # and Classification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20 Key Viewpoint              | York St. at Sussex Dr. | ![Image](image1.png) | • Only the tip of the Peace Tower visible  
• Vegetation obstructing up to the ridgeline of the Peace Tower  
• Difference in elevation could be responsible for the lack of Centre Block visibility  
• Moving up the stairs or changing viewpoint to top of stairs would allow for better sightline | D ‘Lost’ |
| 21 Key Viewpoint              | Metcalfe St. at Wellington St. | ![Image](image2.png) | • Only view interruptions are traffic lights and traffic (not visible in selected picture)  
• Clear silhouette of Centre Block  
• Perfect view | A ‘Strong’ |
## Existing Views Conditions Chart Continued (Supplementary Unnumbered Viewpoints in Sector Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sector Plan View Classification</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rue Laurier at Rue Courcelette (Gatineau) | Other Important Viewpoint | ![Picture](image1.png) | • Foreground commercial obstruction, the eye is drawn to the foreground rather than the National Symbols  
• Clear silhouette of Centre Block and Library  
• No background disruption  
• Favourable elevation for the sightline of Centre Block |
| Rue Laurier at Rue de l'hôtel-de-Ville (Gatineau) | Other Important Viewpoint | ![Picture](image2.png) | • No view of Centre Block, Peace Tower etc.  
• Canadian Museum of History slightly visible  
• Considerable foreground view disruption  
• Purpose/significance of this viewpoint is unclear |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>‘Moderate’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>‘Lost’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Sector Plan View Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rue Laurier at Rue Victoria (Gatineau) | Supplementary Control Viewpoint | ![Picture](image1) | • No views of National Symbols  
• Vegetation completely obstructing foreground and all views  
• The purpose and significance of this viewpoint is unclear; what is meant to be seen here? | D  
‘Lost’ |
| Rue Laurier at Rue Papineau (Gatineau) | Other Important Viewpoint | ![Picture](image2) | • Design of Canadian Museum of History enables views of Parliament, however there is a poor and obstructed view of National Symbols  
• Foreground view disrupted by vegetation  
• Top of National Gallery barely visible  
• Important cultural viewpoint, better sightline required | D  
‘Lost’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sector Plan View Classification</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LeBreton Flats, outside War Museum | Other Important Viewpoint | ![Image](image1.jpg) | • Centre Block and Library visible above eavesline  
• West block spire visible above eavesline  
• View disruption in the right foreground, by the former National Library, National Symbols are overpowered  
• Treeline enables good view | B  
‘Moderate’ |
| Murray St. and Sussex Dr. | Other Important Viewpoint | ![Image](image2.jpg) | • Foreground view disruption by vegetation, and large poles to the west  
• Peace Tower spire visible above eavesline  
• Centre Block is visually overpowered because of foreground | C  
‘Weak’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sector Plan View Classification</th>
<th>Picture</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Major's Hill Park (near the beginning of Alexandra Bridge) | Other Important Viewpoint | ![Major's Hill Park](image) | • No foreground or background disruptions to Centre Block; clear silhouette  
• East Block view is obstructed by commercial buildings in the background  
• Library is prominent from this viewpoint  
• Foreground foliage slightly overgrown |
| Near Astrolabe Theatre on Nepean Point | Supplementary Control Viewpoint | ![Near Astrolabe Theatre on Nepean Point](image) | • Elevation enables a fairly clear silhouette of Centre, West and East Blocks. Escarpment unobstructed by foreground foliage  
• Background obstruction behind East Block  
• Confederation and Justice buildings overpowered by background development  
• Built form on the shoulders of vista distract views |

**Silhouette Rating as Adopted from Capital Views Protection Plan**

- B
  - ‘Moderate’
APPENDIX D: PRECEDENTS
D.1 Cities by Type of View Protection Control

Blanket Height Controls

- Guelph, Ontario Canada
- Helsinki, Finland
- Montréal, Québec, Canada
- Washington, D.C., United States of America

View Corridors and Cones

- Austin, Texas, United States of America
- Canberra, Australia
- Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
- London, England, United Kingdom
- Portland, Oregon, United States of America
- Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Alternative and Hybrid Controls

- Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom
- Kingston, Ontario, Canada
- Oxford, England, United Kingdom

Figure D-1: Primary height control diagram (Hammer, 1969)
The City of Guelph is located in southwestern Ontario, 112 kilometres from the City of Toronto. The city has a rich history and was the headquarters of the Canada Company in the 1800’s. The city was designed to resemble a European city centre, which includes a town square, broad main streets and narrow side streets. The Church of Our Lady Immaculate is considered a unique architectural building in the downtown core, with a strong historical community presence that attracts many residents and out of town visitors to the area. As the city developed, planning policy was established to protect views of the Church of Our Lady Immaculate.1

The Federal Government designated the Church of Our Lady Immaculate as a National Heritage Site in 1990. However, a National Historic Site designated under the Historic Sites and Monuments Act, does not provide the Federal Government jurisdiction to impose rules on the property owner regarding conservation of the site. In Canada, protection of heritage property not owned by the Federal Government is the responsibility of each provincial and local government under its respective legislation. Within the City of Guelph, the church is listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. Properties listed on the register recognize the site’s cultural heritage value in the community. The church is a non-designated heritage property on the register, yet is incorporated into several planning policies for view protection. In 2012, the City of Guelph received the Lieutenant Governor’s Ontario Heritage Award for Community Leadership by the Ontario Heritage Trust.2 The award recognized the city’s initiatives in heritage conservation for the Church of Our Lady Immaculate ensuring Ontario’s heritage is preserved for the city, and its future generations.3

The City of Guelph Official Plan establishes urban design objectives to be upheld in the city. Of those declared objectives, Section 3.6 states the town must preserve and enhance the existing protected views and vistas of Guelph’s built and natural features. The Official Plan also mandates identification and protection of potential new views and vistas. More specifically in section 3.6.7, the Official Plan requires established views of the Church of Our Lady Immaculate to be protected, in addition to other views and vistas of natural heritage features or cultural heritage resources. Downtown Guelph’s Secondary Plan also strongly emphasize view protection of the church as it adds to the city’s character and identity. The City of Guelph’s Zoning By-Law establishes five protected view areas that were designed to preserve clear sight lines to the church from various vantage points in the downtown core. The church is surrounded by mostly residentially zoned properties and a few commercial properties. Zoning policy clearly states that no buildings or structures built in the downtown area may obscure the view of the church. Additionally, no new buildings and structures in the city’s downtown are allowed to be greater in height than the church.4

Like all growing cities, Guelph also faces development pressures advocating for tall buildings within its city...
limits. In 2012, The Tricar Group sought an Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment that would allow the development of an 18-storey building in the downtown. The building would be the tallest in the area with commercial space on the lower floors. The development faced multiple criticisms centred around its appropriateness for Guelph and view protection of the church. Following a Visual Impact Study, it was determined that views of the church would not be impacted, and the city amended its Official Plan to allow for the construction of the condominium. The building aligns with the city's Secondary Plan objective for high-density urban growth.

Figure D-2: This image showcases how building heights in Guelph are not permitted to exceed the Church of Our Lady Immaculate (Padraic, 2007)
Map D-1: This map displays the five protected view corridors in the City of Guelph to protect views of the Church of Our Lady Immaculate. This map is retrieved from Guelph’s zoning by-law (City of Guelph, 2016)
D.2.1.1 LESSONS LEARNED

- Local government in Canada's National Capital Region should also legislate protection of its significant sites through multiple planning policies similar to the City of Guelph. In collaboration with the NCC, local planning bodies can work towards implementing planning policies within their zoning by-laws and Official Plan’s that protect national monuments.

- Guelph has set an exemplary example of protection through its policy work around the Church of Our Lady Immaculate and its views throughout the city. Although the site is a non-designated property on the Municipal Heritage Register, the city’s efforts have been formally recognized by the Ontario Heritage Trust. The National Capital Commission can work in collaboration with the City of Ottawa and Ville de Gatineau to encourage both cities to protect national symbols in a similar manner as the City of Guelph.
## D.2.2 Helsinki, Finland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population (2011)</th>
<th>Density (people per km²)</th>
<th>Type of Capital</th>
<th>Age of City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uusimaa, Finland</td>
<td>City: 629,512</td>
<td>City: 2,945/km²</td>
<td>Multi-Functional Capital</td>
<td>Charter: 1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro: 1,441,601</td>
<td>Metro: 389/km²</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital: 1812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Planning Body</th>
<th>Building Height Limits</th>
<th>What Views are Being Protected?</th>
<th>Types of Controls</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Helsinki Council</td>
<td>Maximum Height of 23m</td>
<td>Tuomiokirkko</td>
<td>Blanket Height Controls</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75.5 ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Helsinki is located in Uusimaa, Finland, on a peninsula and on 315 islands situated on the Baltic Sea’s Gulf of Finland. Helsinki was chosen as the capital of Finland in 1812, and has since grown to become the major political, financial, educational, and cultural centre of the country. As a result, the monuments and political buildings in the city play an integral part in Finland’s national identity. The most prominent monument in Helsinki is the Tuomiokirkko, a cathedral found in Helsinki’s historic Empire City Centre in the Senaatintori (Senate Square). This square represents the centre of the city and together with the urban greenery and natural elements in the archipelago surrounding it, characterizes the historic silhouette of Helsinki and symbolizes the cityscape of the national capital. Helsinki is known for its prominent cityscape and strong national aspirations to protect prominent views.²

Finland’s Ministry of Environment has defined Helsinki as an important part of Finland’s national landscape, and as a result controls of growth and urban character have been tightly policed. A regulation called Rakennusjärjestys was developed in 1895 and was modeled upon a regulation that Berlin, Germany had in place at that time. This regulation dictated that the height of any building could not be higher than the street width by more than 2.5 metres (8.2 feet). If the width of the street could not be defined, a maximum building height of 23 metres (75.46 feet) would be enforced. As a result, a majority of Helsinki’s downtown was built according to the Rakennusjärjestys regulation. In the Empire City Centre, the iconic center of the downtown, a strict height limit of 5-storeys was set to protect views of the important buildings and monuments in Senate Square. Both of these regulations were especially important in the development as they enabled views of the Tuomiokirkko Cathedral across the city and created a landscape of level roofs, with only churches and public buildings emerging from the silhouette.³

Regrettably, 1932 signaled a change in planning policies across the city where building heights could now be regulated by city plans as well. This change enabled development of buildings higher than what was previously allowed. As a result, new zoning guidelines were created by the city planning department. These zoning guidelines laid out areas across the city that are considered appropriate for growth and urban character.

---

² The City of Helsinki is located in Uusimaa, Finland, on a peninsula and on 315 islands situated on the Baltic Sea’s Gulf of Finland. Helsinki was chosen as the capital of Finland in 1812, and has since grown to become the major political, financial, educational, and cultural centre of the country. As a result, the monuments and political buildings in the city play an integral part in Finland’s national identity. The most prominent monument in Helsinki is the Tuomiokirkko, a cathedral found in Helsinki’s historic Empire City Centre in the Senaatintori (Senate Square). This square represents the centre of the city and together with the urban greenery and natural elements in the archipelago surrounding it, characterizes the historic silhouette of Helsinki and symbolizes the cityscape of the national capital.

³ Regrettably, 1932 signaled a change in planning policies across the city where building heights could now be regulated by city plans as well. This change enabled development of buildings higher than what was previously allowed. As a result, new zoning guidelines were created by the city planning department. These zoning guidelines laid out areas across the city that are considered appropriate for growth and urban character.

---

Figure D-4: Helsinki’s Rakennusjärjestys Regulation outlining height limit calculations (City of Helsinki, 2011)
development, and highlighted areas where restrictions were to be established to protect buildings and monuments of national significance.9

These are zoned:

A - No new development that exceeds the present building heights;

B - Some new development but with some conditions: maximum of 16-storeys, no negative effect on the national landscape, and each development must be viewed separately;

Ba - Maximum of 16-storeys with a separate evaluation on the effects; and

C - If the building height exceeds 16-storeys separate evaluation must be done (Figure 6-2).

In the 1930’s, the City of Helsinki and the National Government purchased a large portion of land in order to enforce the Rakennusjärjestys regulation in zone A and in the Empire City Centre to maintain the symbolic character of the area.10 Additionally, the Empire City Centre and a few other nationally significant areas around the city centre and archipelago fall under the protection of the National Board of Antiquities in Finland, who strictly prohibit any new development that would upset the nationally symbolic character of these areas and the silhouette they form.11

Following these new changes, exemptions to the Rakennusjärjestys regulation began in the 1960’s and resulted in the construction of a few large high-rise buildings across the city. These exemptions have resulted in a disruption of the skyline over the years, prompting the City of Helsinki to commence a Views Study as part of the new general plan review in 2016. The study was undertaken to help understand how future development will affect the skyline once high-rise buildings and new bridges are constructed across the city.12

Figure D-5: View of the Tuomiokirkko in the Helsinki City Centre (City of Helsinki, 2011)
Map D-2: Helsinki’s Zoning Guidelines showing zones ‘A’ through ‘C’ on the city map (City of Helsinki, 2011)
The development of a national ideology about the symbolic character of historic buildings plays a crucial role in the preservation of views in Helsinki. Acknowledging views of important city landmarks as being crucial to the city’s identity has worked to create a sense of pride in Helsinkians who continue to advocate for preservation of these views. The National Capital Region should work towards developing stronger public awareness, thereby forming a better perception of identity associated with national symbols.

Despite the fact that high-rise development in the past has affected views of the Empire City Centre, Helsinki is striving to develop comprehensive policies that will prevent the loss of any views of the Empire City Centre. The National Capital Region still has the ability to enact policies and/or by-laws that will prevent the ongoing degradation of views and to preserve views that remain unobstructed.
### D.2.3 Montréal, Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population (2011)</th>
<th>Density (people per km²)</th>
<th>Type of Capital</th>
<th>Age of City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Québec, Canada</td>
<td>City: 1,649,519, Metro: 4,127,100</td>
<td>City: 4,517/km², Metro: 898/km²</td>
<td>Former Capital</td>
<td>1642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Planning Body</th>
<th>Building Height Limits</th>
<th>What Views Are Being Protected?</th>
<th>Types of Controls</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Montréal, Urbanisme et Project Urbains de Montréal</td>
<td>200m (656ft)</td>
<td>Mount-Royal and St. Lawrence River</td>
<td>Blanket Height Controls</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Montréal or Ville de Montréal, is located in southwestern Québec, at the junction of the St. Lawrence River and the Ottawa River. Montréal is located on the Island of Montréal, where the 3-peaked mountain, Mount Royal (Mont-Royal), dominates the landscape. Montréal was originally laid out in bastide style with fortified walls surrounding the town, public squares scattered throughout, and an irregular gridiron street pattern, still evident today. Mont-Royal, standing at a height of 233 metres (731.62 feet) above sea level at its largest peak, includes Montréal's largest green space and is a defining feature of the city. Parc du Mont-Royal includes scenic vistas that overlook the entirety of Montréal's downtown skyline, the St Lawrence Seaway to the east, and provides other breathtaking panoramas of the city. Due to the importance of the mountain to the history and identity of Montréal, Mont-Royal was declared by the city and the province as a Heritage Site in 1988.

Prior to 1920, in an effort to protect views of the mountain, the city used blanket height limits that
limited all development within the city to 10-storeys.\textsuperscript{16} Stronger view protections for Mont-Royal were implemented in 1990 when the \textit{Master Development Plan for the Ville-Marie District} (which encompasses the downtown area) was introduced. The \textit{Plan} identified 12 view corridors facing toward the mountain from viewpoints scattered throughout the district.\textsuperscript{17} The city set additional protection policies when it released the \textit{Montréal Master Plan} (2004), setting the criteria for view protection policies to be implemented in the zoning by-laws of each of the city’s 27 boroughs. The \textit{Montréal Master Plan}’s map titled “Views of Interest from Mount Royal”, identifies 10 broad vistas looking from the mountain, outwards towards the city. In addition, the map titled “Views of Interest Towards Mount Royal” identifies seven broad vistas and 32 view corridors looking toward the mountain. Section 5.1.3 of the \textit{Master Plan}’s \textit{Complementary Document} states “borough by-laws must include rules and criteria that ensure new building construction or extension project seeks to maintain views of the mountain and the river when that building is situated at the extremity or in the path of a view” which applies to views identified in the previously mentioned maps.\textsuperscript{18}

Although Montréal uses view corridors to illustrate views of Mont-Royal, Montréal enforces blanket height limits to achieve its view protection objectives. The \textit{Master Plan} sets the maximum height for any development within Montréal at 200 metres (656.16 feet) or 232.5 metres (762.76 feet) above sea level, whichever is lesser, a height which corresponds to the highest point of the mountain. This limit remains unchanged to this day, although it should be noted that the height limit does not apply to apparatuses such as antennas or chimneys that extend from the roof upwards as per section 8.1.0.1 of the \textit{Plan}.\textsuperscript{19}

As one looks at the skyline of Montréal, they will likely notice a cluster of the tallest buildings in the middle of the city (in the Central Business District) which gradually decrease in height as they move outwards. The cluster of these tall buildings in the centre lightly correspond to where the peak of the mountain is located. This is due to the additional height control policies set by the \textit{Montréal Master Plan} on the Borough of Ville-Marie. As per Section 5.1.1 of Part III: the Complementary Document, the Borough of Ville-Marie must set additional height limits as identified in the map titled “Building Heights”. The policies imposed on Ville-Marie gives Montréal its “hill-and-bowl” appearance setting up a skyline with fractal dimensions that (purposely) do not correspond to fractal dimensions of the mountain.\textsuperscript{20} This is thought to give Montréal a more favourable look or esthetic where the built form (buildings) and the natural form (Mont-Royal) both complement and contrast each other.\textsuperscript{21}

\textit{The Mount Royal Protection and Enhancement Plan} (2009) builds on the \textit{Mount Royal Protection Plan} (1992) which also explores issues such as accessibility, visitor services, public outreach, habitat protection, and heritage preservation in terms of the buildings on or near Mont-Royal. This helps increase awareness of the significance of Mont-Royal, its history, and presence of viewpoints and corridors that are protected.\textsuperscript{22}
Figure D-9: Diagram of Montréal’s ‘Hill and Bowl’ Skyline (Ville de Montréal, 2004)
D.2.3.1 LESSONS LEARNED

- The Mount Royal Protection and Enhancement Plan (2009) attempts to find new and innovative ways of garnering public interest in the history, environment, and cultural significance of Mont-Royal. The more people understand the significance of a landmark, the more likely they are to advocate for preserving views of the area. The NCC could use this document as a guideline to garner public interest in preserving views of the national symbols.

- Parc du Mont-Royal draws visitors and residents alike, and gives the public impressive viewpoints they would otherwise not be able to experience. Having an iconic public green space where views can be enjoyed allows visitors to develop an affinity for the landscape and may increase citizen advocacy for preserving them. Ottawa and Gatineau may be able to replicate this by implementing programs aimed at increasing the enjoyment of greenspaces with views of the national symbols along the river, and Nepean Point.

Figure D-10: “Submerged Montreal”. A photo taken from Mont-Royal looking towards the downtown core (T.E.A Photography, 2012)
D.2.4 WASHINGTON, D.C, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>POPULATION (2015)</th>
<th>DENSITY (PEOPLE PER KM²)</th>
<th>TYPE OF CAPITAL</th>
<th>AGE OF CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>City: 672,228</td>
<td>City: 4,251/KM²</td>
<td>Political Capital</td>
<td>1790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PLANNING BODY</th>
<th>BUILDING HEIGHT LIMITS</th>
<th>WHAT VIEWS ARE BEING PROTECTED?</th>
<th>TYPES OF CONTROLS</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.C. Office of Planning</td>
<td>27M (90FT) Residential; 40M (130 FT) Commercial; 49M (160 FT) on Pennsylvania Avenue</td>
<td>L'Enfant and McMillan Plans</td>
<td>Blanket Height Controls</td>
<td>Beaux Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Washington, D.C., is a compact city on the Potomac River, bordering the states of Maryland and Virginia. As the capital of the United States, the city is a unique place with its own authentic character and identity. The city has three branches of federal government within its borders, along with several iconic museums and art institutions. The city attracts approximately 17.4 million domestic visitors and 1.6 million international visitors each year generating close to $6.7 billion for the local economy. Washington's most prominent feature may be its federal monumental core, but the city also hosts vibrant commercial and residential areas.

The 1793 L’Enfant Plan and 1902 McMillan Plan established an urban design framework for the capital city. These plans are collectively known as the Plan of the City of Washington. These planning principles greatly influenced the design of public spaces and buildings found in the city today. Pierre L’Enfant created the L’Enfant Plan which serves as the planning foundation for the city. The L’Enfant Plan created a regular orthogonal grid sectioned into four quadrants, with the U.S. Capitol at the middle point. Additionally, the plan established a series of diagonal avenues on the orthogonal grid integrating open space and parks within the city’s streetscape design. The McMillan Plan reinforced the notion of grand public spaces and civic buildings influenced by the City Beautiful movement. The McMillan Plan focused on restoring L’Enfant’s original vision of the National Mall, created an enclave for government offices in the city and established a comprehensive regional park and open space recreation system. The McMillan Plan provided a strong framework for many projects, both in the core and extending out into the region. Together, the Plan of the City of Washington has functioned as the foundation for the city’s growth.

The National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) plays a critical role in the federal government’s interests to protect the Plan of the City of Washington’s legacy. In 1997, the NCPC lead a long-range planning study titled the Legacy Plan, which acted as a guide to protect the City of Washington’s planned vision, while accommodating for its future growth. The design of streets, open spaces, public buildings, and developable blocks in L’Enfant’s Plan has been preserved over time and is still implemented via policies legislated by NCPC’s Urban Design Element in the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. Additionally, NCPC’s Memorials and Museums Master Plan proposed policies to preserve historic open spaces by the National Mall and several memorials throughout Washington. As well, the District of Columbia State Historic Preservation Office and the National Parks Service jointly work to protect the Plan of the City of Washington as many sites are part of the National Register of Historic Places.

For more than a century, views of national monuments have been preserved within a developing city through the federally legislated Building Height Act of 1910. Buildings cannot be greater than 6.1 metres (20 feet).
in height more than the width of the facing street, with a maximum of 27.43 metres (90 feet) for residential streets and 39.62 metres (130 feet) on commercial streets.\textsuperscript{27} Since the founding of the city, the federal government has played an active role in its planning and development to ensure that the nation’s capital meets expectations set forward by the aforementioned plans. Federal laws, regulations, policies, and funding decisions directly influence planning activities in the city.\textsuperscript{28} Federal government plays an important role in non-federal areas of the region as well to maintain Washington’s historic urban fabric.\textsuperscript{29}

\textbf{D.2.4.1 Lessons Learned}

- Preservation of Washington’s national monuments has been successful due to the strong partnership of the federal government and local jurisdictions working together to address areas of mutual interest in the United States’ capital region. As Washington continues to evolve, growth and development is guided by federal and local planning bodies. Canada’s National Capital Region must also work towards identifying mutual goals and objectives for the region with Ottawa and Gatineau to create urban design policies that accentuate national symbols.

- To ensure preservation of national monuments in Washington, multiple legislative and judicial bodies work collectively to guide growth and development in the region. As mentioned above, local planning policies are influenced by federal policies that are all framed to protect and emphasize national monuments in the area.
D.3 View Corridors and View Cones

D.3.1 Austin, United States of America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population (2016)</th>
<th>Density (people per km²)</th>
<th>Type of Capital</th>
<th>Age of City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas, United States of America</td>
<td>City: 931,830</td>
<td>City: 1,296 km²</td>
<td>State Capital</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro: 2,010,860</td>
<td>Metro: 180/ km²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Planning Body</th>
<th>Building Height Limits</th>
<th>What Views are Being Protected?</th>
<th>Types of Controls</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Austin Planning and Zoning Department</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>State Capitol Building</td>
<td>View Corridors and View Cones</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Austin, a southern American city located on the Colorado River, replaced Houston as the capital of Texas in 1839. Immediately after Austin was declared the new capital, Edwin Waller, an entrepreneur, was charged with surveying and laying out the new town. In this original survey, Congress Avenue was created running north-south through the middle of the grid, stretching from the river to what would be the “Capital Square.” The Capital Square would eventually house the grand Capitol building, which would be constructed years later in 1888. Serving as the State Capitol Building of Texas since its completion, the Texas State Capitol houses the Texas State Legislature.

The Capitol continues to serve an important political function, and is a point of deep pride for Austinites and Texans alike. The Capitol building stands at 94 metres (308.4 feet) making it taller than the National Capitol Building in Washington D.C (88 metres or 288.71 feet). The Capitol was declared a National Historic Landmark in 1986. The Capitol building dominated...
Austin's skyline for almost a century. Although a maximum height zoning ordinance was established in 1932, limiting building height to just under 61 metres (200.13 feet), the policy had holes that developers would exploit in order to build taller buildings.\(^35\)

The Capitol building was the tallest building from its completion in 1888, until 1974, when it was overtaken by the Chase Bank tower in 1975. The next year, the Bank of America Centre took the top spot standing at 100 metres (328.09 feet). As a result of Austin's booming economy and steadily increasing population, the 1970's and 1980's saw the construction of 17 high-rise developments over 60 metres (196.85 feet) in height. The Capitol, which was once the centre of attention in Austin, was now obscured by the erection of much larger buildings.\(^36\)

In response to losing some of the iconic views of the Capitol, and the fear of losing more, capitol view corridors were established by both the State of Texas and the City of Austin in 1983.\(^37\) The City of Austin Planning Department identified 30 view corridors for protection in the City of Austin's Land Development Code after an extensive study was completed. State view protection was granted under the Texas Government Code identifying 30 view corridors to be protected, four of which were not identified by the city.\(^38\)

The two jurisdictions have different definitions of view corridors, and many of the corridors have slightly different dimensions or descriptions in their respective documents. Under the two jurisdictions there are 35 protected view corridors established across the city.\(^39\)

Instead of enacting a blanket regulation setting a maximum building height for all development, height restrictions were determined (using a trigonometric formula) and mapped within each of the identified corridors. This calculation takes into account the height (from sea-level) of the viewpoint and the angle of the view to determine the height limit that should be implemented in the corridor. These restrictions limit the types of development permitted within these corridors between the viewpoint and the base of the Capitol’s Dome.\(^40\)

Corridors can range from several miles to 70 metres (229.66 feet) in length, and viewsheds from a width of 15 metres (50 feet) to less than five feet.\(^41\) Although the view corridors are protected, they are not set in stone, and flexibility may be granted when necessary in order to reach community objectives. In the early 2000s, relief was granted in order to revitalize the Mueller Airport and also expand the University of Texas’ Football Stadium.\(^42\) View protection is a very hot topic in Austin and prominent community groups such as Preservation Texas continue to advocate for view protection. As of 2013, three of the protected view corridors were considered “lost”, and three as “endangered” by Preservation Texas.\(^43\)

---

Figure D-14: Austin’s Trigonometric formula used to calculate maximum height limits in view corridors (Austin Downtown Commission, 2007)
Map D-3: Austin’s view corridors towards the State Capitol Building (Austin Downtown Commission, 2007)
D.3.1.1 Lessons Learned

- The City of Austin is facing heavy development pressures and the amount of available land is limited. By re-evaluating view corridors on a regular basis, the city can determine which views should continue to be protected and which views may be of lesser importance or have already been lost. Including the public in this process helps determine which views the public feels strongly connected to. By re-evaluating view corridors, the NCC may decide to eliminate views which have already been lost. This may allow for putting greater time, attention and resources in protecting the highest quality views.

- Austin has a formula for determining the specific maximum height allowance in foreground developments in each view corridor. This is more agreeable with developers as it allows for high-rise development within the city, but it strategically allows for them to take place in areas that do not affect the view corridor. Ottawa and Gatineau may be able to enact similar policies thus strategically allowing development while not obstructing views.

- View protection is a joint effort by both the State of Texas and the City of Austin. Although the provincial government has not become involved with view protection in Canada’s Capital Region, it may be useful for the Ontario and Quebec Governments to step in to implement their own protection policies which can complement existing ones. As views of Parliament contribute to the sense of pride of all Canadians, it may be ideal in advocating for the Government of Ontario and Quebec to recognize these views as provincial interests.

Figure D-15: View of the State Capitol Building from South Congress Avenue. Note the large buildings in the forefront which overwhelm the Capitol (Michael, 2010)
The City of Canberra, located in the Australian Capital Territory, is known internationally as Australia’s planned capital. Designed by the American architect Walter Burley Griffin and Marion Mahony Griffin in 1913, the city is home to the Federal Government and hosts many major governmental, judicial, cultural, scientific, educational, and military institutions and organizations. As an entirely planned city, Canberra had the opportunity to become a national centerpiece from the beginning of construction. A crucial element of the Canberra plan was its axial orientation that used the natural features of the site to situate itself along an axis defined by Mount Ainslie on one end, and Mount Bimberi located 25 kilometres away. This is argued to be the defining feature of the design that ‘monumentalized’ the capital’s future site. As well, a river axis was created along the naturally occurring waterway and transformed into a series of lakes and basins across the city. This established many viewpoints from which to view the urban surroundings. Griffin mimicked the axial corridor found in Washington D.C. to create a similar corridor of important buildings and monuments in an aim to align the city and draw attention to the area. This multi-axial plan formed the Parliamentary Triangle as it is known today, with the city oriented by natural features and important city structures arranged in “accordance with a systematic political symbolism”. The Parliamentary Triangle is anchored by the Parliament House, the Defense Headquarters at Russell, and City Hill, thereby hosting the most important institutions in the city in one area.

The National Capital Authority governs Canberra and the Australian Capital Territory, therefore “Canberra’s role and function as the national capital remains a responsibility of the Australian Government.” The National Capital Authority was established by the Commonwealth to take care of the interests of the capital, and as such they are responsible for matters such as “the pre-eminence of the role of Canberra and the Territory as the centre of national capital functions, and as the symbol of Australian national life and values, and respect for the key elements of the Griffins’ original plan for Canberra.” The National Capital Plan continues to support Canberra as a “city which embodies the Australian spirit, and symbolizes Australian life and achievement.” To complement this, there are many policies in place requiring the preservation of the views of nearby mountains and the Inner Hills because they act as a backdrop when viewing the city. In addition there are policies to protect view corridors in the Parliamentary Zone Precinct, to protect view corridors radiating out from City Hill, to protect views of the National Capital monuments from the Acton Peninsula, as well as to protect views of the cityscape from across Lake Burley Griffin.

These policies are implemented through their inclusion in the ‘Designated Areas’ policy that is given authority by the Australian Capital Territory (Planning and Land Management) Act (1988). Section 10(1) of the act states that “the National Capital Plan may specify...”
areas of land that have the special characteristics of the National Capital to be Designated Areas. Section 10(2)(c) of the Act further states that the Plan may set out detailed conditions of planning, design and development in Designated Areas and the priorities in carrying out such planning, design and development. As well, Section 10(2)(d) of the Act specifies that “the Plan may set out special requirements for the development of any area (not being a Designated Area), being requirements that are desirable in the interests of the National Capital.”

Canberra has been able to maintain strong view corridors to the capitol as a result of modeling current land use planning after the general aims of the initial plan for the city. The continual use of the original plan has led to a strong city identity. Canada’s National Capital Region would benefit greatly from the implementation of policies that reflect the early aims of its city plans and reflect the importance of the national symbols.

Canberra has policies that protect views of neighbouring mountains and hills that are part of the city’s landscape. This is a strong precedent to support the development of policies on the protection of natural features that could be implemented by both Ottawa and Gatineau.

By integrating the city as a symbol of the nation into city planning documents, the whole of Canberra became an important monument that was worth preserving thereby creating a cultural identity that is tied to the national buildings. Through increased public promotion, national symbols in Canada’s National Capital Region can be emphasized as an iconic monument together, and therefore become a stronger piece of our national heritage instead of a divided heritage entity between two cities.

D.3.2.1 LESSONS LEARNED

- Canberra’s Capitol Hill along the land axis across Lake Burley Griffin

(Figure D-17: City of Canberra’s axial plan showing land axis on the upper right corner and five roads that radiate out from Capitol Hill (Source: Burley Griffin, 1914))

Figure D-16: Canberra’s Capitol Hill along the land axis across Lake Burley Griffin (Explore Australia, 2010)
D.3.3 Halifax, Canada

Halifax’s Citadel Hill has played a significant role in Nova Scotia’s history for over 50 years. Citadel Hill helped the British Military defend the city due to its orientation overlooking the Halifax Harbour. A wooden guardhouse was built on the hill for defense which prompted Halifax’s first settlers who constructed their homes at the base of the hill, closer to the water. In addition to its historical significance, Citadel Hill is also a popular tourist attraction hosting 800,000 people annually.

The City of Halifax and Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM) have passed policies regarding protected view planes and height limits to preserve views from Citadel Hill. In 1974, Halifax Council adopted 10 view planes to protect view corridors from specific points on the hill. In 1978, Halifax Council adopted protection policies in the Municipal Planning Strategy to protect views between view planes. If tall buildings and structures were allowed to be built between the narrow ends of protected view planes, it would obstruct the view of the harbour, creating a ‘picket fence’ effect with restrictive views from narrow gaps between tall buildings. The Federal Government, on behalf of Parks Canada, intervened for several development proposals, advocating for protection of views between the ends of view planes. In 1985, Halifax Council, with support from the Government of Canada, adopted more policies to control heights in the vicinity of Citadel Hill, to avoid walling off the view between view planes. Protection policies regarding Citadel Hill have been carried forward in the most recent Halifax Municipal Planning Strategy.

Halifax Land Use By-Law Section 24 states that no building shall be erected, constructed, altered, reconstructed, or located in any zone in the city that may protrude through a protected view plane. Section 70 also legislates that no building or structure which is located in the vicinity of Citadel Hill shall be visible above the Citadel’s ramparts which stand at a height of 27.4 metres (90 feet). Furthermore, Section 77 of the by-law states that if a proposed building is to be constructed under or adjacent to edges of a protected view corridors and view cones.

Figure D-18: This is an aerial view of Halifax displaying Citadel Hill and the city core (Tourism Nova Scotia, 2016)
view plane, then the sides of the proposed structure lying outside but adjacent to an edge of the view plane must not be parallel, unless the edge of the view plane is parallel to the immediate street.\textsuperscript{56}

The Heritage Statement for Nova Scotia defines the Provincial Government’s role to identify, preserve, and protect significant natural and cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{57} The Provincial Government works with the municipality towards preserving heritage and its surrounding regions. Additionally, a Halifax Regional Municipality Committee communicates concerns regarding HRM’s planning policies that may be in conflict with the Province’s Heritage Statement to the Board of the Heritage Trust of Nova Scotia. This committee has been very active in protecting views from Citadel Hill, advocating for the establishment of HRM’s first Heritage Conservation District and has had considerable input in the recent ‘HRMbyDesign’ Plan. Moreover, Save the View (STV) is a coalition of eleven non-partisan groups in Halifax that actively advocates for view corridor protection of Citadel Hill. The group works to raise awareness among the general public regarding smart development and view preservation. Successful preservation of views in Halifax are a result of planning policies and organizations such as, the Halifax Regional Municipality Committee, working in collaboration.\textsuperscript{58}

\section*{D.3.3.1 Lessons Learned}

- Planning policy in Halifax works to protect views between view planes, creating a complete skyline view of Halifax without obstructed views resulting from clusters of tall buildings. Canada’s National Capital Region can also work towards implementing similar policy with local planning organizations in partnership with the National Capital Commission using Halifax as reference.

- Halifax Regional Municipality Committee is a strong advocate in Halifax working to protect view planes as the city continues to evolve. As well, having organizations similar to STV, also plays a vital role in raising awareness around view protection. It would be extremely beneficial to have similar organizations in the National Capital Region under the guidance of the National Capital Commission.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure-D-19}
\caption{The prominence of the clock tower on Citadel Hill stands out on the skyline (Skumar84, 2012)}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{map-D-4}
\caption{This displays view planes that were created by the City of Halifax in 1974 to protect views from Citadel Hill to the Halifax Harbour (Halifax Regional Municipality, 2016)}
\end{figure}
D.3.4 London, England

London, England is world-renowned for its Global City status, its financial influence, and its position as a cultural capital. It is located along the River Thames, and offers incredible views of the river and other iconic buildings throughout the city. Yet, as a result of its longstanding history as the head of the British Empire, the city has gone through unimaginable growth during its lifespan, threatening these views and the character of the city. London has also been the focus of intense pressures that have forced the city to grow and develop ahead of planning regulations and guidelines. As a result, many views across the city have been lost because of improper and rapid development. A key example of this is the construction of the building at 30 St. Mary Axe, commonly known as "The Gherkin", which negatively influences views of the iconic St. Paul's Cathedral (see Figure D.17.2).

Planning in London is a shared responsibility between the Mayor of London, the Corporation of the City of London, and the 32 boroughs in London. This collective planning body established the Greater London Authority through which they can plan the city. The Mayor of London is responsible for producing a spatial development strategy for the city through the Greater London Authority, called the London Plan (2011), and to continually review and renew this plan according to changes in the city and its planning needs. The London Plan acts as a guiding document for the city and requires that neighbourhood plans conform to its policies. Boroughs in London create a Local Development Framework which must reflect the principles and policies that are found in the London Plan. In the London Plan, there are policies that require large and tall buildings to improve or enhance views and the skyline of London. This is done through policies such as: Policy 7.7, which requires that tall buildings should not have an adverse impact on local or strategic views; Policy 7.10 controls development in and around World Heritage Sites including views to them; and, 7.11 and 7.12, which provide authority to the London View Management Framework that protects a number of strategically planned views across the city. The Plan also suggests assessing the impact that buildings will have on their surrounding environment and views of the city. This can be done with assistance from the Mayor who can provide guidance in the development of Local Development Plans as to the appropriate location of tall buildings throughout the city. Yet, despite the ability for the Mayor of London to help control the growth of inappropriate development, there has been an increase in tall buildings that has affected views of the city and skyline across London.

As well, policies in the Plan direct neighbourhood plans to "identify, protect, enhance and improve access to the historic environment and heritage assets and their settings." There are many World Heritage Sites across the city that fall under the jurisdiction of the London Plan including: Maritime Greenwich, Royal

### Location
ENGAGEMENT, UNITED KINGDOM

### Population (2015)
CITY: 8,673,713
METRO: 13,879,757

### Density
CITY: 5,518/km²
METRO: 1,656/km²

### Type of Capital
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL AND GLOBAL CAPITAL

### Age of City
C.43 AD

### Responsible Planning Body
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

### Building Height Limits
N/A

### What Views are Being Protected?
ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL, PALACE OF WESTMINSTER AND TOWER OF LONDON

### Types of Controls
VIEW CORRIDORS AND VIEW CONES

### Landscape
BAROQUE
Botanic Gardens Kew, Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey, including St Margaret’s Church and the Tower of London. These sites are recognized to have outstanding universal value and therefore fall under additional protection through UNESCO’s World Heritage Management Plans, which protect them by the use of a buffer zone. The buffer zone protects the heritage site and the surrounding area from any development that could harm the site or its character.63

Through policies in the London Plan, authority is given to the London View Management Framework as a supplementary guiding document to the continual management and implementation of designated views classified as London panoramas, linear views, river prospects, and townscape views. However, three strategically important landmarks in London have been identified for designated views: St Paul’s Cathedral, the Palace of Westminster and the Tower of London which are also individually supported by World Heritage Management Plans. While this Plan is forward thinking, it is only a guiding document and these protected view lines have not been used to implement policies to protect development from interrupting the character of these areas. Additionally, considerable attention has been paid to encouraging development that will accentuate and add to the dynamic skyline of London in policies throughout the London Plan, which poses risks to views that are considered less significant. As a result, many views have been lost across the city to the development of high-rise buildings that were meant to improve and add to the skyline, and to not harm existing views.64

In comparison, Paris also decided to allow a high-rise tower in their downtown core (Montparnasse) and quickly came to realize that development of this scale would significantly affect views of its skyline. As a result, they have since required development to occur away from the core in La Défense where it’s presence would not have an effect on the city’s skyline. London has also allowed concentrated high rise development away from the downtown core in the Canary Wharf area.

D.3.4.1 LESSONS LEARNED

- London is a strong example of the new development of guiding policies in response to high-rise development disrupting important views around the city. Despite the good intentions of the Mayor of London, the development of a skyline study to identify current and lost views would have been more proactive a few decades earlier. The National Capital Region has the opportunity to be proactive in ensuring important sightlines of national symbols are studied and protected prior to future development pressures.

- The guiding document, London View Management Framework, is a strong document in support of view protection policies across the city. Yet, because it is not being used to implement corresponding policy, its aims are not being achieved. Therefore this document does not have meaningful influence over planning in the city, except on occasions where the Mayor of London considers a view critical to the identity of the city and its history. The creation of a guiding document would be beneficial to the National Capital Region to start developing policy corresponding to the view corridors to protect them from harmful development.

- The National Capital Region could benefit from the London View Management Framework’s consideration of the foreground, middle-ground, and background of each view. Special attention should be paid to all aspects of a view, especially if a lost view can be salvaged by foliage changes in the foreground or middle ground.

Figure D-20: The obstructed view of St. Paul’s Cathedral with the ‘Gherkin’ present in the background (Attractions Map, 2016)
D.3.5 Portland, United States of America

Portland is a Pacific northwest city located in Oregon, USA, situated on the bank of the Willamette River. Originally settled by pioneers in the 1840s, Portland was founded in 1843. In the late 19th century, Portland had a strong commitment to creating greenspaces throughout the city and was famous for its impressive City Park (later renamed Washington Park) which included over 400-acres of greenspace in the heart of the city with spectacular views of Mount Hood to the east and Mount St. Helens to the northeast. The Greater Portland Plan (1912), by Edward Bennett, inspired by the City Beautiful movement, included grand parks and wide boulevards in an attempt to complement spectacular views of the natural features surrounding the city while boosting civic pride.

In 1979, the adoption of the Downtown Plan identified height limits for Portland’s downtown core to preserve view corridors of Mount St. Helens and Mount Hood. Although the mountains are largely considered the most notable scenic views associated with Portland, the city also enacted view protection policies for bridges, buildings, parks, and bodies of water. Additionally, view protection was regularly built into the fabric of many of Portland’s special policy areas including the Willamette Greenway Plan (1979), the Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Study (1983), the Macadam Corridor Plan (1985), and the Central City Plan (1988). In 1981, the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission released a new state-wide planning requirement that required all municipalities “to conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources.” In response, the City of Portland released the Scenic Views, Sites and Drives Inventory in 1989. This 330-page report identified over 300 views nominated (by citizens) for protection, evaluating each on a predetermined set of criteria which included feasibility of protection, visual quality and accessibility, among others. Scoring of each possible scenic resource was completed, and 131 views were placed and ranked in each category: panoramas, mountain views, bridge views, city views, scenic sites, and scenic drives. Many of the 131 views already had full or partial protection from previously enacted state or city legislation.

The Portland Planning Bureau released the Scenic Views, Sites, and Corridors: Scenic Resources Protection Plan (1991) to guide the protection of views identified in the inventory. This plan includes criteria for land acquisition, vegetation management, citizen involvement, revised height limits, updated zoning maps, and the creation of a new Scenic Resource Zone in the downtown. In terms of development, the maximum height limit is calculated on a site-by-site basis and is variable across the city. Portland uses the same trigonometric formula to calculate allowable building height as Austin, Texas. This allows for the City
of Portland to prioritize and protect chosen views across the city (mountains, bridges, etc.) while directing development to other areas. As a further way of controlling development, applications must undergo design review before being approved by the city.\textsuperscript{70}

Portland also has policies which allow for “bonuses” which may increase the maximum height for a development in exchange for a provision that benefits the city and/or the public.\textsuperscript{71} As Portland’s population continues to increase, there have been many calls from developers (and citizens) to lift many of the height limits throughout the city to address housing shortages, but there are citizens also speaking out in favour of protecting and retaining them.\textsuperscript{72}

**D.3.5.1 Lessons Learned**

- Portland’s Scenic Views, Sites, and Corridors: Scenic Resources Protection Plan (1991) places a heavy importance on vegetation management in view corridors throughout the city. The Plan lists permitted species, tree removal & planting requirements, and pruning measures on both public and private lands. This policy aims to guarantee that vegetation complements and does not obstruct views. This could be very valuable lesson for the National Capital Region which has vegetation obstructing many of the views of the national symbols.

- Portland’s Scenic Views, Sites, and Corridors: Scenic Resources Protection Plan (1991) also has provisions for establishing bike and pedestrian routes in areas with important viewpoints or view corridors. This is done to allow for residents to feel pride in their city, while enhancing quality of life and making the city a more aesthetic place to live. When updating active transportation plans, it may be a good practice for the NCC, City of Ottawa and Ville de Gatineau to locate routes along scenic corridors.
Vancouver is located on a peninsula between the Straight of Georgia, the Fraser River and the Burrard Inlet on the west coast of British Columbia. The city has grown to become a Beta Global City, and is widely considered to be one of the world’s most livable cities. As a result of its stunning location on the Pacific Ocean and proximity to the North Shore Mountains, Vancouver has developed a unique skyline and caters views and backdrops to both the shoreline and the mountains. These views have become synonymous with the city’s “connection to nature.” As a result, the maintenance and preservation of the views has become a crucial part of the City of Vancouver’s planning objectives.

Due to the scarcity of available land in the downtown core, high-rise buildings have become an inevitable part of the city’s landscape. To help mitigate the adverse effects that high-rise development can have on the city’s skyline, Vancouver conducted two studies regarding the public’s vision for the city’s future in 1978 and 1979. These reports identified a top priority for the preservation of views of the shoreline, the downtown skyline, and the North Shore Mountains. Following these studies, development pressures in the 1980’s began to threaten skylines across the city and without intervention from the city, these views would have been lost. In 1989 the Vancouver View Study was conducted. This resulted in the creation of View Protection Guidelines (2011) identifying 26 view corridors across the city protecting the mountains, the downtown skyline, and False Creek from a number of different viewpoints. The goal of this set of guidelines is to encourage the development and design of high-rise buildings in places around the city that will not affect view corridors, while still supporting large-scale development. This is done through the use of angular planes which assess the height of proposed buildings to determine whether or not they will puncture a view cone. After a review of the guidelines in 2011, which included public consultations, leading to the identification of additional views. The guidelines were adopted by City Council and resulted in a total of 36 protected view cones in Vancouver.

Two additional studies have been commissioned by the City of Vancouver: The Heritage Area Height Review (2011) and The Higher Building Review (2013). The purpose of these studies was to determine the ability of the city to allow taller high-rise development in areas outside of view corridors without affecting protected views. One adjustment to the View Protection Guidelines that came about in 2016 is the potential development of “benefit capacity” as a planning tool. This tool allows a developer to increase the density of their building, obstructing a view corridor if they agree to provide public benefits in exchange. The City of Vancouver would then be responsible for adjusting the respective view corridor to allow for the new development. Benefit capacity was developed after the View Protection Guidelines were in place as a tool to get around the current view cones and to allow more development to occur in the downtown. This would allow the City of Vancouver to protect important views and make room for new high-rise development.
at the same time. To explore the foreseeable potential of benefit capacity, a study has been requested by City Council to determine the long term development potential of this tool and the effects it may have on view corridors around the city.\textsuperscript{75}

Figure D-24: Vancouver skyline, showing views to both the water and the mountains in the distance (Shah, 2013)
View Location Map 2 (Outlying Areas)

OUTLYING AREA VIEW CONES

3.1 Queen Elizabeth Park to Downtown (Revised, Council report 1990 12 11)

3.2 Queen Elizabeth Park to the North Shore (this View is composed of four sub-sections) (Revised, Council report 1990 12 11)

9.1 Cambie St. at 10th/11th to the North Shore (Revised, Council report 1990 12 11)

9.2 Cambie St. at 10th/11th to the North Shore

20 Granville at Broadway to the Capilano Valley

21 Commercial Dr. at 15th to Crown/Grouse

22 Main St. at 6th to the North Shore

27 Trout lake to Crown/Grouse

F1 Choklit Park to Grouse & Mount Fromme

This map shows the locations of View Cones from outlying areas. For View Cones from False Creek shoreline and bridges refer to View Location Map 1. Refer also to area specific policies, regulations and guidelines which council has adopted that may apply to the protection of other views.

VIEW PROTECTION GUIDELINES
Reduced View Location Map 2
City of Vancouver

Date: 2011-02-10
Scale: NTS

Map D-5: City of Vancouver View Protection Guidelines showing all 36 view corridors (City of Vancouver, 2016)
D.3.5.1 Lessons Learned

- Before high-rise development became problematic for their skyline, Vancouver was considered a leader in view protection through the creation of the View Protection Guidelines that started with the View Control Study in 1989. The National Capital Region still has the opportunity to implement a view protection guideline of the same scale as Vancouver to prevent any more development that does not suit the background of the capital’s skyline.

- Public support and public perception of views of Vancouver’s skyline, mountains, and shoreline plays a large part in the adherence of developers to the View Protection Guidelines. The use of a survey to gauge the public’s opinions of the National Capital Region’s skyline could prove to be a strong resource to support the protection of views across the region.

Figure D-25: This figure illustrates the proposed skyline that was chosen by council with heavy influence from the public, including two Landmark towers standing at 600 metres (1969 feet) (City of Vancouver, 1997)
Along the Central Belt of Scotland, on the Firth of Forth’s southern shore, is the capital city of Edinburgh. Edinburgh is located on top of a landscape that was formed by early volcanic activity, resulting in a rocky and hilly landscape. The natural advantages of a large rock formation - now called Castle Hill - provided opportunities for fortification. Many of the buildings and monuments found here have created a distinguishing picturesque landscape that has defined Edinburgh’s iconic skyline.76

In order to maintain the character of this historic city, the City of Edinburgh Council adopted the Edinburgh City Local Plan 2010 which is the current land use plan for the urban area of the city. This Plan manages the whole city with the exception of the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh which was identified as a World Heritage Site in 1995. This specific area is under the protection of The Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site Management Plan 2011-2016. This area includes important local, national, and international historical buildings, and therefore requires different protections than the rest of Edinburgh. Monuments such as Edinburgh Castle, the contrast between the medieval Old Town and the planned Georgian New Town, the iconic skyline, and the views and panoramas this creates, defines the importance of this part of the city making it the focus of view protection. The Scottish Parliament Building, housing the seat of government in the country, is also located in the heritage district. Through the Edinburgh City Local Plan and a Skyline Study guidance document, additional key views across the city outside of the heritage district have been defined with the hopes of protecting them through local planning controls. By controlling tall building development in this surrounding area, the city plans to protect the silhouette of the Heritage Site and views of the city from the site.77

The landscape of the city includes views “available from many vantage points, within the city and beyond, of landmark buildings, the city’s historic skyline, undeveloped hillsides within the urban area, and the hills, open countryside and the Firth of Forth.”78 Many of these key views are across the World Heritage Site and the historic buildings found here. Therefore, the pressure and scale of new urban development around the city could be a serious problem for the preservation of key views. To address this concern, a Skyline Study was conducted to analyze and understand key views around the city to and from the Old and New Towns of the Edinburgh World Heritage Site. The City of Edinburgh Council used the study’s findings and the agreeing public opinions on view protection to develop a defined buffer zone around the Heritage Site in order to protect the sites outstanding universal value and to add to protections already in place by the City of Edinburgh for the skyline. As a result, the Heritage Management Plan is in charge of monitoring the resulting skyline policy and ensuring its continuation as well as reviewing the need for a buffer zone around the site as added protection. City Council has also created policies that require new development to “respond to
and reinforce the distinctive patterns of development, townscape, views, landscape, scale, materials and quality of the World Heritage Site in its proximity. These new policy developments on view protection have resulted in advancing thinking about best practices to protect heritage sites from surrounding development and the use of buffer zones as a method of protection.

### D.4.1.1 Lessons Learned

- Edinburgh has developed a strong identity that is tied to its world-renowned skyline. A consultation session was held to determine the opinion of local stakeholders on the importance of view protection in Edinburgh. The findings from the consultation session matched the academic findings of the Skyline Study that was conducted, indicating that there was a strong need for view protection in the city that was also supported by its citizens. Conducting a Skyline Study in a similar manner to Edinburgh would greatly benefit the National Capital Region and this could be used to present view protection options to the City of Ottawa and Ville de Gatineau that are supported by the public.

- The development of a buffer zone has proven effective to protect and control high-rise development that could harm the skyline and views to and from the Old and New Towns of the Edinburgh World Heritage Site. Yet, the City of Edinburgh Council has responded to this requirement by UNESCO with increased protections of the Heritage Site’s skyline through their own local policies. The National Capital Region could choose to seek out a heritage designation for all of the national monuments in the region and move to protect the area with local policies from both municipalities that are not as restricting as those handed down by UNESCO.
D.4.2 Kingston, Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Kingston, Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density (people per km²)</td>
<td>City: 273/km² Metro: 82/km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Capital</td>
<td>Former Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of City</td>
<td>1673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Planning Body</th>
<th>Kingston Planning &amp; Building Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height Limits</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What views are being protected?</td>
<td>City Hall, Water, Historic Defense Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Controls</td>
<td>Alternative / Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nicknamed the “Limestone City,” Kingston served as Canada’s first capital from 1841 until 1844. Situated on Lake Ontario, at the confluence of the St. Lawrence and Cataraqui Rivers, Kingston’s location made it invaluable as a major military centre throughout the first half of the 19th century. In 1784, the area known as Cataraqui was first surveyed as a town site, following the gridiron pattern popularly used at the time. The original town plan included provisions for a market square – which would be built and serve as an important community space from 1801 onward.

Kingston’s City Hall, designed by architect George Browne, would be built behind the square in 1844 and would serve as one of Kingston’s most prominent landmarks into the 21st Century.

The City of Kingston has enacted many policies aimed at preserving the esthetic and cultural heritage of the city, especially its historic downtown. View and skyline protection policies were first created in 1960 when Stephenson and Muirhead released A Planning Study, Kingston, Ontario. This study aimed to reinvent/redevelop the Kingston downtown area, preserving its historic character and ensuring the prominence of the civic and institutional buildings on the city’s skyline. This study heavily influenced development around the downtown and waterfront for over two decades.

In addition, the City of Kingston’s Springer Market Square Heritage Conservation District Plan (1985), updated in 2013, sets strict design and development policies within the Market Square Heritage Conservation District, of which City Hall is located within. This document is accompanied by view protection policies enacted via the City of Kingston’s Official Plan (2010). View protection policies are
New Tools for View Controls in Canada’s Capital │ Nouveaux outils pour la protection des vues dans la région de la capitale du Canada

Appendix D: Precedents

outlined in the Downtown and Harbour Special Policy Area (Schedule DH-4) of the Official Plan. In the plan, eight viewpoints have been identified for protection with all view planes terminating at the cupula of City Hall.87 There were previously 11 viewpoints, however, the Downtown Harbour Area Architectural Guidelines Study by Baird Sampson Neuert Architects recommended that three viewpoints in the background of City Hall be removed as allowable development would obstruct the view.88 The eight remaining views are protected through height limit policies that are enforced directly behind City Hall, with the maximum height increasing as a person moves away from the building. Directly behind City Hall, in the Market Square Heritage District, the maximum height must not exceed the tallest building in the block (the building must also be contained in the district). At present, there is no building in this district standing taller than City Hall. Flanking City Hall to the north and northwest, the Lower Princess Street Heritage Area, and to the southwest, parts of the Old Sydenham Heritage Area has a lower height limit, increasing as a person moves further away from City Hall.89

Along with protections offered to City Hall, additional views are identified in Schedule 9 of the Official Plan - Heritage Areas, Features and Protected Views which identifies over 30 viewpoints in the downtown area with view corridors that terminate at the water’s edge. These views include sightlines of Barriefield Village, the four Martello towers, Fort Henry, Fort Frederick, and water bodies such as the Kingston Inner Harbour and Lake Ontario. Policies regarding development adjacent to these protected views are found in Section 8.6, which do not permit development that would obstruct sightlines (including adjacent buildings and/or structures). In addition, development of facilities or structures that would complement the view and/or make it more popular and enjoyable for visitors are encouraged. For National Historic Sites such as the Martello Towers, Fort Henry, Fort Frontenac, and the Rideau Canal (a UNESCO World Heritage Site), Visual Impact Studies are required before any adjacent development can take place.90

Figure D-28: Kingston City Hall at night. Note the background development obscures the prominence of City Hall on the Kingston skyline (Howells, 2013)
Although Kingston does have many view protection policies, implementation has continued to be an issue. Over the past three decades, there has been many high-rise hotels, condominiums, and apartment buildings erected just south and southwest of City Hall. This has negatively affected Kingston’s skyline which was once dominated by civic and institutional landmarks - is now overwhelmed by private development. The Downtown Harbour Area Architectural Guidelines Study warns that while views of the cupula may be protected, they are not strong enough to continue to ensure the importance of City Hall in Kingston’s future skyline. If development in the area were to follow maximum height limits, the prominent skyline feature could still be lost. To combat this, the study recommends that Kingston designate the skyline area as a “Cultural Landscape” and would thus be well protected under Part IV of the Heritage Act (1990). The City, to this day, is still facing heavy development pressure regarding high-rise development in its downtown.

**D.4.2.1 Lessons Learned**

- By including City Hall as part of the Market Square Heritage Conservation District, new developments are required to adhere to height limits included in the zoning by-law, and to maintain the character of the district. This influences allowable development in the Market Square Heritage District to protect the immediate surroundings of City Hall and preserving its historical feel and context.

- Prior to development, developers are charged with completion of a Visual Impact Study. This allows the city to determine if any views will be negatively affected before development gets approved and can proceed. Requiring a Visual Impact Study for developments in close proximity to the national symbols, may be a good tool to use by the NCC, Ottawa and/or Gatineau. This requirement can still foster development by allowing for developers and designers to find innovative ways to make their project or building complement the national symbols while not obstructing views.

Map D-7: This map shows view planes terminating at the cupula of City Hall (City of Kingston, 2010)
Top: Figure D-29: View of Kingston Waterfront from Point Frederick in 1960 (Stephenson & Muirhead, 1960)
Bottom: Figure D-30: A Sketch of the proposed development of the Kingston waterfront from *A Planning Study, Kingston, Ontario* (1960). The vision emphasized the civic and institutional buildings on the skyline, emphasized use of the harbour by boaters, and also included large amounts of pedestrian space (Stephenson & Muirhead, 1960)
D4.3 Oxford, England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>POPULATION (2014)</th>
<th>DENSITY (PEOPLE PER KM²)</th>
<th>TYPE OF CAPITAL</th>
<th>AGE OF CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England, United Kingdom</td>
<td>City: 171,380</td>
<td>City: 3,270/KM²</td>
<td>Cultural / Educational</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PLANNING BODY</th>
<th>BUILDING HEIGHT LIMITS</th>
<th>WHAT VIEWS ARE BEING PROTECTED?</th>
<th>TYPES OF CONTROLS</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford City Council</td>
<td>No development exceeding 18.28m (60ft) within a 1,200m (3937ft) radius of Carfax Tower</td>
<td>10 protected view points</td>
<td>Alternative / Hybrid</td>
<td>Picturesque</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oxford showcases a unique architectural history that spans nearly 1000 years. The medley of diverse buildings comes together to form the city’s core townscape and skyline consisting of domes, spires and towers. Oxford’s unique character is also shaped by its physical environment. The River Thames and River Cherwell flow into the west and east of the city centre respectively, and the city’s historic core was established where the rivers meet. The earliest published views of Oxford date from the 16th and 17th centuries that also include the skyline from various vantage points from surrounding cities. The Oxford Almanac, an annual broadsheet academic calendar, played a crucial role in documenting views of the Oxford skyline since 1674. By the early 1960s, local officials realized that the views of Oxford could be negatively influenced by development within the city and its surrounding rural setting. These observations led to the establishment of high buildings and view cone policies, which have been implemented in the City of Oxford for over fifty years. The Oxford City Council’s City Architect and Planning Officer’s Report of 1962 highlighted six points spread evenly around the perimeter of the city that provided multiple views of the Oxford skyline. View corridors were drawn from these points to the center of the city with each view focusing on distinct historic buildings. The report recommended that the areas within the view cones were unsuitable for tall building construction. Principles from this report formed the foundation of subsequent planning documents in Oxford, and remain largely unchanged today, with the exception of an addition of four new view planes. The additional view planes were introduced by the Oxford Local Plan in 1986 and were formally adopted in the Local Plan for 1991-2001. Protected view corridors identified by the Oxford Local Plan are located both within the city’s boundaries and its perimeters. The Oxford Local Plan clearly states under Section HE.9 and HE.10 that permission will not be granted for buildings and structures proposed within or close to the areas that are of special importance for the preservation of views of Oxford, or buildings that are of a height that would compromise these views. Additional view protection of Oxford’s skyline can be found in the Oxford Core Strategy 2026 and the West End Area Action Plan 2007 – 2016. Both plans work to supplement policies mandated by the Oxford Local Plan acknowledging the need to preserve the skyline’s character as the city plans for new development. The historic high buildings that are protected by Oxford’s view corridors and define the city’s skyline are statutory listed buildings protected under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The historic core of Oxford and the majority of its northern and eastern suburbs are designated conservation areas under the same Act. Under Section 72 of the Act, local planning authorities must pay extra caution to preserving and enhancing the character of conservation areas as part of their judicial responsibility. These designations as defined by the Planning Act work to further protect the character of
the area as the city continues to evolve. Lastly, view protection policy is also written into the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) of 2012. Policies set forth by the NPPF must be taken into account in all planning decisions and supported by the local and neighbourhood plans in England. The NPPF reinforces the government’s overarching aim to preserve its national historic environment and its heritage assets for current and future generations.

D.4.3.1 LESSONS LEARNED

- Oxford City Council works with several organizations such as, the Oxford Preservation Trust, Historic England and other planning professionals to produce collaborative studies on view protection. These studies help raise professional and public awareness regarding the significance of view protection in the city. The National Capital Commission can work towards setting up similar partnerships in the future to produce reports that will help raise awareness around stronger view protection policies in the National Capital Region.

- The City of Oxford has been very successful in protecting its skyline and city views based on multiple planning legislations from surrounding cities and varying judicial levels that work in unison to protect and enhance views. The National Capital Commission can take guidance for recommendations to present local planning bodies in the National Capital Region, using policies that are currently implemented to preserve Oxford’s skyline.

Figure D-31: The view of St. Mary’s Tower highlighting the towers and spires visible across Oxford (Aishimsa, 2013)

Figure D-32: View from Carfax Tower looking out towards the City of Oxford. Note the uniform building height around the tower (FreeCityGuides, 2016)
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Context of the view - how does the location of the viewing place affect the experience of the heritage assessment as a whole?

- From what direction is the heritage asset seen and how does this affect what is most prominent?
- Is it seen from close up or far away and how will this affect what is appreciated about it?

Layout, expanse and framing of the view—Does this absence of framing provide majestic sweeping vista or does framing trees, buildings, etc. create a channeled view that emphasizes a focal feature or other feature of interest? How are the features in the view distributed and how does this affect the way the eye moves around the view?

- How broad is the arch of the view (e.g. narrow and focused or broad and expansive)?
- Does this apply to all it or just a part (e.g. broad foreground with trees framing a narrow, middle group)?
- How far can you see? Is this a short view in which all features are clearly discernible or is a long view or is it a long view in which features in the distance recede into an obscure horizon?
- What are the characteristics of the foreground, mid-ground and background and how do these vary?
- Where are the focal features of the landscape?
- How open is the landscape? Does it balance or contract with the openness of the landscape?
- What provides framing if there is any?
Topography - how does the elevation of the viewing place or other elements in the landscape affect the character or the view?

- Does the eye naturally travel down a hillside to focus on whatever is in the valley below?
- How does the elevation influence the relative dominance of the foreground, middle ground, background and skyscape?
- Does the elevation provide an expansive foreground or is this foreshortened by a steep slope that makes the middle and background more dominant in the view?
- Does a low level viewing point make the skyscape more dominant and leave areas of the middle ground and background hidden from view?
- Does a feature on a hilltop or raised area in the landscape appear more prominent than other features?
- How does the influence of elevation vary across the viewing place?

Green Characteristics - how do the buildings contribute to the character of the view?

- What are the different characteristics of the contribution of greenery to the foreground, middle and background?
- How does the greenery contribute to the transitions between areas?
- What contributions does this make to the aesthetic value of these areas in the view or parts of them?
- Does the greenery represent formal planning that is intended to have an aesthetic impact in the view, or is it representative of an historic experience of the view and connection with the past viewers?
- How does the greenery influence appreciation of focal features in the view?
- Does any area of the greenery make a particular contribution to the identity of a community—such as trees in a historic park or parish graveyard?
Architectural characteristics - how do buildings contribute to the character of the view?

- Which individual buildings, areas or groupings of buildings can be identified in the view?
- How do the materials, heights, shapes, densities and alignments of buildings influence their aesthetic contribution to the view?
- What features do different groups of buildings have that provide evidence of different periods of development, different uses, or other influences that mean they contribute to the aesthetic or historical value of the view differently?
- Are any of the buildings particularly prominent and does this contribute to the aesthetic or historical value of the view?
- Are there any gaps between areas of buildings that contribute to their historical or aesthetic value? For example, by allowing them to stand apart or by illustrating their separate development?
- Do any areas of architectural character contribute to the identity of a particular community?

Focal features - what provides the focus of a view, how does it do this and how does it contribute to the historical and aesthetic value of the view?

- Is there a focal feature or several?
- Is its/their focal role in views an intentional feature of their historical design or by accident?
- Is it spread out across the view or confined to a narrow part of it?
- If several features are clustered together, how does their juxtaposition affect their aesthetic and historical value—are they designed to compete with each other or to contribute to a unified design?
- What in the surrounding landscape contributes to its/their prominence? E.g. Does the absence of other competing features make them more prominent or does the presence of a feature in the background or foreground draw attention to them?
- Are these features that contribute to the identity of one or a number of communities by memorializing their origins or history representing activities?
Infrastructure - how do features that run across the landscape, contribute to its structure or lead the eye around the view, contribute to its historical and aesthetic value?

- Examples to consider might include roads, rivers, canals, or railway lines. These represent specific features that have influenced the development of the landscape and have had specific uses in the past. They may have particular historical and aesthetic associations relating to their development and function.

Skyscape, light and the seasons - how do diurnal and seasonal changes in light influence the character of a view? What features of the landscape are likely to change in predictable fashion? What conditions are recognized as the best to view it?

- How does the extent of the skyscape contribute to the quality of the view? Is it constrained by the surrounding features such as trees that frame views and contribute to a formal parkland setting or is it the openness and lack of framing part of a wider rural character that is part of the picturesque quality of the view?

- How does this affect your appreciation of features in the view? E.g. by casting shadows, highlight or illuminating particular features strongly to change in sunlight and could cover?

- What seasonal changes in foliage affect what is visible, including architectural characteristics and focal features?

- Are there any other changes, such as seasonal flooding that are expected to influence the character of a view?
Unique Features - is there anything unique in the view not covered by the questions above that contributes to its ability to provide a connection with past people and events, that could reveal more about past human activity and experience, that contributes to its aesthetic impact of identity or cohesiveness of communities?

Detractors—how does features perceived as incongruous or unattractive detract from its heritage value?

- Do they hide features that are considered to make a positive contribution to the heritage asset's significance? This includes its aesthetic value but might also include historical, evidential and communal values.
- Do they draw the eye away from the features that make a positive contribution to the heritage asset's value by being more prominent?
- Do they significantly alter the characteristics of an area within a view that was appreciated the past for making a particularly positive contribution to the view’s historical or aesthetic value?

Table taken from the City of Oxford’s methodology of assessing views *(The Assessment of the Oxford View Cones—Draft Report, 2014)*
APPENDIX F: WORKSHOP
WHAT WE HEARD

On October 28, 2016, a workshop was held at Queen’s School of Urban and Regional Planning in Kingston, Ontario. Stakeholders, interested parties, and SURP students were invited to participate. The project team requested feedback on existing viewpoints and on precedent case studies that the attendees found interesting and thought should be further researched.

The following is a summary of comments that participants communicated during the workshop:

VIEWPOINTS

- Viewpoints from Victoria Island would look quite nice during the evening hours
- A variety of viewpoints are seasonal; for instance viewpoint 20
- The most interesting views are the dynamic ones
- Viewpoints can be impacted by traffic (i.e. along Alexander Bridge and Nicolas Street)
- Place de Ville ruins views
- Viewpoint that perform a visual striptease are among the most exciting and dynamic views
- Street lighting takes away from views, such as at viewpoint 2

PRECEDESNTS

HALIFAX
- Canadian City
- Similar structure to what is being protected; however they are not under the same development pressure that is occurring in the National Capital Region
- Halifax uses different types of view controls that would be interesting to look out

VANCOUVER
- Canadian City
- A lot of development pressures in Vancouver, which is similar to the National Capital Region
- What they are protecting is different from Ottawa, but would be interesting to see whether they are successful or not

OXFORD
- European City
- Comparable to Ottawa context due to topography.
- Interesting approach with buffer zones and view cone tools
- They are not only protecting one building, so it would be interesting to see whether Oxford’s implementation tools could be incorporated in National Capital Region
- Interesting case study due to UNESCO working with the municipal policies as well
- Oxford is picturesque, so it has similar form to Ottawa in that context

MONTREAL
- Canadian City
- Stood out for its natural features, which can be similar to the natural escarpment in Ottawa
- Their public engagement tools could be looked at to see if they can be incorporated into the National Capital Region

PORTLAND
- American City
- Created a scenic views plan where they had strategies for vegetation management
- Public engagement for Portland should be looked into further
- Portland includes the mountains in the protection policies; would be interesting to compare to the natural escarpment of Ottawa

GUELPH
- Canadian City
- Guelph established an incremental height limit where further away from the Church of Our Lady Immaculate, six storeys were permissible. The closer you went to the main church downtown, the lower the allowed height limits were
Following the project team’s final presentation in Ottawa, ON, on December 7, 2016, a question and answer period was held to discuss various aspects of the presentation with project stakeholders and industry professionals. The following is a list of questions and comments received, and the answers provided by the project team. It is important to note that no recording device was used. Instead, questions and comments were manually written down with pen and paper, and may not be verbatim of the original questions and answers.

Q: Your comment was that PSPC shouldn’t lease buildings in viewsheds... is that what you are inferring? PSPC leases space in buildings that are respectful of local plans. It is the responsibility of the cities. I do not believe this is an appropriate statement. Why put the onus on Public Works to do view protection? This falls under the cities to make that judgement, not us - if they meet the zoning requirements of the city.

A: Thank you for your comment. The project team recommends that PSPC enhance their ‘Good Neighbour Policy’ to include a provision that considers the NCC’s view control policy when delivering their Real Property Program in the National Capital Region. A recent example of PSPC being a pioneer in evoking positive change occurred when they required buildings be LEED GOLD Certified in order for the federal government to lease commercial office space within them. This change in requirements motivated landlords to improve the environmental performance of their buildings by meeting the LEED GOLD standards.

Comment from another audience member on the topic: Before Public Works argues too strong against its capital role, a while ago there was an agreement on the Gatineau side, an agreement implemented with NCC & Public Works – that leasing would obey the height limits. It is the responsibility of the NCC and Ottawa and Gatineau and of the Federal Government on behalf of the whole population. This has become very serious, we have a record of looking after our symbols and national symbols as does Washington, Canberra, and Paris. We should welcome at least as part of this, this should suggest a conversation. This doesn’t just come down to Good neighbour, it comes down to respect. We should respect and celebrate Public Works. The responsibility is on us, with the NCC, as part of a discussion within a federal family.

Comment from another audience member on the topic: It is easier for future buildings. There was a document released by Ottawa setting guidelines on how to build in their downtown. I don’t recall Public Works and Ottawa discussed this issue then. This is an area we could work on with the city to benefit the capital.
Q: When you were out and about looking at viewpoints, were there any others that you believe should be protected or chosen as viewpoints? What about the Gatineau Hills?

A: When we were doing our fieldwork, our primary concern was finding the mapped viewpoints and figuring out where to take the pictures. At the time of our visit, I don’t believe we discussed other locations we though deserved protection; that was beyond the scope of our work that day as we had difficulty finding the existing viewpoints. There were a few points in Gatineau, however, where the group didn’t understand the purpose of the viewpoints, and thought they didn’t offer good views of national symbols. Consulting the public more greatly to re-evaluate existing and new viewpoints is one of our team’s recommendations. The public has the best idea of places within Ottawa and Gatineau that provide good views, and should be included in view protection so their input can be integrated with policy.

Q: I am very intrigued by the part of public engagement. In your research, did you come across any really good examples regarding public engagement?

A: Halifax was a city examined for the best practices section of our report. Halifax is an especially relevant case to this project because it shares a similar geography with the National Capital Region; the views needing re-evaluation in their case were from across the Halifax Harbour, similar to the views of Parliament from Gatineau across the Ottawa River. The public was invited to an open house and asked to rank proposed viewpoints in order of preference, and select elements of each view to determine what made it special. From this process, Halifax also removed a viewpoint that was on a golf course that was on privately owned land. This was a very effective method of public consultation for Halifax; it helped to improve view planes and eased development strains, and we feel such public consultation could be equally successful here.

A: Vancouver had many great examples of public participation that included multiple rounds of public consultation, including activities to see if they should add or change any viewpoints. Through this process, two new viewpoints were added from Olympic village and all of the other viewpoints were solidified.
Q: The elements of things that we need to think about in the future, you mention Picturesque – Picturesque is about oblique views, it is about what you are going to see next – like meandering a forest. In contrast, we are very Beaux Arts at the Centre block – the lawn is beaux art. How do we reintegrate this concept? Look at the view from Mackenzie Bridge, we see an oblique of the East Block- what do you propose?

A: I’m happy you brought this up. It was either Lawrence Vale or an author, I think it was Sonne, that discussed how Ottawa and Gatineau had successfully combined these two seemingly contradictory approaches. As for how to approach this, it is something I have been thinking about. One thing that I think could be tried, is to approach views as a series, you know, 14a, 14b, 14c, 14d and have a measurement for the view along that route. The idea is that it’s okay to allow for some obstruction up to the big reveal at the last point in the sequence, that you want to be an A.

Beyond that, well, I was kind of hoping that all of you would have a better answer for me.

Comment from another audience member on the topic: This is not two contradictory topics. This is what makes this place so unique. The part of the “pop” of what makes it good. The 1993 study included view sequences. And we narrowed it down to the viewpoints. We did this because we knew that protecting certain viewpoints would also protect all of the dynamic views around the boulevard. The way you move around them and the relationship between them – it is picturesque. The west blocks and the towers are beaux arts.

Q: As a developer, the first thing that comes to thought when proposing a new building is not view control protection. Have you thought of how this is going to be put into the zoning? How do you put this into real law, where a developer will think of view control earlier on in the process?

A: The project team reviewed the City of Ottawa’s Zoning By-law and identified it as strong support for view control policies; therefore, even if view control policies does not come to a developers mind when proposing a new building, it is being considered through the height limits in the zoning by-law. However, as view protection of the national symbols is very important, the NCC, City of Ottawa and Ville de Gatineau could incorporate a publicly accessible tool, such as layering KML files on top of Google Earth, to demonstrate where the view cones are located and what height of a building is allowable before interrupting the view cones.
Q: In any of the case studies- did you come across any that look at what happens to the views at night, anything that could change our perspective on lighting?

A: Unfortunately, lighting and ‘night views’ were not within the scope of this project.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

COMMENT: I really enjoyed the part of your recommendation about Public Engagement.

COMMENT: As a Former SURPer, congratulations. The graphics were great, this was an interesting topic, well done.

COMMENT: I agree, that was an excellent presentation. A few things: the other cities that have been studied through view protection. Ottawa is in a bubble. It is nice to see 41 other cities around the work with view protection and many of them not capitals. The NCC gets a bad rap, but there are many other cities that are not capitals who believe view protection is fantastic. View protection is good not only for the NCC, but the population as a whole, but it may ruffle a few feathers.

COMMENT: It is challenging for the NCC to effectively garner public opinion and input from Canadians. These symbols and views are owned by all Canadians not just the cities. The Cities face their own issues, they are trying to build their cities, they want to generate revenue, but these views belong to all Canadians, how do you effectively engage Canadians? These images that you see are breathtaking and we take them for granted here in Ottawa.

COMMENT: You talk about expanding the definitions to include the river and the two shores and opened the door for this, this uniqueness of the Capital Region! The landscapes, foreground, and background on both sides of the Ottawa river, this information that is being offered to us, we have a good amount of work to do.
APPENDIX H: ETHICS
H.1: LETTER OF INFORMATION—SURP 824: NEW TOOLS FOR VIEW CONTROLS IN CANADA’S CAPITAL

This research is being conducted by Natalie Pulcine, Emilie Coyle, Aidan J. Kennedy, Paul Bell, Olivia Fortenbacher, Jonathan Byrd, Caitlin Carmichael, Sarah Cranston, Rabiya Adhia, Lesley Mushet, and Henna Hovi, herein referred to as the Project Team, under the supervision of Dr. David Gordon, in the School of Urban and Regional Planning, part of the Department of Geography and Planning at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario.

This study has been granted clearance by the General Research Ethics Board according to Canadian research ethics’ principles (http://www.ethics.gc.ca/default.aspx) and Queen's University policies (http://www.queensu.ca/urs/research-ethics).

What is this study about? The purpose of this research is to research tools for the National Capital Commission’s Planning Branch to improve its planning tools to control iconic views of its national symbols. Most capital city plans have controls to ensure that views of nationally-important symbols are protected, and Canada’s capital has had view controls for over a century. The Project Team, will be researching techniques used for view controls in other capitals and selected North American cities that might be useful precedents for Canada’s capital. This is a workshop course intended to give students experience in preparing a plan under conditions that simulate professional practice. The study will require one to two visits, of about an hour to two hours in length.

Are there any risks in this study? There are no known physical, psychological, economic, or social risks associated with this study.

Is my participation voluntary? Yes. Although it be would be greatly appreciated if you would answer all material as frankly as possible, you should not feel obliged to answer any material that you find objectionable or that makes you feel uncomfortable. You may also withdraw at any time without consequence. You may choose to refrain from answering a particular question, or may also request to be completely withdrawn from the study.

What will happen to my responses? Your answers will be kept confidential. Only experimenters will have access to this information. Interview recordings will be kept on a personal computer with password protection, and any notes taken of the interview will also be kept in a locked office. Furthermore, any hard copies such as notes will be destroyed upon completion of the research.
**What if I have any questions or concerns?** Any questions about study participation may be directed to the Natalie Pulcine at natalie.pulcine@queensu.ca or 613-302-8022, Emilie Coyle at 13emc3@queensu.ca or 613-449-2802, or Dr. David Gordon at 613-533-6000 ext. 77063 or david.gordon@queensu.ca. If you have any ethical concerns or complaints, you may contact the Chair of the Queen’s University General Research Ethics Board at 1-844-535-2988 or chair.GREB@queensu.ca.

Again, thank you. Your interest in participating in this research study is greatly appreciated.

**Written Consent**

By signing below, I am verifying that: I have read the Letter of Information and had it explained to me. I am aware that I can withdraw my participation in this study at any time and may request any information collected about me be removed. I know my personal information will be kept confidential, and that this information will not be released without my permission. I know who I should contact regarding questions about this research or if I should have any ethical concerns about my participation or how the research was conducted.

Participant’s Name __________________________ Date____________________

________________________________________
Signature of Participant

________________________________________
Confirmation by Student Researcher

< My initials below indicate whether I am willing to have my picture/image shown in presentations>

<I am a) NOT willing ____ b) willing ____to have my image shown in a presentation>
1.2. CONSENT FORM—SURP 824: NEW TOOLS FOR VIEW CONTROLS IN CANADA’S CAPITAL WORKSHOP

Name (please print clearly): ________________________________________

I understand that I will be participating in an interview for the SURP 824 project ‘New Tools for View Controls in Canada’s Capital’.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time. I understand that every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of the data now and in the future. Only team members and supervisor(s) in this research project will have access to the data. The data will be kept in a locked office. The data may also be published in professional journals or presented at scientific conferences, but any such presentations will be of general findings and will never breach individual confidentiality. All data containing personal identifiable information will be destroyed upon completion of the project. Should you be interested, you are entitled to a copy of the findings and can obtain one from the Queen’s School of Urban and Regional Planning.

I am aware that if I have any questions about study participation they may be directed to Natalie Pulcine at natalie.pulcine@queensu.ca or 613-302-8022, and/or to Emilie Coyle at 13emc3@queensu.ca or 613-449-2802, and/or to Dr. David Gordon at 613-533-6000 ext. 77063 or david.gordon@queensu.ca. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or 1-844-535-2988.

I have read the above statements and freely consent to participate in this research:

Signature: ________________________________   Date: ________________________
I.3 INTERVIEW SCRIPT

Interview Script

First of all, thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. I really appreciate you taking the time out of your schedule to speak with me. To remind you of our project, the NCC has tasked us, a group of Master's student from Queen's University's School of Urban and Regional Planning, to produce a final best-practice precedent catalogue that will demonstrate our research on the techniques used for view controls in other capitals and selected North American cities that may be useful precedents for Canada's capital. In the end, after analysis on existing views and policies, our team will suggest new approaches and tools that could improve view controls, and recommend ways to enhance communication and public understanding of view control policies.

City of Ottawa Questions

1. How did the view control policies that are in place at the City of Ottawa get developed and implemented?
2. As a planner working in the city, how do you interpret these tools and policies in place at the City of Ottawa?
3. Are you aware of how many, if any, zoning by-law amendments (and/or OPAs) have occurred to allow buildings in the central area that go above the height limits that are in place to protect the views of the National Symbols?
4. Beechwood CDP states that a view protection study for Beechwood Cemetery was to be undertaken – are you aware of what this study stated in its findings? Do you have a copy?
5. With the construction of the LRT, and the implementation of TOD guidelines and Plans for Lees, Hurdman, Tremblay, St. Laurent, Cyrville, and Blair; do you see the potential of increased height around LRT stations setting precedents for the allowable height near the stations closer to the downtown core?
6. Do you believe that citizens are aware that the view protection policies that are in place?
7. Are you aware of any tools that are used that enhance the views or showcase them to the public? (i.e tourism, tours, apps, maps, websites).
8. What have you seen elsewhere in regards to view controls or public awareness of view controls?
Interview Script

City of Vancouver and City of Portland Questions:
1. Can you provide some background on how the view control policies came to be? Were there any specific cities the policies were modeled after?
2. With these policies, what do you feel is the biggest challenge to implementation?
3. Do you feel like these policies would hold up in the face of larger development pressure as the city continues to grow?
4. How big of a role do you believe that the public plays in view protection in the city? How in depth was the public consulted when the policies were created?
5. Do you believe that citizens know that these policies are in place? If yes, has the city attempted to increase awareness?
6. Was there any public consultation on the use of benefit capacity around the city?
7. Are you aware of any tools that are used that enhance the views or showcase them to the public? (i.e. tourism tours, maps, apps, websites)
8. Was there ever an attempt to quantify the economic generation in the city from views being protected? Are you aware of the monetary offset in the city when high-rise developments are pushed outside the core?
9. Do you feel that there are additional policies that could enhance view control protection in the city?
10. Are there any other things you would like to mention?
Interview Script

City of Halifax Questions:
1. Can you provide some background on how the view control policies came to be? Is the City of Dartmouth involved in the policy as well?
2. With these view protection policies, what do you feel is the biggest challenge to implementation?
3. Do you feel view protection policies would hold up in the face of larger development pressures as the city continues to grow?
4. Are the citizens of Halifax aware of the view protection policies? Were they consulted when the policy was created? How has HRM attempted to increase this awareness?
5. Has a study been done to quantify the economic generation in the city from views being protected? For example, high-rise development being prevented in the core, how is revenue in the core being impacted by that?
6. Are you aware of any tools that are being used in Halifax to enhance views showcasing them to the public? Do you know tools being use in any other cities?
Interview Script

City of Guelph Questions:

1. Can you provide some background on how the view control policies came to be?
2. With these view protection policies, what have you found to be the biggest challenge for implementation?
3. In your experience, how are the view protection policies holding up as pressure for larger development increases as the city continues to grow?
4. Are the citizens of Guelph aware of the view protection policies? How were they consulted when the policy was created and again for the secondary plan? How has the City of Guelph attempted to increase this awareness?
5. Are you aware of any tools that are being used in Guelph to enhance views showcasing them to the public?
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