

## **PUBLIC ROUNDTABLE #2, NOTES:**

*Below are the notes collected at the **Citizens' Assembly's Public Roundtable #2**, on Thursday March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2015. The focus of the roundtable was the Assembly's draft neighbourhood-wide recommendations. These recommendations were developed in response to the City of Vancouver's community-wide policy directions for Grandview-Woodland in Emerging Directions, June 2013.*

*There were 103 community participants in attendance, as well as members of the Citizens' Assembly.*

*The Assembly will carefully consider this feedback as they expand, update and refine their neighbourhood-wide recommendations.*

### **HOUSING (5 Tables + Posted Comments)**

#### **SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**1.1:** *We recommend changing this policy to: "In collaboration with senior levels of Government, provide sufficient Winter Response shelter space until more permanent housing options are developed."*

- Support

**1.2:** *We recommend changing this policy to: "Work with neighbourhood service providers to ensure adequate provision of support services for the visible and hidden homeless."*

- Support
- Make recommendation more inclusive to include people with mental disabilities

**1.3:** *We recommend changing this policy to: "Meet the demand of supported housing options in Grandview-Woodland."*

- Support

**1.4:** *We recommend the City identify opportunities for additional supported housing, and pursue creative, non-market ways to implement them.*

- Loves attics / basements
- Look at variety of rental sizes very small – 2 / 3 bedroom
- Best practices: Tax empty condos and rent control
- Purpose built single room rental

- Use attic space
- Shared hybrid housing (separate bedroom and bath with shared kitchen, etc.)
- Introduces the concept of “non-market” that is confusing and should be defined clearly with examples. In general one table thought that the assembly should simplify the language and make sure that their recommendations are not too vague. Adding many examples was one of the suggestions from the table.
- Draft Recommendation 1.5: We recommend the City identify opportunities for additional non-market rental housing, and pursue creative, non-market ways to implement them.
- Rent controls
- Need municipal rent controls
- Adopt best practices from other cities
- Actions that work to sustain/promote coops
- Tax empty condos, i.e. track by power consumption
- Use micro-houses

**1.6: *We urge the City to create new non-market rental through increasing the Development Cost Levy (DCL), mandating a Community Amenity Contribution (CAC), and allowing bonus density pending support from the local community.***

- One table appeared initially in favor of 1.6. But then a participant explained that this would bias the focus of the revenue collected through the levies toward affordable housing instead of allowing the community to decide to what to spend the revenues on. This new frame made some participants change their opinion. One participant also highlighted that increasing the levies would increase the cost for developers and would affect the supply of housing. The rest of the table seemed conflicted. Everybody liked the idea that the community should have a say and that affordable housing is important. But they were unclear about the consequences of raising the CAC and DCL levies. For the homeowners the key thing was to keep the character of the district, while allowing gentle densification. Their solution appeared to be reducing the regulation of what homeowners can do in terms of splitting their property and subletting parts of it, but introducing restrictions on how things should look like.
- Standardizing the CAC – is this possible?
- Include the wording “and other means” (might be additional financing tools)
- To increase fees... it’s too early, and the wording is too strong. Shouldn’t mandate at this point – this should be considered at this point
- What can we learn from the Cambie story and landlift?
  - Paul Cheng: In the Cambie situation, some developers weren’t familiar with the CAC process, and bought land at higher prices

- Fixed-rate CACs written into the zoning, rather than a negotiated process – already being considered at the City level. Fixed-rates stabilizes costs for the developers
- A second table decided that there should be a policy that deliberately states that the CAC derived from development stays in the neighbourhood. They also liked the idea of fixed-rate CACs for the developers
- Get rid of CACs
- The more \$ you extract from developers the more housing will cost

**1.7: *We expect the City to establish at least one mechanism, within the next three years, to fund owners who want to upgrade existing rental housing stock without increasing rents, in order to protect sustainable, affordable housing. (See, for instance, the City of Winnipeg’s Housing Rehabilitation Reserve and the Seattle Housing Levy for Rental Production and Preservation.)***

- One table: Heritage conservation is key and this is reflected by this recommendation, which gains support from the table.
- Zoning changes contingent on acceptance by immediate neighbours
- Have Heritage house zoning NOT up to code today
- Sunset clause – how many years?
- City needs to be more flexible, easier to work with for homeowners to do work on their house to put in nanny suite, rental unit, etc.
- Advocate to the provincial government that they raise the penalty for evicting someone to renovate
- Is important; these will be slums if we do not act (much support)
- One participant likes draft recommendation 1.7
- Will probably need to increase taxes to implement 1.7

**1.8: *We strongly urge the City to work with co-op and non-profit housing providers to respond to the potential loss of Federal operating agreements.***

- Alter wording: remove “potential”, and add an insert. See new wording below:  
 “We strongly urge the City to work with co-op and non-profit housing providers, and their umbrella organizations to respond to the loss of subsidy for low-income members as federal and provincial operating agreements end
- Is weak

**1.9: *We strongly urge the City to expand opportunities for new market rental housing development and to retain the current balance of rental to ownership ratio.***

- Support for existing rent / own ratio

- One table was unclear regarding what the “balance” currently was, and feared that a recommendation about maintaining a specific balance was impossible to enforce

**1.11: *We recommend that the City consider encouraging more affordable development by reducing or in special circumstances eliminating parking requirements for new rental developments. We expect that this will not apply to the parking for businesses located in mixed-use buildings.***

- Ease up on parking requirement for homeowners who are in-filling (coach, laneway houses) especially given city emphasis on not driving a car
- One table thought that this recommendation was very similar to 1.16. There was a discussion of the pros and cons of eliminating parking requirements. Some believed that eliminating parking made sense because at most people have to walk 4 blocks to reach a transit stop, other thoughts that parking requirements should be kept for those locations that are far away from transit.
- It’s difficult to find parking for residents, especially close to transportation nodes
- Increasing density in the area will have parking impacts
- For recommendation 1.11 and 1.16: eliminating the parking before we get rid of the cars is problematic; this will create difficulties for the neighbours

**1.12: *Support the expansion of Coach-house development in RT zones.***

- This recommendation is commended for addressing the need for gentle densification and in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood.
- Support expansion of coach-house RENTAL
- Add some detail to this one - - ideas on changes that would support/incentivize more people to build/reno densified forms (infill, suites, etc.) e.g. Relaxing the parking requirements
- This is good, but also include laneways; there should be incentives to give home owners advantages for laneway development; maybe relax permitting costs/procedures

**1.13: *We recommend that the City investigate and implement means to improve affordability in duplex and townhouse zones by allowing lock-off suites.***

- Love lock-offs

**1.14: *We urge the City to allow secondary rental units in attics and basements for all building forms, in accordance with existing safety regulations.***

- There is support for this recommendation due to its value in allowing higher densities without disrupting the character of the neighbourhood.
- We urge the City to allow secondary rental units in attics and basements for all building forms -à \_especially all our 100 year old houses, many of which were renovated legally before the mid 1950's to have suites on four floors.
- Strongly supported
- Let greater diversity: leave original structure but add density, i.e. Strathcona zoning
- Hard to be creative when city says bylaw won't allow
- Allow parking beside fire hydrant
- Written too generally, possible to make more specific?
- Allowing third suites (legal) in RS1
- Allowing basement/lock-off suites in RT

**1.15: We recommend that the City enable new home ownership opportunities...  
Feedback sought on four possible options:**

- A. ...within existing zoning height restrictions.**
- B. ...up to a maximum of 6 stories.**
- C. ...up to a maximum of 12 stories.**
- D. ....with height restrictions to be determined by each sub-area.**

- One table thought the answer is D with height restrictions to be determined by each sub-area.
- A second table thought that it was not useful to set general guidelines for the entire district given its diversity, and instead the guidelines should be street by street.
- A third table whose preference was D – to be determined by sub-areas. Some participants were flexible with height (would prefer to see some height rather than just more width)
- A fourth table largely preferred option A (existing zoning), with two exceptions: one who preferred option B, and one who preferred C might but only because of the Safeway site
- A fifth table preferred D, but there was also a preference for a 6 storey maximum
- Land assembly: Not # of lots = size of land assembled
- Zone for diversity -à \_current height (1910 heights) \* levels
- Infill, coach, laneways
- Within existing zoning only
- High density along Broadway
- Truth is density increases affordability
- Use what you have; city should be more flexible for owners to use infill opportunities for affordable housing

- House is more affordable with allowing multiple units, i.e. Duplex won't allow for laneway houses. It should.
- Zone for diversity, i.e. Duplex
- Let zoning allow suite in house
- People are unclear about how many more suites are needed – they're open to considering, but they need to know more about the needs
- Not so much an issue of to what height

**1.17: *We recommend that the City implement ways to support “alternative” ownership models such as equity co-op and co-housing, shared equity models, and accessible models such as Calgary’s Attainable Homes and Ontario’s Options for Homes.***

- Include co-housing, co-development
- Also micro-suites and communal living options
- On table unanimous, strong support

**1.19: *We recommend the City prioritize the maintenance and expansion of cooperative housing as diverse communities in which members have security of tenure and control over decision-making.***

- Recommendation 1.19 is good

## **MISSING ISSUES**

### Population Growth Expectations:

- How are the targets of the population growth determined? How are these targets being represented through the densification proposals? How do they manifest through the massing of the built environment?
- Is it realistic to limit the amount of people moving into the neighbourhood? Counter argument to the concern with population growth. The community should embrace those individuals who wish to move in and make part of the GW Neighbourhood.
- Could population growth be seen as an opportunity to manage the development of the neighbourhood? The neighbours discuss how the projects might be utilized as leverage to help the community shape the new urban forms. Laneway Housing, rental units and distribution of densification are discussed as desirable forms. The overall consensus is to achieve what one of the members describes as “gentle densification”.
- How are these expectations of population growth reflected in the recommendations?, and how do they address the preservation of the character of the neighbourhood?

### Density:

- Orientation away from major arterials, and into the lanes – important to consider how to better utilize laneways near arterials

- This could create parking issues
- Also, where will the schools go? Added people means added families with children

#### Built Form:

- There is no mention of maintaining commercial to the street at the same time as allowing gentle densification.
- I feel that this very important feature to maintain the residential feel of the neighbourhood while allowing for more choice.
- Having variation, 3 to 4 storeys as opposed to monoliths that may disrupt the quality of space.
- Preserving the vibrancy of the street life, which might be threatened by isolation of big frontages.
- The discussion about the specifics of the built form is seen as a pressing matter. There is an overall feeling that the amount of time allocated for this is rushed and inappropriate.

#### Affordability:

- Affordability is not limited to more housing stock. Increasing density through development is not the ideal way to reach affordability. Allowing other forms of diversifying the accessibility to housing such as rental units, and apartments is a desirable solution.
- Counter argument - The inclusion of higher developments that provide communal amenities such as common public areas increase social vitality. Also, the investment on densification around transit nodes enables more users to access public transit, which in return is seen as a different form of affordability.
- No spot rezoning is desired. Equitable development with a maximum of 2 lot assembly is the ideal form.
- If more people want to live here we need to provide the zoning to accommodate them, we cannot choose how many people move here.
- What we need to allow more of it is all of the above. Condos, rentals, townhouses, basement suites, coach houses. Find a way it works with residents but not at the expense of the new ones.
- Focus on finding ways to make market rentals and ownership affordable (parking, increasing the very constrained supply)
- Maintain low cost rental housing by encouraging retention of rental buildings and creating financial incentives to owners to upgrade.
- Allow duplex to include basement suites.
- Encourage heritage home renovations and retention by using financial incentives to encourage homeowners to build a suite.
- Encourage rental buildings to be built by developers.
- All monies paid by developers to the city for project approval to be spent in the neighbourhood the building goes up in.
- The city is neither seen as a developer nor as having the responsibility to invest in housing. However, it can provide the tools to get developers to contribute to the community. CAC's are one such tool.

- From a renter's perspective there is a deficit in the availability of rental units within the neighbourhood. A mixture of condos and rental apartment units is desirable. Townhouses, duplexes with rental units are also viable options to increment the stock.
- There was interest in knowing who's buying, and whether buyers are actually living there – Issue related to price inflations. [Could recommend a study if one doesn't already exist].
- Basic finishes but good quality vs. appliances/finishes targeted at the investor market
- Micro-suites – good idea, but in balance with the rest of the neighbourhood would be best

Land Assembly:

- Consider it on a sub-area basis
- Most are concerned that this restriction wouldn't be effective in achieving good design and appropriate development
- No spot-zoning, and maximum of 2-lot land assemblies

**GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

- Concerned with radical change
- Love heritage and a worried about displacement
- Interested in land assembly
- Interested in subsidized housing
- People will build what is profitable
- Affordability is the result when you increase height; there are some places you could go and increase height without changing nature
- Co-buying a house is an option that should be approved by the City: VanCity accommodates mortgages for co-ownership – it increases sense of community. Is it legal?
- Zone for diversity: add basement or attic suite, let people solve their own problems, maximize creative potential, allow people to come with lots of ideas if neighbours approve
- Support increase density with creative bylaws
- Lower development will lower amenity payments that add to community services
- Amenity payments need to be negotiated instead of going into a "pot" and doesn't go into community; let CACs stay in the community
- Keep an existing house exterior "as is", but allow multiple suites within the house (attic suite; basement suite), single room rentals, while still allow laneway house.
- The City needs to be more flexible and bylaws need to be less restrictive in order to allow creative solutions to density be implemented by the community
- Interest in the shift to low cost and rental housing affordability.
- Not being overwhelmed by the scope of development and its effects on the character of the neighbourhood.
- Management of the neighbourhood as a whole and the distribution of density across its entire area.



- Supply of different types of housing to fulfill affordability needs and diversify the housing stock.
- Development of the city at large is seen as a menace to the character of the neighbourhood. The amount of development projects occurring in the City of Vancouver is discussed as the inevitable future for the GW neighbourhood.
- Potential to overdevelop the area. Possible unevenness of the distribution of development across the neighbourhood poses a risk to certain areas more than others, particularly those closer to transit nodes.
- Conserving the existing diversity and avoiding gentrification.
- Distribution of density around the neighbourhood is preferred as opposed to specific concentrations in height in tower form.
- Keeping a balance between the ideas proposed during these meetings and the financial sustainability of the proposals.
- Secrecy of the Citizens' Assembly throughout the process and the lack of exposure of their work to the community at large. The disparity of power being held by the Citizens' Assembly in finalizing the recommendations is seen as a menace to the true representation of the community's opinions presented to City Council.
- The order of the recommendations should be in the order of public importance – not the order of Council priorities. -affordability –non-market rental housing – rental housing – variety of ownership forms. Homelessness is important but not the # 1 priority of the people. Homelessness as the first item on the Housing recommendations agenda is regarded as a City driven agenda. This politicized topic may be given priority and this poses a threat to other important issues that might be undermined such as housing stock diversity.
- Support for laneways and co-ops
- No more spot zoning should be allowed once the plan is in place; City should not be allowed to re-zone for, say, 10 years
- Support for more densification of housing like Kits: laneway, in-fill, strata, etc.; more in-fill will give us more units in RT zones, but they should be kept as rentals
- Concern over lack of transparency around targeted population
- People living in poverty/with disabilities should be better distributed city-wide
- Affordability: how can we provide housing for low- and middle-income residents?
- We need more options in between single-family houses and rentals
- Density: some supported more on First, and on Broadway; others worried that density on the arterials would put pressure on renters, decrease affordability, and lead to replacement by condos (“more density does not lead to more affordable housing”)
- Density in GW was/is already high
- There is no mention of seniors; we need supportive housing for them
- We need more co-op housing units
- Reward developers for rental development through an incentive program
- Regarding building height: if you impose a limit of 4 stories, the City will allow 6 – so say what you mean and don't give them latitude
- Limit amount of lot coverage to that currently existing; concern for adjacent lots

- One person said high-rises are not so bad; others disagreed
- Support for mixed-use buildings
- Street life is important
- It would be good to encourage more storage in new development
- Concern with City as developer: look at Olympic Village; lack of faith in bureaucrats (these ones at least); however, there was support for the City to develop parks
- Did the City give the CA density targets?
- “Rate of change” should be neighborhood-wide; strengthen this somehow

## TRANSPORTATION (2 Tables + Posted Comments)

### SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS:

**2.1:** *We recommend the City work to create a richer and safer pedestrian experience, balance the needs of the different users, and seek further opportunities to enhance the pedestrian experience on arterials in industrial-zoned areas.*

- Victoria Drive is a grey area: it is not an arterial, but it has serious sidewalk issues.
- Some people had trouble with the use of the concept “pedestrian experience”, since it excludes people who are not on foot (i.e. wheelchairs, etc.), and suggested to make explicit mention to sidewalks. Maybe “sidewalk experience.”
- Some people had trouble with the use of the concept “arterial” and suggested “busier streets”, which is a broader concept and expands the applicability of the recommendation.
- Some debate around expanding sidewalk network.
- Complete sidewalk network or equivalent for pedestrians. The key concern is about having safe and accessible infrastructure for all pedestrians.
- Some participants want to keep the charm of the neighbourhood and avoid reinforcing built form. “Don’t necessarily need sidewalks on all streets- keep some wildness in the City.”

**2.2:** *We recommend the enhancement of the public realm on neighbourhood shopping streets, by widening sidewalks, allowing parklets, providing amenities, like street trees, furniture and buffers between pedestrians and moving traffic.*

- Wheelchair accessibility is missing from the formulation and should be included.
- One person was concerned that widening and making sidewalks more accessible to wheelchairs and other disability supports might be an invitation to other motorized vehicles (i.e. scooters) to use sidewalks more, thus creating safety problems.
- Good-to-go with minor additions
- Have an explicit mention of key intersections.

**2.3:** *We recommend the City of Vancouver engage media and education to inform and reinforce safe cycling.*

- Concern that this should also include education around safe driving, since bad driving is one of the main causes of lack of safety for cyclists and pedestrians.

- Note that cycling infrastructure is a big issue in this regard, which has a significant impact on safe cycling (maybe more than public education).
- Concern that this recommendation is not specific to GW. While there is agreement that this should apply to the whole city, there is the risk that by making the recommendation too broad, GW might not get the benefits soon enough if the neighborhood is not prioritized due to budget limitations.
- Good-to-go with minor addition.
- Add: “and safe driving”.

**2.4: *We recommend the City of Vancouver expedite the creation of a multi-stakeholder task force that reviews objective, transparent research to resolve locations of proposed cycling routes.***

- Some people found this recommendation unnecessary, arguing that there is a wealth of research and information available already. “There are already professional people looking at this.” Setting up a parallel task force means distrusting the work they do.
- Others felt this was like “a plan to make a plan.”
- Another option would be to have the City proposing bike routes and then having a task force to review the proposals.
- The CA member explained why GW should participate in developing the proposals, not only approving/rejecting the City’s ideas. Overall, people agreed with the point.
- Good-to-go, minor additions that can be taken care of with an additional recommendation that explicitly demands the recognition of cycling as a legitimate mode of transportation.
- Recognize cycling explicitly as a legitimate mode of transportation on major transportation / commercial routes.
- Encourage and foster more cycling.
- Recognize the need to improve cycling routes, taking into account potential conflicts with transit.

**2.5: *We urge the City advocate on behalf of Grandview-Woodland to Translink to improve local transit service and efficiently connect the neighbourhood internally and to regional destinations, with service that is fast, frequent, reliable, clean, safe, fully accessible and comfortable.***

- People emphasized reliability as a key issue.
- Suggestion to remove the “and to regional destinations”, since GW is already well connected regionally. Emphasis should be placed on internal connectivity (neighborhood shuttle), especially for seniors.

- Concern about seniors (expressed by a senior): buses need to stop often. We don't only need more B-lines.
- Good-to-go, minor additions
- Some specific concerns about the direct involvement of the city in improving the reliability of the bus #20.
- Consider using bus bulges.
- Mention explicitly community shuttle.

**2.6: *We request the City to provide more bus information devices at major stops (as in Main and Granville Streets).***

- Concern that location of bus stops on sidewalks interferes with other activities (i.e. street furniture).
- Need to make access to bus stops easier for pedestrians. Improve bus stop locations at intersections without marked crosswalks.
- Need to make sidewalks wider to accommodate bus stops and other uses.
- Good to go

**2.7: *We instruct the City to remove Prior-Venables-Victoria-1st Ave as a commuter thoroughway.***

- Add off-pick hour parking.
- Add street trees.
- Concern that this might push commuters to 12th Avenue.
- Double standard? Regarding biking decisions, the CA is suggesting to create a task force to evaluate alternatives. But it seems that for these streets citizens already know what they want and decisions are made. Keep in mind that we still do not know what will happen with the viaducts.
- I'm worried that allowing parking on 1st Avenue will only result in pushing commuters onto 12th Avenue, a residential street that is already congested + dangerous.
- Significant disagreement
- Taking Prior-Venables-Victoria-1st out of the commuter route needs to be considered in context of moving traffic out of downtown.
- GW Residents also need 1st Ave to come in and out of the neighbourhood.
- Concerns about the possibility of diverting traffic to other nearby arterials.

**2.8: *We instruct the City to turn 1st Ave. into a local street by reintroducing street parking.***

- Add 12th Avenue (between Nanaimo and Clark) to this recommendation.
- Significant disagreement

- Turning 1st ave into a local 2 lane street needs to be considered in context of traffic to downtown—both for commuters to events (football, hockey). 1st is divided to Nanaimo and after Clarke. Consider building a traffic tunnel for vehicles between Nanaimo and Clarke. East of Nanaimo 1st is a divided street, as it is West of Clarke. It is a potential solution that addresses most aspects.
- Another alternative is the suggestion of a bus route along 1st ave, and probably a trolley bus.

**2.9: *We urge the City enforce speed limits on the major truck routes (e.g., Nanaimo & Clarke).***

- Should this focus on major truck routes only? This seems to be a generalized problem. Should other arteries be included?
- Add safe pedestrian control on Clark.
- Look at speed control mechanisms and crossings more broadly.
- Good-to-go with minor additions
- Add: “so that streets are safe”
- Alternative formulation: “We urge the City lower and enforce speed limits on the major truck routes.”
- Consider efficiency in traffic
- Consider physical traffic-calming tools: roundabouts

**2.10: *We urge the City consult with the Grandview-Woodland community prior to approving any traffic route changes as a result of the removal of the Georgia and Dunsmuir viaducts.***

- Support
- Poor + weak language around the traffic issues that will result from the removal of the viaducts. GW citizens MUST be kept informed.
- Good-to-go

**2.11: *We urge the City adopt and communicate best practices to ensure the safe transportation of materials by train through the neighbourhood.***

- Support
- Good-to-go

**2.12: *We recommend installing electric charging stations in key locations.***

- Support
- Good-to-go

**2.13: *We recommend the City pursue improved bike access on high streets by providing sufficient bike parking, without affecting pedestrian safety and walkability.***

- Concern: should bike access focus only on high streets? Many bikers prefer less busy routes.
- Some people expressed concern about the possibility of having a bike lane on Victoria Drive, which is already narrow and has sidewalk issues.
- People want to bike on Commercial Drive, so that is where the bike lane should be.
- Recommendation from CA member: use alleys adjacent to Commercial Drive for biking and commercial purposes. Clean up alleys and make them inviting to people. Downsides: alleys are often discontinuous over the blocks; if there is increased activity, businesses will want more parking.
- Concern that the wording of the recommendation does not refer to solutions for bike access itself, but to bike parking (i.e. “improved bike access BY providing sufficient bike parking”). Suggestion to change for “such as sufficient bike parking”.
- Good-to-go

**SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION:**

- **CYCLING AS A LEGITIMATE MODE OF TRANSPORTATION:** “We recommend the city improve cycling facilities in the neighbourhood so that all residents may choose cycling as a save and comfortable transportation option to move and shop in the neighbourhood.”

**MISSING ISSUES + GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

- Need for crosswalks at bus stops.
- Room for street furniture at bus stops.
- Introduce off-peak parking on 12th Avenue.
- Enforce speed limits in general.
- Pedestrian connections parallel to Commercial Drive.
- “Neighbourhood is a walking area but focus is on biking routes instead of walking routes; more people walk than bike.”
- **RESPONSIVE TRAFFIC SIGNALS:** Pedestrian controlled signals need to be coordinated to allow traffic flow on streets.
- **“SCRAMBLE LIGHTS”:** Consider scramble lights as a suggestion for congested pedestrian intersections. This means that pedestrians only move on the scramble light, therefore cars can turn right faster and the bus can move faster through the intersection.
- **TENSIONS BETWEEN CYCLING AND PARKING:** “Regarding adding bike lanes to Commercial Drive, parking meters are almost always full. If parking is removed will those drivers/customers continue frequenting the businesses? Residential parking is permit only so where do people with cars park?”

- DESIGNATION OF STREETS: “Make sure that traffic on streets is according to designation of streets (e.g., Victoria Drive has the traffic of a secondary arterial, but now it stands as a local collector.)
- NOISE REDUCTION: Need to look at ways to abate noise from traffic.
- REDUCE CARS: Reduce vehicular traffic and car ownership, increase parking requirements and impose parking maximums.
- TRANSIT: Consider the use of bus lanes (lanes with priority for public transit), using bus bulges, reducing the number of bus stops (as per Streets for Everyone proposal)
- Suggestion to have a bus route running on 1st Ave and connecting the West End with Burnaby; some disagreement about the dangers of noise that this will cause; suggestion to have instead a trolley bus.
- There should be mention of the plan to make Vancouver the greenest city.



## **PUBLIC REALM (1 Table + Posted Comments)**

### **SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**3.1:** *We expect the City to immediately implement a more rigorous rodent abatement program, in order to improve the usability of public spaces, including plazas, public parks, and community gardens.*

- This recommendation seems like a “red herring” in that the CA has more important things to do – shouldn’t be in the community plan.
- This is not a problem, but the recommendations should include some mention about trash.

**3.2:** *As part of any future development in Grandview Woodlands, we urge the City to work to secure new park space. Acknowledging the difficulty in acquiring new land, we request that the City also prioritize securing alternative public and private park spaces (e.g., roof gardens, pocket parks, etc.) for new/redeveloped buildings in the neighbourhood.*

- Private development and public buildings (e.g. fire halls) should also be required to convert rooftop spaces into community gardens.

**3.3:** *We recommend that the City planning department immediately identify and study the feasibility of developing the “Grandview cut” for public use.*

- There should be no development of the Grandview cut.
- The proposed redevelopment of the cut should be modeled off of the “High Line” park in NYC.

**3.5:** *We request that the City include a plan to create a new public plaza at Broadway and Commercial as part of any redevelopment of Broadway and Commercial.*

**AND**

**3.7:** *We request that the City immediately begin work to identify suitable plaza space in the north of Grandview Woodlands to support public gathering, ideally to be built within the next 5-10 years.*

- Emphatic “no” to the plaza idea: The last the community needs is more concrete – plazas are not an alternative to well-designed open space
- If there must be a plaza, then it should be a plaza without hard surfaces as this just creates “dead” space that no one will use and may even become a place where criminals hang out.

**3.9:** *Recognizing the different populations that the Templeton and Britannia pools currently serve, and the anticipated increase in population in Grandview Woodlands,*

***we request that both of these facilities be retained and upgraded after direct consultation with the community (including feedback regarding programming).***

- Crucial to maintain both pools (and maybe even add a third)
- Problems with recommendation 3.9 about the Britannia community development and renewal. The Templeton pool needs to be maintained because it serves a different side of the neighbourhood (e.g., north v. south).

#### **GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

- Disagrees about fruit trees – fruit trees should be street trees, especially given that community organizations may benefit from being given/being able to sell the fruit
- There should be some sort of statement that the proportion of parks/park space in the neighbourhood should grow in proportion to population growth in the neighbourhood.
- Need a lot more “high quality” parks with space designed to attract the public because there are things to do.
- Streets are the main “public spaces” in the neighbourhood, and so there should be a recommendation that the number of lanes are reduced (and sidewalks widened) between Broadway and 1st.
- Overall would give the current public realm recommendations (in terms of detail, quality, and relevancy) a below “0” grade.
- Was confused by the tension between fruit trees and street trees
- Bike lanes: Would like to see dedicated bike lanes with dividers that separate bikers from motorists – but rejected the idea that these dividers should be concrete – why can’t the dividers be flower boxes?
- Public realm recommendations should focus on the idea of creating “destination” parks, with playgrounds for children but also spaces for adults to enjoy
- The recommendation of adding extra parking in back lanes is a terrible idea – people already block that space. The idea of more underground parking is, however, a good one.
- Sidewalks should be widened on the Drive.
- Undecided on the issue of whether fruit trees are better than street trees, but is a fan of petitioning the city to convert more public spaces into community gardens.
- In favour of more underground/sunken parking lots.
- The sidewalks on the Drive should be widened and more permanent outdoor seating space should be provided (similar to the West End)
- The current CA public realm recommendations are far too vague, and need to be more future-oriented.
- Most of the issues people have with the public realm in GW seem to come down to questions of stewardship – perhaps the City can support more initiatives for stewardship of existing parks so that this responsibility is not just foisted ad hoc onto grassroots community organizations.

- Finds it interesting that current park space in the neighbourhood is being under used, this suggests that the real problem is the quality of existing park spaces, and not just the acquisition of new park spaces – parks need to do a better job of attracting more people.
- On the question of pools, many people don't want to use the local pools (and go to Hillcrest) because of the chemicals that are used – lower levels of chemicals might increase pool usage.
- We are somewhat park deficient in the neighbourhood, but the bigger problem is that current park space is not well maintained and offers no attractions. For example, some parks only have a few benches for people to sit on and not much else. We need to address people's usage of parks.
- There should be more input from the CA into the capital plan development project for Britannia.
- What people are looking for are outdoor "living rooms" where there are tables, places to sit, read, play games, etc. in parks and on the sidewalks.
- The pools and community centres also need to offer new and better programming for residents.
- There is no information about the infrastructure needed to accommodate more density in the neighbourhood,
- We need to do a better job of using and developing the parks and park space already in the neighbourhood.
- Templeton programming (and all community centres) needs to be drastically improved.
- Need to incorporate more of the feedback from the sub-area workshops into these recommendations (at present there is very little).
- Maintain the expansion of adequate community centres
- Get rid of sandwich boards along commercial drive to widen the space on the sidewalks – hang signage instead.
- There needs to be much stronger language in the recommendations for public realm – less "we request" and "we recommend" and more "we urge," "we instruct," as in other areas, such as Transportation and Housing.
- There should be no cars allowed to park between Broadway and Venables

## HERITAGE (1 Table + Posted Comments)

### SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS:

**4.1:** *As part of the heritage context statement that is being prepared for Grandview-Woodland, we expect the City to ensure that the definition of “heritage” is inclusive of a wide array of built form considerations including, but not limited to: housing, landscape, gardens, street features, and small retail.*

- Confusion about what the heritage context statement is
- Interest in seeing design criteria – want to make sure design guidelines that were created by citizens are being used
- Would like to include natural heritage in the above recommendation
- Under “street features” would like to reflect the narrowness of the street which contributes to unique feel of the neighbourhood

**4.2:** *As part of the heritage context statement the redevelopment of key community facilities (e.g., the Britannia Community Centre), we expect the City to ensure that the definition of heritage includes the preservation of social and cultural history, including Indigenous history, as well as the history of the culturally diverse and mixed-income character of the neighbourhood.*

- Confusion about the definition of social/cultural history
- Some concern that social/cultural history and indigenous history are out of place in the heritage section
- Would like there to be an explanation of what social/cultural and indigenous history mean

**4.3:** *While recognizing the value of both the heritage of building forms and of key social and cultural assets, we also recognize that there may sometimes exist tensions between them. We encourage the City to prioritize social and cultural heritage over the heritage of building form in weighing any future decisions about development/redevelopment.*

- The table would like to take out this recommendation. The group felt that this recommendation minimizes what 4.1 and 4.2 were working towards
- The table had a problem with the ranking and prioritization of built form as less important than social and cultural heritage
- Some felt that built form was more integral than social and cultural heritage
- Others felt that there was an interplay between both built form and social and cultural heritage that this recommendation did not adequately reflect

**4.4:** *We, the Citizens Assembly, recognize that there are varying and competing aesthetic tastes (e.g., what constitutes good or bad design, whether “faux” heritage is*

*appropriate, whether modernism is poorly badly executed, and so on) that inform on-going debates on the acceptability of development in our community.*

*We expect trust that the current (and evolving) design guidelines followed by the City already facilitate the integration of new development into the existing character of the neighbourhood. The City must conduct early public input on any new development in the neighbourhood with special attention to contentious sites. We expect the City to support and provide public venues for debate and consultation in order to advance, record, and resolve these conversations – especially those concerning developments that propose increased density or heritage designation.*

- Table felt that a stronger word than ‘trust’ should be used
- Group consensus that improved public input was essential to include in this recommendation
- Spot rezoning should be included in the second half of the recommendation under the sentence about public input. The group wants assurance that there will be lots of public involvement, public notifications and that input will be included in the new plans.

#### **MISSING/ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- A recommendation regarding the negative application of applying modern building codes to heritage buildings. There is concern that these codes lead to a lack of restoration because it is too expensive to renovate.
- There needs to be research into alternative solutions or equivalencies – for example, “if doesn’t leak why build a rain screen.” This type of consideration needs to be recognized in building codes.
- Policy regarding the increase of heritage designations such as “heritage conservation areas” as well as the incentivization of heritage designations
- A recommendation that reflects the strong dissatisfaction of the community with spot rezoning – preference to get rid of these but at the very least to consider heritage
- A recommendation or incorporate into above recommendations about natural/geographical heritage
- The table would like to include an overarching statement that precludes the recommendations that makes it explicit that “retention of heritage character” is the foundation of all the following recommendations.
- There was an additional proposal that there could be an overarching statement recognizing the indigenous land that predates “heritage.”

## ARTS & CUTLURE (1 Table and Posted Comments)

### SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS:

**5.1:** *We urge the City to create opportunities for affordable co-location/shared cultural spaces well as spaces suitable for use as a shared community hub.*

- Participants felt that the wording was too vague in this recommendation, and that a more direct approach should be taken – create the specific spaces instead of just creating opportunities.
- Not enough jam spaces for bands and musicians

**5.2:** *Any redevelopment projects that involve the disturbance or demolition of existing registered studios (“makers’ spaces”) must include plans to replace those studio spaces within the Grandview Woodlands neighbourhood with spaces of equivalent size and value.*

- Replace the word “value” with the word “rent”.

**5.3:** *As part of the redevelopment of key community facilities (e.g., the Britannia Community Centre), we expect the City to seek enhanced affordable space for arts and culture production.*

- It is vital to maintain affordability in these spaces for low-income residents and to accommodate the inclusion and integration of families. At Britannia Community Centre, participants want to expand the art gallery and to maintain the integration of the library.

**5.4:** *We urge the City to expand events and financial support for Grandview Woodland’s rich tradition of cultural festivals and events – especially First Nations events.*

- In this recommendation the wording was considered too vague. People wanted to add the wording diversity, inclusion, and all visible minorities in addition to solely including First Nations events – they wanted to include events of many different cultural traditions.
- Should take advantage of Britannia Community Centre to host cultural events, and there was a wish to build an amphitheater for use by cultural events outside of the Community Centre.

**5.6:** *Recognizing the current shortage of hotel space in Grandview Woodlands, and other accommodation barriers to cultural visitors to the neighbourhood (e.g., artists, musicians, attendees), we urge the City to provide support for developing visitor accommodation within walking distance of Grandview-Woodland’s performance venues (e.g., the Cultch, York Theatre, live music venues). We hope that this will result*

***in a wide range of accommodation options of varying affordability, suitable for hosting a diverse range of visitors***

- There was a lot of specific discussion around this recommendation, and a wish for a range of places to stay for visiting artists. Participants wanted locally owned and affordable hotels close to performing venues and transit.
- There was some discussion around bed and breakfasts, and disagreement about arrangements like AirBnB, which may take rental stock out of the market and increase the overall rental prices. Participants did agree on having more bed and breakfasts, and may be amenable to extending the zoning to include bed and breakfasts, perhaps throughout the area.

**MISSING ISSUES/GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

- Venables Greenway: There was widespread agreement to see Venables redeveloped into a space better for pedestrians. With the viaducts eventually coming down, people saw a reduction in traffic on Venables and wanted to make changes to facilitate and further that reduction in traffic between Clark and Commercial. Participants wanted widened sidewalks, reduction to two lanes of traffic, lots of greenery, and affordable space for locals and non-locals to come (e.g. affordable spots for small coffee shops). Public transportation on Venables was wished for, such as a shuttle bus (or even a streetcar). An example of what people wanted on Venables is Skidmore Fountain in Portland.
- Some noted that a specific site to stay the same was at Franklin and Victoria, where Terminal City Ironworks is located. There was a fear that if this site is redeveloped the rest of the area will be developed and change the character of this area. They wanted to note that an eye should be kept on this lot and how it is zoned.
- More jam spaces for bands and musicians should be included.
- Can use tools such as density transfer and density bonusing in order to keep key buildings.
- There was some discussion around where development of more commercial areas should take place. Some felt that extending the vibrancy/commercial areas of Commercial down from Venables to Hastings would be beneficial. Others wanted to keep the affordable housing in that section of Commercial, and extend the vibrancy East-West on both Venables and Hastings. Some small places of commercial along Commercial between Venables and Hastings may be beneficial.
- There was a note of a forming brewery district.
- Finally, some wanted to provide a rent subsidy to non-profit performing groups for the more expensive theatres.

## LOCAL ECONOMY (1 Table + Posted Comments)

### SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS:

**6.1:** *We encourage the City of Vancouver to protect the commercial business identity of Grandview-Woodland by limiting store frontage outside of rapid transit zones. The City should also give preference to retail that serves the local community over retailers that serve the region.*

- Suggestion to protect the identity of commercial business of Grandview-Woodland by not only limiting store frontage but also issuing or recommending design guidelines for businesses. Designers should work with neighbourhood members as much as possible.
- Question about the feasibility of adopting best practices for interior design of businesses so that space can be repurposed if it changes hands (specifically, the issue of large 'floor plates' that cannot be adapted to smaller businesses).
- Smaller business spaces would also allow business owners to buy their space rather than rent and remain vulnerable to lease hikes.
- Is it possible to create commercial rent control?

**6.2:** *We recommend that the City of Vancouver change the zoning/guidelines to increase the amount of office space near rapid transit nodes in order to encourage job growth within Grandview-Woodland and increase the diversity of the local economy (including the digital and high-tech sector).*

- It is unclear from this recommendation if the City of Vancouver is in fact responsible for zoning problems that currently prevent the creation of office space.

**6.3:** *We encourage the City of Vancouver to continue pursuing the concept of split-level assessment for taxation in order to increase fairness and support small and existing businesses.*

- Recommendation for split-level taxation is endorsed. Would split-level taxation help to create or encourage development of mixed-use spaces? Are there examples or models of mixed-use spaces that can be examined? How can already existing mixed-use spaces be further protected?

**6.4:** *We are concerned about the potential of losing industrial and manufacturing land. We recommend the City maintain current manufacturing and industrial zoning and incentivize development to create jobs and support the local economy.*



- The recommendation should be reworded in the following way: “We are concerned about the potential of losing have a significant asset of our industrial and manufacturing land. We recommend the City maintain revise current manufacturing and industrial zoning and to incentivize development, to create jobs and support the local economy through mixed-use zoning and buffer zones.”
- Current manufacturing and industrial zoning limits the development of split-level and mixed-use businesses.
- What is “industrial” and what does it mean to keep “industrial, industrial”? The issue of ‘preservation’ of these spaces should be reconsidered with special attention to how that may limit job creation and further development.
- Some attention should be paid to the role of artists in the community. How can zoning and development help create and protect ‘live-work’ spaces for artists?

#### **MISSING ISSUES/GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

- It is important to maintain the character of commercial buildings in order to encourage higher rents for occupying businesses and prevent commercial decay.
- Why does the location have to be Broadway-Commercial? What about moving this further north to Venables?
- In general, the Venables corridor is underdeveloped and could be repurposed for mixed-use spaces. What problem can this land solve?
- “Job developing” versus “local serving” businesses. Job developing businesses and projects should be prioritized and included in the guiding principles.
- Re animating laneways: Is it possible to open laneways and alleys for commercial use? Small businesses can incubate in these spaces with lower rents. Especially relevant as potential live/work spaces for artists.
- Density from Safeway should be distributed throughout the community and not concentrated on one site.
- There should be mechanisms for sharing information among businesses to create collaboration and solve problems (like parking) at the community level without zoning changes.
- Some concern about the lack of business voices in the drafting of recommendations.
- Recommended creation of an ‘economic development commission’ for the whole community, rather than BIAs that focus on particular business interests (such as commercial store fronts on the Drive).
- Re: language of recommendations, what is the difference between “require” and “encourage”? What does this difference say about the authority of the CA?
- Venables should be reconceptualised as a ‘high street’ and developed in an original manner.
- In general the ‘emerging directions’ are pretty good and should accompany the recommendations for local economy as they do for the other topics.

- Emerging directions should not explicitly protect or maintain current manufacturing/industrial zones.

## COMMUNITY WELL-BEING & HEALTH (1 Table + Posted Comments)

### SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS:

**7.1:** *We recommend that the City's social infrastructure division support non-profit community health and social services such as REACH in their efforts to sustain, expand, and/or relocate in G-W.*

- Remove specific reference to REACH

### GENERAL DISCUSSION/MISSING ISSUES:

- Positive: aboriginal issues are here.
- Negative: there should be more explicit language regarding mental health, drug and alcohol. It goes through all segments of community.
- There is a need for more harm reduction services specially in regards to people with drug problems in Parks
- There was some disagreement or the issue of needle exchange. The agreement was over the need for a service to reduce the number of needles in areas where there are children present: parks, schoolyards, and community centers.
- Something that the city needs to consider is that it is difficult to house homeless people because often times they have to house them outside of Grandview woodlands. And they don't want to go.

#### Youth:

- There needs to be a recommendation around youth. Perhaps something along the lines of after-school care services for children between the ages of 6 to 18.
- The main question was why is there no service for tweens? Some of the problems are just simple like malnutrition.
- And issue was raised regarding the children that are overdosing or are just hungry near Britannia community center. Perhaps there should be some research as to why are these kids there? Is it because a foster homes, abuse, prostitution?
- In regards to the same kids: perhaps there should be a recommendation about increasing and maintaining ongoing support. Perhaps we should just start by handing out free food.

#### Health, noise/air/light pollution:

- An issue was raised in regards to noise: for people who are living near second and Commercial Drive, there is a lot of noise every night with the skytrain. Perhaps there can be a recommendation that requires a study that looks at harmful acoustic levels. There should be a study looking at how noise can affect health. They're considering a new skytrain design. Should they consider potentially an igloo?

- The City should work with Translink in order to promote cleaner burning fuels for the buses. When they idle on the side of the road, there is a lot of pollution. Especially raised in regards to the number 99 bus and the pollution it creates.
- On the issue of light: it is not just sunlight that is important but also we need to consider light pollution for people who live near commercial districts. Light is important for security but there is a way to force light down instead of up towards the windows of apartments.

#### Parks:

- There is a huge connection between parks and community health. We need to maintain and extend the parks. This might be more of an issue for public around but it is still very important for health. Perhaps a recommendation around considering redesign for optimal use of the parks.
- There was a discussion about creating wellness parks. This basically means trying to connect the different parks in Grandview Woodlands through Green pathways.
- Participants talked about Japan's healing forests: they are densely planted and have special trees that promote cleaner air.
- Participants also talked about millennium Park Castle Park: which has workout stations for people to promote health.
- We need neighborhood infrastructure that makes walking and cycling as safe as possible: this means separating them from moving traffic as much as possible.

#### Emergencies:

- There needs to be better communication to community in regards to emergency plans. This concern was raised because of the fire at the Port. Perhaps we should consider things such as tsunami speakers, police cars going around informing people, or even a phone tree. We just need to get better at creating a link between the port and trains and trucks and the community.

## ENERGY & CLIMATE CHANGE (1 Table + Posted Comments)

### SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS:

**8.1:** *We urge the City to analyze and prioritize energy demand management strategies whenever questions of additional energy supply arise in order to reduce emissions. This should include the City advocating for this at higher levels of government.*

- Clarify and simplify the message. Table recommends using a few specific examples.

**8.2** *We recommend that the City work with other levels of government and utility companies such as BC Hydro and Fortis as well as other stakeholders to establish programs of incentives and subsidies for the retrofit of all existing buildings including private properties for energy conservation and efficiency.*

AND

**8.3** *We urge to the City of Vancouver to explore all opportunities to promote retrofits and repurposing of existing housing stock and social services infrastructure - such as schools (through partnerships with provincial and federal governments), libraries, community and recreation centers, daycare facilities, and etc. - where ever possible to create additional housing and community services where this promises to reduce our environmental footprint.*

- Need some rewording to clarify, it is currently very wordy and not very clear.
- Differentiate between publicly owned buildings and private stock.

**8.4** *Encourage new developments to utilize renewable energy where cost/benefit and life cycles analysis support it.*

- This recommendation should be reworded to that it indicates that this guideline would ultimately make it into the official plan guideline. It should be referenced and include some concrete examples. i.e.: explain how building with solar panels may produce more emissions and waste in the long term than buildings using a passive solar technology.

**8.5** *We urge the City to require developers to identify opportunities for energy conservation and renewable energy.*

- We urge the city to require developers to meet certain standards set by the City or Government, these standards should reflect best practices of the time for energy conservation and renewable energy. Must be stronger than “identify opportunities”.

**8.6** *We recommend that the City implement measurable and area-specific tree planting goals*

- GOOD TO GO

**8.7** *We urge the City to monitor and address deficient tree canopies continuously, in order to promote lower emissions, pure air, biodiversity, beauty and general community well-being.*

- We urge the City to monitor, improve and optimize tree canopies continuously in order to promote lower emissions, pure air, biodiversity, beauty and general community well-being.

**8.8** *We ask that the City add another policy objective to this section of Emerging Directions: “Continue to promote a zero waste policy.”*

- GOOD TO GO – just add a concrete example

**8.9** *We urge the City to develop and implement best practices storm water management and gray water reuse plan to meet the goals of zero waste.*

- GOOD TO GO

**8.10** *We urge the City to promote reduced use of resources as an even higher priority than recycling through public education to meet the goals of zero waste.*

- GOOD TO GO, provide a concrete example

#### **GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

- Recommendations should include specific energy efficient targets, need more specifics. The City should encourage net-zero development, it is too easy to encourage or require opportunities for energy conservation and renewable energy. City should work to enable renewable energy generation with district energy centre, current economies makes small scale renewable energy generation difficult.
- How does the neighbourhood promote green jobs?
- How can the community influence the Port Authority to discourage the development of fossil fuels and non-sustainable projects (fracking, tar sands, dangerous chemicals)
- Free parking for electric cars
- Foster sustainable transportation initiatives. Invest in infrastructure to make walking, cycling and transit available for everyone
- Encourage the City to offer incentives to keep housing stock, using retrofits and repurposing, instead of rebuilding. Reduce construction waste.

## WILD CARD (1 Table + Posted Comments)

### SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS:

**9.3** *We require that a long-term city-funded advocate be established as recommended by the Citizens' Assembly and to keep the Grandview-Woodland informed of the implementation progress.*

- Generally good to go...
- What do you mean by "long term city funded advocate"?
- Is there any body that will ensure the longevity of the Citizens Assembly plan? Will will hold the city to task? Would the GWAC be the stewards of the plan?
- Who is the advocate answering to?
- When funding is finished, does the person go back to the city?
- Who gets to choose the person? Is there an election process? Who is the pool of applicants?
- A participant mentioned that the community of Chinatown had a "social planner" selected and funded by the City for 4 years, but working independently from it. It was a specific position at City Hall, aiming at advocating the will of the residents of Chinatown. This advocate received a funding of around \$100000 per year. He focused first on safety / security issues. After 4 years, the Chinatown community members pursued the work of this social planner themselves.
- A participant said that it would be very useful to get a job description of this social planner. But: this social planner was only hired for a short-term period, whereas the CA's recommendations will be implemented over the long-term.
- Find out more about the "social planner" job description. Where is funding from? How long do they last?
- Support idea of an ombudsman/ action plan to ensure citizens' assembly recommendations are pursued by government

**9.4** *We urge the City to engage in communication with vested parties (i.e. the province, parents, students, teachers, VSB and Parks) to brainstorm ways that the parties can jointly address public school issues and opportunities. This will allow our community to have sound educational choices and more fully utilize current facilities.*

- Revisit and clarify the first sentence. What are the issues and opportunities? Define and have solutions. City and community should have a role in education?
- Real problem: how can we improve the level of education / funding?

- CA members should define what the specific problem is in the recommendation on public school and propose solutions for it. The recommendation is still quite unclear and needs to be more specific.
- Is it possible to include the language of artists and community to mentor the youth?

**9.5 *We urge the City to develop a City Plan that includes all neighbourhoods with the objective of fairly distributing density, resources and amenities***

- Needs clarification

**GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

- Need park space targets on a per capita basis. Grandview Woodland is already on the low end in terms of per-capita park space, adding 10,000 more people will only make the per-capita space worse.
- Free WIFI for Grandview Woodland
- We need more Indoor meeting spaces that community groups can use (and they need to be affordable)
- Upgrade of Britannia community centre and recreational facilities.
- City to support the construction of affordable rental housing in GW area, including co-op and non-profit housing.
- No spot zoning for three years.
- The City does not follow what it says. Has the city given any feedback or assurance about this process or recommendations?
- Recommendation regarding a restructuring to a ward system?
- What groups / organizations / community members will be the advocates of GW once the CA ends? Who will continue the work of the CA?
- We need to make sure that the CA recommendations are implemented.



## ALL OF THE ABOVE (2 Tables)

### GENERAL DISCUSSION:

#### Housing + Growth:

- Participant wants the incremental implementation of densification – doesn't want shape of neighborhood to change over night – wants rezoning to be done incrementally
- Participant says city planning for density for tax purposes – so they can make more money through property taxes – this is bad
- Participant wants the creative absorption of density and interesting developments. Thinks area can take some more density, but requires increasing walkability and bikability.
- One participant doesn't have a problem with more density – as long as it comes with increases in green space and there are not increases in traffic. Likes the model of Euro cities – pedestrian zones. Thinks Olympic village works quite well
- One participant: willing to accept some increases density – provide it allows for the preservation of the good stuff about the community. Thinks the good stuff is lost with towers. Commercial drive makes the neighborhood what it is – but it's already been changing. Likes idea of looking into business space in laneways
- Heritage houses, laneway houses are good
- Basement suites the only really affordable housing – when they get torn down, there's no where for those people to go – they lose their homes
- Aim for more density – but hoping for increases in housing that is affordable
- One participant mentions Kettle site, doesn't want towers
- Nice laneway houses that participant would love to see more of (Garden Drive and laneway between 7th and 8th)
- One participant likes development at 11th and Arbutus – particularly that the street was removed to create green space – can be way to increase density as well
- One participant lives in a triplex – loves it – co-owns with a friend – they each live on one floor and they rent the other out- would like to see more of this
- Near Glen drive and Windsor bike route is a creative pocket of density (involving triplex or fourplex) - also 21st and Winsor (little cottages)
- Live/work spaces yet – artists need affordable housing – where will the artists go and we lose affordable housing? Neighbor (well known artist) built studio in backyard – had to pretend it was a garage to get approval. Need to find creative ways to leave space for artists – they're a big part of making the neighborhood what it is
- Having development means people will get squeezed out
- Co-ops/ affordability important
- Foreign investor tax?
- Maintain existing stock
- Extend duplex zoning east (gentle densification)
- Promote laneways
- Promote basement suites
- More consultation on each project (e.g., large development)

- Use language of gentle densification (specific recommendation)
- Not too much density around parks
- These concerns are particularly with respect to Garden Park. The residents in the area do not like the 'fingers' that extend from the Nanaimo Area. There is strong opposition to 'eyes on the park'.
- How much more density is needed? What's the plan? What's the plan across all neighbourhoods?
- Diversity/co-operative living
- Promote micro forms of cooperative housing

#### Local economy:

- Most of customers at my restaurant come from the neighbourhood
- Participant owned a travel agency on the Drive for many years- most customers from outside the neighborhood
- Interested in a study on where customers for drive businesses come from
- How much has the Assembly heard from Commercial Drive Business Society?
- Want to make sure all business associations being heard from/participating
- At Hasting Sunrise subarea workshop lots of people didn't know about the East Village business association, and also they were not at meeting
- Discussions re. bikes on drive – has heard some business owners saying that the business associations don't represent opinions of everyone – not everyone agrees about protecting parking
- Issue of whether big developments make it harder for small business –heard view that big developments want a big chain to anchor the development.
- Some of the city's zoning rules make it difficult to have office and storage space in retail space – this is hard on small businesses – but bigger ones tend to have these things in other places anyway. Maybe changing these zoning rules could make it easier to maintain small, independent businesses
- Desire to maintain independent businesses. Businesses in Olympic Village all chains?
- One participant wants bike lanes on Commercial Dr.
- Preserve eclectic mix, local stores

#### Transportation:

- More development means we need better transit. Worry that B&C already a mess and it'll just get worse
- One participant wants bike lanes on Commercial Dr.
- Need good transit along the Drive, a B-line?
- Use co-op cars, doesn't own cars nor do friends
- 99 stop is horrible. So poorly organized.

#### Parks:

- Parks around B&C no used well and badly maintained
- Parks further North used a lot
- Preserve quiet nature of the park

- Importance of Walkability and green space

Process:

- Institutionalize process (of the citizens' assembly)
- Support idea of an ombudsman/ action plan to ensure citizens' assembly recommendations are pursued by government
- Like Ward system
- Campaign finance reform to help deal with the overly strong influence of developers on local government
- Take special interests/developers out of workshops (open only to residents), get backgrounders before night before