

Public Roundtable #3:

Participant feedback on the Citizens' Assembly's draft sub area recommendations

May 7, 2015

Members of the Citizen's Assembly shared their draft sub area recommendations with community participants at their Public roundtable meeting on the evening of May 5th 2015 at the Croatian Cultural Centre. There were 128 community participants in attendance, in addition to members of the Citizens' Assembly.

This document includes notes from table conversations and the specific feedback given to Assembly members on their draft sub area recommendations at the meeting. For most the neighbourhood's sub areas, there were four different table conversations over the course of the evening.

1.0 CEDAR COVE

DRAFT PREAMBLE

Cedar Cove is characterized by mix of industrial and residential uses and includes a significant portion of rental housing. We value maintaining industrial uses and rental housing stock in the sub area.

(Other ideas to include:

- Diversity
- Working class neighbourhood
- Can feel separated from the rest of G-W
- Scenic views
- Affordability
- Connection with Port)

Public realm & transportation

1.1: We are concerned that Cedar Cove is disconnected from the rest of Grandview-Woodland. We urge the City to work with Translink to extend or establish bus routes linking the subarea to the rest of the neighborhood. One example of this might be bus service along Commercial Drive between Hasting and Powell. Another possibility is a Community Shuttle that runs along Wall Street (beginning at Wall and Nanaimo) and Commercial Drive (ending at Commercial and Hastings?).

1.2: We request that the City study traffic patterns west of Nanaimo and north of Powell Street to ensure safety in this residential zone.

1.3: We encourage the City to improve amenities such as benches, lighting and trees in industrial areas in order to promote more alternative public space

1.4: We support the City's efforts, as outlined in emerging directions (2.3, CC-9), to negotiate with the Port of Vancouver for the creation of public access to the waterfront within Cedar Cove.

1.5: We appreciate the improvements that have been achieved in regards to industrial odors. We urge the City [to continue to promote these improvements] on an ongoing and permanent basis.

- Likes that smell of chicken plant is identified

1.6: We encourage the City to find opportunities for street art and historical and cultural improvements in the sub-area (for example, wayfinding indicators and historical placards) and particularly in industrial areas. Noting the appeal of the mural at the Granville Island Concrete Factory, we encourage the City to consider similar projects in the sub-area (e.g. at the Vitera Grain Silos near Powell and Salsbury.)

1.7: We trust the City's plan to increase bike lane expansion and safety east-west along Dundas Street and request that any bike infrastructure improvements also include pedestrian's safety and increased green space.

Housing & built form

1.8: In order to increase the number of shops and services in the northeastern section of Cedar Cove, we propose rezoning Nanaimo Street from McGill to Cambridge to mixed-use commercial residential zoning (C-2C) and to allow up to 4 storeys in height.

1.9: We value protecting the views along Wall Street. Therefore we expect the City to respect the existing character of the area and to maintain green spaces and sightlines when considering zoning changes.

1.10: We recommend that the City rezone the north and south sides of Pandora park to allow for residential buildings of up to 6 storeys. However, we require that the existing Kiwassa social housing and co-ops in this area are preserved.

- Participant thinks going to 6 around Pandora park essentially means no change

1.11: Cedar Cove can be distinguished from the other subareas of Grandview-Woodland because of its large industrial zone and because most of its residential housing units are apartments. We request that the City preserves rental stock in the area and supports the development of social housing. (Add target for increases in social housing?)

1.12: We recommend that the City allow mixed use commercial and residential buildings up to 6 storeys in height along Dundas between Semlin and Templeton. We expect the City to encourage rental tenure in these buildings.

1.13: At the corner of Semlin and Dundas, we support the development of a reasonable sized commercial node. This node should contain mixed-use buildings of no more than 8 storeys.

- re Dundas node – won't get 8 storeys – it's not economical because once you build above 6 you can't do wood frame and the building costs go up a lot – it's not worth it for 2 extra storeys
- Why isn't 2073 Dundas included in the node? – BC housing interested in buying

Local economy

See **1.3, 1.5, 1.8, 1.12, 1.13.**

Additional issues/recommendation:

- Recommendation to protect existing Single Room Occupancy hotel

- Form of “mixed-use”: One option would be to have commercial zoning at ground level and residential above. A second would be to have some buildings dedicated to commercial uses and some to residential.
- General concerns raised about the form of development and character: support for a diversity of building types. Would like to see setbacks and gaps between taller buildings so that they don’t form one big wall The concern was also raised that the more you do to buildings architecturally, the more they cost.
- Some discussion about whether to stipulate that where additional height has been allowed that there be some portion of social housing and that the residential units be rentals
- Accessibility:
 - a. Sidewalk improvements
 - b. Improvements for Elderly, people with disabilities, Handyart
- Terminal City Iron Works site:
 - a. Interest in turning this into some sort community hub and of asking city to buy the site. Brickworks in Toronto was brought up as one potential model
- Greenway from Hastings to Pandora Park?

Draft Map: Provided the conditions outlined in the recommendations above are met, this map illustrates the areas of change in Cedar Cove over the next 30 years.

General feedback from Cedar Cove tables:

- Participant wants to put seniors housing up in the area
- This is a ‘no-change’ plan
- new parkettes, qualitative improvements to parks
- Pandora park needs specified improvements like tables and chairs
- Why are we talking so much about reforming plaza? Need more talk on making Pandora park more public and child friendly
- Laneway housing needs to be more affordable...who is really benefitting from the pricing of laneway houses?
- Cedar cove has its own feel
- Goals listed in document are achievable
- RM3 zoning needs to be reformed because it doesn’t give any ability to look at project for its merits
- Proposal of more mixed family housing in Cedar Cove: family on top, rental on bottom

- RM3a zoning is too restrictive...allow director of planning to make certain judgments to increase restaurants cafes and small business micro industries in the area
- Plaza recommendations are not pedestrian friendly, no local shoppers at the businesses in Cedar Cove, they all go elsewhere and do not support local community businesses
- Need more background garden spaces as extension to local businesses like Platform 47
- Creating more public spaces and maintaining Pandora park...for the sake of creating a coming-togetherness
- Need more of a diversity in clientele to local businesses like Platform 47
- There is a serious discrepancy between the neighbourhood-wide recommendations and the specific recommendations for Cedar Cove. For example, why is homelessness discussed in bigger report, but not in Cedar Cove? What about homelessness in Cedar Cove? How will the changes in the big report influence Cedar Cove on a micro level? Very frustrated by the Citizens' Assembly process, what's the point and meaning of all of this?
- Cedar Cove is the area with the least amount of changes proposed
- Participant wants to see a certain kind of change in neighbourhood: higher density, multifamily homes, residential opportunities
- Frustration with not knowing enough about facts about zoning laws
- Preserve industrial lands, especially around Powell St which is a major arterial road
- High density is important for major streets...some places are more suitable for such recommended changes
- Car reduction
- Likes: bike lane changes, new bus routes, all good signs of City's desire to lessen cars. Especially widening of sidewalks is good news
- Need more co-op housing and affordable housing

2.0 HASTINGS

DRAFT Preamble:

We consider Hastings Street to be an area suitable for extensive redevelopment if and when there is a commensurate creation of public benefits. Hastings street currently consists of two zones: the commercial high street zone in the east, which serves the adjacent residential areas, and the mixed-use zone in the west. We seek to maintain and improve the commercial zone while allowing the transformation of the mixed-use zone into a high to medium density mixed-use residential area.

(To include (?):

- We want Hastings to be a visually vibrant and a useful place to walk, shop, and look at sights.
- Priorities: adult education, art classes, easels, protecting small businesses, area for green + recreational space, and densification while maintaining affordability)

Public realm & transportation

2.1: We are strongly committed to strengthening the public realm along Hastings Street. We would like the City to work to improve connectivity along (and across) the street. We expect that as the area gets developed, that these improvements will be included.

2.2: We ask the City to look at increasing the pedestrian-controlled crossings in order to improve livability and access to both sides of the street as the area get developed.

- [We want less dangerous traffic - make it or keep it safer](#)

2.3: We recognize the role of Hastings Street as a key public transit corridor. We strongly encourage the increase of transit including future rapid transit service.

2.4: We expect the City to use the opportunity that new developments provide to increase our green space and recreational space, which is currently deficient in Grandview-Woodland. Given the ongoing issues that children and youth face in GW, we insist that the City take every opportunity to provide the activity space needed for youth for example a turf field, rock-climbing wall, a skate-boarding area, or paintball field.

2.5: We are anxious to see the City provide secure and under-cover bicycle lockup at transit hubs within a year. This would address the concerns of cyclists for their bicycles while they take public transit.

2.6: We recommend the investigation of the possibility of a new plaza along at the corner of Hastings and Commercial. We would direct the City to work with the Aboriginal community in designing this public space in order to honour the history of Aboriginal presence in this area as well strengthen present-day multicultural integration.

- Kettle has presence on Hastings
- Views are important but not the only reason to make decision
- What would you see as a viable/vibrant way to get people on Hastings together? Using side streets, more of the plaza suggested on Garden, more coffee places, more nightlife
- Visualize drums playing, honouring unseated coast Salish territories + different culture
- We need to inspire the kids by showing what we have to offer // these are high school kids; they are not hoodlums; We want more openness with UNYA
- UNYA would like to provide multi-purpose; gym, kitchen, alternative housing school, etc.

2.7: We encourage the City to consider the development of a plaza at Hastings Street and Garden Drive and incorporate Garden Drive into Pandora Park. We believe that this would increase livability of Hastings Street and create a gathering place for the community. We would also recommend a similar greenway corridor from Hastings to Woodland Park on Mclean Drive.

2.8: In order to encourage public interaction and a sense of community and prevent tunneling, we would like to see generous setbacks to create wider sidewalks. The creation of street arcades, street trees, street furniture (benches + tables) and public art would create a more welcoming pedestrian experience, create more active store fronts, and more customers for businesses.

2.9: We urge the City to soften Hastings Street by planting trees in congruence with the new development and the building setbacks (wider sidewalks). We would like to suggest the same style of trees as done in the Netherlands (2-dimensional style that allows for light as well as green space)

Housing & built form

2.10: We expect the City will create opportunities for medium (up to 8-storeys) to higher (up to 15-storeys) density mixed use (retail + office + residential + industrial + studio space) in current MC-2 and MC-1 ("let-go" industrial) zoned areas (Hastings between Clarke and Victoria/Semlin).

2.11: We encourage the City to allow additional mixed-use opportunities (retail + office + residential) in areas currently zoned for commercial (Hastings between Victoria/Semlin and Kamloops).

2.12: We recommend that the allowable height on Hastings be kept at 4 storeys in order to maintain the high street feel of small-scale independent stores that provide service to the local community. As the demand for housing grows, we are open to increase conditional height as follows:

- NE corner of Hastings and Clarke - up to 20 storeys;
- Hastings, between Clarke and west of Commercial - up to 15 storeys
- Hastings, Commercial to Kamloops - up to 8-storeys;

This is to ensure that the need for non-market social housing and much needed community services can be met. We would expect a visual differentiation on both height and built-form. The rest of the conditions are outlined in the public realm section: **2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9.**

- Walking –how would height affect the walking, jogging experience?
- Concerned with losing mountain view (live on Venables)
- Concern with shadowing
- More important: mechanism that allows things/ restricts things in a constructive way
- Less density = less economical for developers
- This means that you can't create = less supply = less affordability
- 15-20 storeys means concrete and steel buildings which are more expensive. What about the Boheme -- 4 storeys / wood
- Would the new business be able to afford these new developments? What amenities for the neighbourhood?
- Higher-end commercial space comes in with new development
- Lots of people would have to move with the new rent speculations
- Change zoning from light industrial to C2C along Hastings
- New densification = everything will change = new businesses
- Parking space is limited underground. Densifications will mean more cars on the street. Nobody talks about cars. Consider that density will mean lack of space for cars.
- Parking is really an issue; important to consider human-scale and 3D of what these towers would look like
- Change the zoning to something like Commercial Dr.
- This is a 30 year plan: go baby steps; go for 4 storeys; it is just too much
- Problem: don't want to walk down a tunnel
- C2: Kingsway - 15th looks better

- Go for something like Olympic village
- Connections are what matter: amenities, sidewalks, parks.
- If you want to see change, then you need densification
- Step backs will work
- Change in zoning from MC2 to C2C (light industrial to commercial/residential aka commercial drive) - - The issue is use and very restrictive (i.e. Boheme is the most you can get from it) - - more flexibility with C2 zoning/ to give you the type of business/residential that you have on W 4th, Arbutus, and W 10th .
- If you don't let neighbourhood to develop (even in a natural way), you get a bunch of parking, rental, etc. Problems
- Ought to include a rezoning and public benefits strategy - neighbourhood considers height and density through rezoning so that they can get community contribution - -the recently approved West End, DTES, Marpole community plans have a "rezoning policy" and a "public benefits strategy"
- Benefits have to be decided by the community that lives in that area
- Community amenities need to be defined better: childcare, health centre, Seniors recreation, Reach, etc. Not commercial services but non-profit.
- Another source for funding is DCL: development cost levies. They will have to be spent on very particular things
- Why is it that we care about height but not about people. How about making more areas of refuge on the side streets?

2.13: We expect the new buildings to be designed in such a way as to provide adequate solar access to the street and to have a human-scale street wall.

2.14: We recommend the creation of transitional areas on north and south sides of Hastings. On the north side, we want to preserve the current industrial space from the adverse impacts of residential construction and recommend the rezoning to a light industrial from laneway to Franklin Street. On the south side, we recommend that the area between laneway and E. Pender be rezoned for intermediate height building so that it transitions from existing buildings to the newer (higher) developments. Specifically where the adjacent zoning is industrial, the buffer zone should be zoned light industrial and where the adjacent zoning is residential, we recommend intermediate mixed-use zoning in the buffer area.

2.15: We strongly recommend that the City take the opportunities provided by redevelopment to create affordable housing opportunities through the rezoning process, specifically in relation

to artists.

Local economy

2.16: In order to maintain and enhance the character of the high street component between Victoria and Nanaimo (Kamloops), we request that the City limit the size of storefronts to ensure the viability of small, independent businesses. This would not apply to Southside of Hastings from Commercial to Clarke.

See also: **2.10, 2.11**

- Maybe: small businesses, meat shops, grocery store; but those have to be encouraged: through zoning
- Theme for Hastings? Lots of restaurants; breweries;
- We want to keep Semlin - Nanaimo
- Width of storefronts (25-35ft) = ensuring mom/pop stores.

Services, amenities and other planning themes

2.17: We support the expansion of key Aboriginal services - Vancouver Aboriginal Friendship Centre, and Urban Native Youth Association. This is important due to the large Aboriginal population in Grandview-Woodland.

2.18: We expect the City to retain the space for arts and culture that the Waldorf provides. We would encourage the city to work with the Waldorf to study the possibility of visiting artist temporary living space. This would create a cultural corridor that would connect the Cultch, the Wise Hall, the York Theatre, and the Waldorf.

- We need to put more in the Waldorf

Remaining issues/recommendations:

- Parking going into industrial area. This falls under Cedar Cove but Hastings creates the problem
- Parking permits are good because you can get a space + bad because you have to pay. On the north side we can make sure it is only for industrial workers
- Really need to think about parking; when parking is challenging, people kill each other

General feedback from Hastings Tables

- Likes the increased in density along Hastings – street needs to be improved, would liked to see building staggered to let in light
- Connections between subareas that is the strong message that needs to be made
- Language in Hasting section on built form vague and wishy washy eg 2.12 – open to increases in height in future – this could open door to spot rezoning

Draft Map: Provided the conditions outlined in the recommendations above are met, this map illustrates the areas of change along Hastings Street over the next 30 years.

3.0 BRITANNIA-WOODLAND

DRAFT Preamble:

Britannia-Woodland is a sub-area in Grandview-Woodland that contains a substantial amount of rental and co-op housing stock and some of the most affordable rents in Vancouver. This is a valuable resource that a diverse (and sometimes vulnerable) population relies upon and builds their existence upon. Britannia-Woodland also contains bustling bicycle routes and crossroads, a thriving and creative light industrial district, and the community hub at Britannia.

With the following sub-area recommendations, we seek to preserve and maintain this existing community – and when possible, add to it.

Public realm & transportation

3.1: We recommend that the City improve the Mosaic Bikeway by ensuring a smooth, continuous surface; installing stop signs on all streets coming into the bikeway (except where traffic circles are present); and continuing streetscape improvements for year-round greenery.

- There should be less car access through Mosaic bikeway; safety concerns; restrict cars at intersections to prevent thoroughfare from Clark to Commercial; Woodland/Grant traffic restriction
- Support for stop sign at 4th and Woodland
- Suggestion of a 4 way stops at Grant and Woodland
- Traffic circles are not as effective as stop signs
- More indication is needed to tell drivers that they are coming up to bike routes
- What does bike route even mean? Mosaic is not fully a bike route.

3.2: We expect the City to complete the sidewalk network in Britannia-Woodland by ensuring there are sidewalks on every block, on both sides of the street.

3.3: We recommend that the City seek methods to return First Avenue to the neighbourhood by reducing traffic and prioritizing alternative modes of transportation (e.g. transit), and include in long-term planning the possibility of installing a tunnel under First Avenue for commuter traffic between Clark and Victoria (or further east).

- 1st Avenue should be slowed down, possibly by adding street parking; 1st divides the neighbourhood in half

- Support for tunnel (expressed by many); one suggested that perhaps the tunnel could coincide with the viaducts coming down

3.4: We expect the City to study the safety at Woodland Drive and Grandview Highway, and implement measures to improve safety within one year.

- Support for safer pedestrian crossing; more traffic control needed (expressed by many)
- Add specificity around Grandview/Woodland intersection: maybe a traffic light

3.5: We recommend that the City add an East-West bike route between First Avenue and the Britannia Centre that connects the Mosaic and Lakewood Bikeways (e.g. along Charles or William).

- Support for this and other bike lanes/routes (expressed by many)

3.6: We recommend that the City negotiate with Translink to add bus transit on First Avenue.

- Support for this and other bike lanes/routes (expressed by many)

3.7: We expect to be included in the consultation over the removal of the Georgia and Dunsmuir Viaducts.

3.8: We ask the City to create a bike route on Vernon Drive with connection to the Mosaic Bikeway.

3.9: We encourage the City to improve bike friendliness westward onto the Grandview Viaduct.

- Support for bike improvements (expressed by many)

3.10: We urge the City to develop a bike underpass along Grandview Highway under Clark Drive to complete the connection of the Central Valley Greenway to points west.

- Support expressed by many
- If underpass is too expensive and not forthcoming, make shorter-term changes (e.g. shorter wait at light on Clark)
- Clarity needed to the underpass plan at Grandview/Clark; redirect bike lane to 7th?

Housing & built form

3.11: Recognizing that the Britannia-Woodland sub-area contains a significant portion of Grandview-Woodland's affordable rental and co-op housing, we expect the City to prioritize retention of existing and new housing of these types in the sub-area.

- Support for this expressed

3.12: We expect the City to retain existing ratios of rental, co-op, and ownership units in the sub-area.

- Support for this expressed
- Support for maintaining proportions of rental and co-op housing
- Two expressed support for maintaining a diverse and affordable housing stock

3.13: We strongly recommend that the City maintain the existing RM4 height restrictions throughout the Britannia-Woodland sub-area.

- Several expressed that they are content with current height restrictions, including on 1st Avenue
- Two participants supported flexibility for height, especially on 1st Avenue; one commented that height could slope upwards on 1st with more height close to Commercial and less nearer to Clark
- How do we encourage bringing height up to 4 stories?
- This seems to contradict 3.14

3.14: We urge the City to amend the RM4 zoning to allow the infill or additions to existing buildings to a floor space ratio from 1.45 up to 2.00, so as to allow for greater density in existing housing stock.

- Support for this expressed
- For environmental reasons, we should promote improvements to existing housing stock/redevelopment/infill, rather than new development
- One participant said that parking is getting worse and worse, and this will only get worse with more density; support for density so long as more parking is made available – such as through underground parking
- Another countered that it is preferable to limit parking and cars; make it harder for people to use cars to discourage their use and encourage shift to greener transportation
- Another countered that underground parking spaces are often not used
- Density along the cut may be seismically unstable (earthquake risk)
- One participant expressed that single family houses are out of reach for most young people and that there needs to be more affordable ownership options in the neighbourhood

3.15: We urge the City to amend the RM4 zoning to allow for single family dwellings with two long-term rental suites, so as to allow for greater density.

- Support for this expressed

3.16: We urge the City to institute design guidelines to allow for a variety of styles of buildings with various shapes and materials. We urge the City to limit lot assembly to ensure there is not a continuous corridor of buildings, with a preference for 2 lot assemblage and a maximum of 3 lots, except in cases of new co-op or non-market rental housing.

- Design guidelines need more specificity

Services, amenities and other planning themes

3.17: We recommend that the City retain the position of the live-in custodian in Woodland Park.

3.18: We support the revitalization of the Britannia Community Services Centre, which is widely regarded as the ‘heart’ of both the sub-area and Grandview-Woodland. We are pleased that the Centre has been identified to receive renewal funds in the next Capital Plan, and encourage the City to upgrade the complex by improving way-finding, building newer/modern facilities, ‘greening’ the facility, and better integrating it into the surrounding neighbourhood. We recommend that the City extensively consult with the community in the renewal of the Britannia Community Services Centre.

- Britannia Centre improvements: hope the push goes through
- More permanent community gardens at Britannia Centre
- Stronger language around improving Britannia Centre

3.19: We recommend that the City consider the following from the sub area workshops:

- Recognition of First Nations’ culture and history is needed in the sub-area.
- There is strong support for improving local First Nations’ services and programs, in consultation with the First Nations community.
- There is support for improvements to Clark and Venables public realm – trees/greenery, lighting, safer pedestrian and cycling crossings. Related to this, there is also support for improving the seam/transition where industrial and residential areas meet (e.g. along Odlum, McLean, and Adanac).
 - Support for improvement of transition between industrial and residential along Clark
 - There should be transitional zoning in the ‘seam’: more “artisan” than “artist”, more multi-use than the older-style of industrial use, residential/rentals above

offices which are both above industry (many expressed support for this)

- Support for mixed use along Clark; office spaces, restrictions on residential development, hope to keep it retail/office/artist work space above the initial level of industry
- Walking space along Clark, to go with mixed use
- Woodland, Alice Townley and Mosaic Parks are all valued community assets. There is support for park renewal and improvements (including new equipment, seating, a greater variety of uses/activities).
 - More emphasis on Woodland, Alice Townley and Mosaic park renewal and improvements (this deserves its own point)
- Grandview Elementary (and aspects of the Grandview Cut) were identified by a number of participants as a possible 'hub' for the community – with some discussion regarding public realm improvements in this area, and with priority given to food security and greenspace.
 - This is not very substantive; this could be clarified
 - More housing diversity in the area could help Grandview Elementary
- There was general interest in additional community gardens and fruit trees.
- Mountain views are highly valued – preserve these wherever possible. Use sub-area's slopes to maximize views and minimize 'wall' effect.
- There is strong support for preserving the brick surface of Francis Street as an aspect of local heritage.
- There is general agreement that additional density should be targeted to new rental units, as opposed to strata/condos (ownership). In addition, participants noted agreement that more seniors-oriented and family-oriented housing is needed in the sub-area.
 - Add co-ops here
- There is broad and general support for the sub-area's role in the cultural economy – with particular focus on the presence of arts studios in industrial areas. There is support for additional cultural production space in these areas.
 - Change language from "broad support" to "we urge"
- There is interest in the creation of smaller laneway market space near Commercial Drive (e.g. for artisans or other micro-businesses).
 - Much support expressed for this

General feedback from Britannia-Woodland tables:

- No to the Malkin connector overpass
- No more parking meters
- There was an sense of futility around the improvements that would cost a lot, and discouragement of including projects that lacked a chance to be fulfilled
- Enhance relations between First Nations community and settlers community
- Keep the conversation going after this Assembly is finished
- Sub-area's recommendations lack ambition
- New development also means new people that want to join the neighbourhood; there needs to be more room to breathe
- There should be a parkade around Venables and Commercial
- One person supported height/tower at Venables and Commercial
- Another person commented that there is not enough supported housing in the Boffo/Kettle proposal
- The City should facilitate affordable, non-market housing
- The City should not impose peaked roofs; we should shift away from the perception that we need to reproduce a bygone era's architectural style
- Want more density on 1st from Commercial to Clark

Draft Map: Provided the conditions outlined in the recommendations above are met, this map illustrates the areas of change in Britannia-Woodland over the next 30 years.

4.0 GRANDVIEW

Draft Preamble:

The heritage and character of the neighborhood is well represented by Grandview. Grandview includes a significant portion of residential housing and heritage buildings. It is crossed West-East by a main arterial, 1st Avenue and North-South by a secondary arterial, Victoria Drive.

Our aim with these recommendations is to expand rental and ownership opportunities alongside 1st Avenue, encourage gentle densification in all other parts of Grandview, preserve heritage assets, improve our parks and make our streets safer for everybody.

- LIKE: “preserve heritage assets”
- Victoria drive is not a secondary arterial. It is a neighborhood collector. Wording needs to change.

Public realm & transportation

4.1: Victoria Drive lacks sufficient safe crosswalks. We expect the City to improve the safety of intersections along Victoria Drive by ensuring that all crossings are well-designed for visibility, lighting and pedestrian, vehicle and bicycle movement, specifically at the intersections of:

- East 7th: implement a pedestrian-activated crossing, additional lighting and an improvement of site-lines
- William Street: implement pedestrian crossing at William and Victoria due to the food traffic because of the local businesses
- Venables: study measures to improve safety
- Adanac: cyclist and pedestrian-activated crosswalk
- LIKE: Improve the safety of intersections in Victoria Drive. Addressing safety at the corner of Venables and Victoria Drive. School zone, needs reduced speed.
- Propose an improvement in pedestrian routes in the neighborhood/walkable neighborhood. Sidewalk inconsistencies (no sidewalks, no ramps). Include more measures regarding walkability and safety.
- Study the traffic calming and speed limits in the area, to make improvements/or additions. Traffic calming between 1st and Broadway, and Nanaimo and Victoria. Also Lakewood.
- Improve traffic/road safety at Victoria.
- Address parking at Victoria and William corner, especially during weekends. Lots of congestion. Increase signage.
- Focus on 1st Avenue between Clark and Nanaimo.
- Improve safety around school zones/intersections.

4.2: We recommend that the City creates new parks and micro parks which could include areas adjacent to bike lanes and greenways because Grandview-Woodland has 60% less parks and open spaces than the city wide average (0.4 ha per 1000 residents compared to 1.1 ha per 1000 residents city wide). For example, the City should consider acquiring properties (such as the Telus building, Victoria and East Georgia) to convert them to parks or greenspace.

- If you are to make micro parks adjacent to bike lanes, ensure that it is respectful of people who live there and that it won't create a noise nuisance.
- Increased call for parks – or better use of existing parks. Victoria Park is underdeveloped (only 1/3) and often not useable due to drinking near Victoria. Habitual users prevent family use. Increase policing? Victoria Park needs to be cleaned up.
- Use of St. Francis' church land as park? City could negotiate.
- Rose St. church lands are unused. Green space that the city could use better/more.
- LIKE: "recommend micro parks." Should use micro-park at Napier and Salsbury as a good example. It has a small book library bracketed by two benches. Perfect for walkers to sit, read, and maybe meet a neighbor. Need only be 10' by 10'.
- LIKE: Improving park infrastructure. People end up using school grounds due to the lack of park amenities.

4.3: The City needs to address the lack of biodiversity in parks (McSpadden, Templeton, Salsbury) by incorporating habitat spaces to encourage a wide range of flora that reflects our local environment and attract local fauna such as, birds, bees, butterflies etc.

- LIKE: Increase biodiversity in existing park.

4.4: We request that the City plant more trees where appropriate to provide shade, specifically for the playground at Templeton Park.

- LIKE: Planting trees at Templeton Park. Creation of new parks/Increase biodiversity in existing ones and improve infrastructure like lighting, garbage bins, etc.

4.5: We request that the City increase recreational infrastructure to expand opportunities for play for all ages. For instance, we recommend a pump track at Templeton Park and outdoor fitness circuit in McSpadden. Existing amenities, such as Templeton pool, should be maintained.

- LIKE: Increasing outdoor recreational spaces.
- LIKE: Increasing play structures for children, since there are lots of families in the area.
- LIKE: Improve existing Templeton Community Centre.

4.6: We encourage the City to explore an additional East-West bike route in the south end of Grandview to fill in the gap in the cycling network.

- Provide more details about cycling infrastructure.
- Create greenways – with the bike routes that connect the neighborhood with other areas.
- Re-route Lakewood bike route at 6th Avenue over to Templeton Dr. because of grade and safety issue of speeding, etc. There are no stop signs between Broadway and 1st. Cars circulate very fast, despite being a 30km/h zone.
- If there is a bike lane at Commercial Dr., there is no need for another one on Victoria Dr. Don't forget there is another already at Lakewood (i.e. overkill). There is already trouble with traffic, and having an excessive network of bike lanes will worsen it.

4.7: We request that the City add lighting, garbage and recycling bins and signage at all parks.

- LIKE: Improve infrastructure like lighting, garbage bins, etc.

4.8: We request the City to address drainage issues at McSpadden and Salsbury parks to ensure they can be used all year round.

4.9: We urge the City to explore opportunities for the placement of local art in public spaces like parks and plazas to express the character of the neighborhood and promote local artists.

4.10: The City should explore the possibility of off-peak parking on 1st for the convenience of local residents.

- Bad idea for traffic. Traffic is already a big problem and over time it will tend to increase or remain the same. Where will all of those vehicles go? It makes more sense to increase density and liberate space to have more street lanes.
- Both groups expressed explicit support for all the articles up to this point that deal with parks and that according to the groups reflect the request of the previous subarea workshops, and more specific support for the pool

Housing & built form

4.11: To maintain the neighborhood character and preserve heritage assets, we recommend that the City keep the current zoning.

- LIKE: Heritage/character retention. However, how do we make sure we maintain that? How to make it happen?
- Which character are we talking about? Need to make it more explicit.

- Duplex (2 ½ duplexes). Only thing allowed if the house is torn down is the building of 2 NEW half duplexes for sale for ~ 1 MILLION! Many 3-4 storey houses are being torn down, changing the character of the area. Allowing to have rental suites on basements and attics would help increase density, without increasing height and changing the character. Keeping the same zoning regulations will continue to move people out of the neighborhood.
- Encourage residents to change existing zoning. Keeping zoning as it is risks de-densifying the neighborhood over time.
- New wording: We recommend the City maintain the neighborhood character and preserve heritage assets, specifically to protect the current buildings and accommodations of all varieties and maintain access to all level of affordability.
- Although most participants were quite vocal against densification, one participant suggested to change all duplex zoning to multifamily (up to 5 units)

4.12: We suggest that the City study the opportunity to have additional density with the following conditions: no more than 3 storeys and no land assembly to avoid too drastic a change to the neighborhood character.

- Subdividing large lots into smaller ones. This would allow keeping existing cute little character homes and be an alternative to duplexes.
- The proposed density is too little. The neighborhood needs to densify more for the future, as population will increase. If there is not enough densification, people will be forced to move out and people who want to move in, will not be able too. More housing options are needed. No single family houses should exist so close to the city core. Do not reject land assemblies upfront in all cases. Maybe co-ops and rental housing can benefit from land assemblies.
- The only way of increasing affordability is to increase density and diversity of housing options.
- In other parts of the city there have been laneway consolidations and work fine. This allows increasing density too.
- Limit densification around parks, which are already crowded areas.
- 6 storey limit?

4.13: We recommend that the City look at potential modifications to single-family and duplex zoning in Grandview with a view to:

- Encouraging strata ownership reduces the rental pool

- Retaining heritage assets
 - LIKE: Character retention.
- Enabling laneway, coach house or infill housing
 - LIKE: Allowing coach houses. Allowing laneways in RT-4 zoning.
 - LIKE: Good idea to consider development of coach houses. They can be for rental or for sale. Avoid tearing down existing homes to build duplexes and re-work what is currently there.
 - delete “coach house or infill”
 - change in “laneway OR duplex zoning”
 - clarify and differentiate between rental (laneway) zoning or infill (strata) zoning
- Expanding ownership opportunities to create an array of housing opportunities that respects the character of the neighborhood.
 - What does the third bullet point mean? The devil is in the details, be more specific

4.14: We recommend additional density along 1st Avenue / East of Commercial given the following criteria:

- LIKE: Increase density on 1st Avenue.
- Allow basements and attics. “Fourplexes” and other forms of stratified buildings, which retain character and increase density.
- Be careful of not missing the opportunity to have other small pockets of higher density in other areas (townhouses, for instance).
- A maximum height of 4 storeys with consideration of shadowing adjacent properties on the north side of 1st to ensure height-consistency with the rest of the neighborhood;
 - LIKE: I support the inclusion of density and height transition zones around 1st and Broadway. There should be ~3 storey townhomes, duplexes, laneways, and coach houses. North and south of 1st, between Nanaimo and Commercial. South of Broadway, between Commercial and Nanaimo to ~7th Avenue. The City and residents need to have increased housing choices. Not having transition zones takes away a great opportunity to increase density and housing choices, as well as the opportunity to enhance the public realm in the area.

- 4 storey is too high, it will bring too much density when taking into account the increase in density that is proposed to happen along Nanaimo, Broadway, and Victoria. Residents within this perimeter will be boxed in creating through ****traffic**** (NOTE: *unsure, illegible*) issues.
- 4 storey is okay for commercial nodes, but keep it up to 3 in intermediate areas (i.e. height transition).
- 4 story zoning on 1st Avenue is not a good idea.
 - **Reason 1:** No bus service (and very hard to establish on 1st). Especially eastern reach is too far to walk to Commercial for many. Currently, 1st is not an ideal corridor for walkability.
 - **Reason 2:** Many blocks have narrow lots, making height difference harder to transition.
 - **Reason 3:** Existing alleys already congested and unsafe; cannot accommodate more traffic.
 - **Reason 4:** Impacts to views/shading on neighboring lots.
 - **Reason 5:** Not consistent with character if the neighborhood (unlike West of Commercial, where nearby lots are multi-storey too).
 - **Note:** These issues have been raised by local residents constantly, and none of the feedback is reflected.
 - **Please consider:** Rowhouses or ground-oriented townhouses (limit to 2 ½ stories); limit apartment/townhose zoning to between Commercial and Victoria (where it probably makes sense); if it is not going to change, at least rezone neighboring lots (2nd, Graveley) to allow for proper transitions.
- To preserve heritage assets and to provide lots of rental housing, allow existing homes to put suites in attics and basements. There you get 4 stories with a variety of rentals.
- Find gentler form of densification (i.e. row houses and ground-oriented densification).
- Make it clear which areas will be 4 stories and which areas should be ground-oriented).
- Risk that if the plan allows 4 stories, there will be a trend to actually have 4 storey buildings, as opposed to trying to find alternative ways of densifying that better preserve the character (such as ground-oriented options). Ideally, there should not be buildings, but townhouses and row houses.
- The consideration of mostly townhouses and, if appropriate, apartments to ensure a building form that fits with the neighbourhood character;
- The development in the area should include a minimum of 30% rental units to ensure the cultural and economic diversity of the community;

- Development permits should be restricted to maintain existing heritage buildings, in order to ensure to preserve the character of the community;
- To ensure visual diversity in housing types along 1st Avenue, the City should use tools such as limits on land assembly and design guidelines
 - One group suggested to introduce provisions to limit demolitions, for example change development permits in “demolition permits”
 - Change in: “use tools to limit land assemblies to a maximum of 3 lots”
 - The problem is that most buildings in GW are not designated as heritage. The second group suggested that instead any demolition of residential building should justify why demolition is preferable with respect renovation and refurbishment.
- Change the limit to 3 storeys to make it consistent to 4.12
- Introduce a gradual increase in height. First two storeys, the 3 storeys. Do not switch abruptly to 3.
- Provide incentives (subsidies or easier access to permit) to maintain/expand/renovate current buildings.
- Provide incentives to not tear down buildings and instead use existing materials to renovate. Current policies are not environmentally sustainable because they promote the tear down of buildings and they do not promote recycling.
- One participant recommended including off peak parking on 1st Avenue, it would have the additional advantage of slowing down traffic during off peak hours.
- 1st bullet point: stronger language is needed or the recommendation will be useless. For example shadowing consideration should enter the development approval process
- Approve of the spirit of the recommendation to increase densification on 1st Ave

Local economy

4.11: We recommend that the City maintain and extend small scale retail along Victoria Drive by allowing non residential space on new developments. Frontage should be limited to 33 feet to encourage small-scale local businesses.

- LIKE: Expanding small retail along Victoria Drive
- Retail on Victoria limited to small scale that fits with existing building form

Draft Map: Provided the conditions outlined in the recommendations above are met, this map illustrates the areas of change in Grandview over the next 30 years.

General feedback from Grandview tables:

Public realm & transportation

- Focus on opening east-west traffic flow through Grandview.
- East-west connection to downtown.
- Widen 1st Avenue/Add density to address this.
- A new bike lane was drawn on the map, it goes from north to south. It is a dedicated lane only on commercial.
- One group added numerous traffic calming recommendations, see the map. Most of them are a rotatory (circle) and not a diverter. Only one diverter has been added and is signaled in the map. Locations:
 - Lakewood + Venables (circle)
 - Traffic median along Nanaimo should be extended across Venables to cover the lane between Venables and Parker
 - On third, past Queen Victoria School. This location is quite dangerous at peak hours. Crosswalk is not enough. Add a circle.
 - On second ave + ? (see map)
 - 1st +Victoria intersection
- Pedestrian activated crosswalks are dangerous and should be avoided. They promote people running stop signs, they should be substituted with more traditional cross-walk or with flashing yellow lights.
- How are cyclist going to get from commercial south of 1st over to Salsbury bike route?
- Lower speed limit to 30 Km/h in the entire area.

Housing & built form

- Ensure different models of density/ownership of housing for the neighborhood.
- Allow more density in the entire neighborhood.
- It is important to redevelop 1st between Commercial and Garden Dr.
- Up-zone RT-4 to RT-5 or allow more density and options for existing homes.

- Up-zone RS-1 to RT-4.
- Consider RT11/10 stratified housing.
- Allow secondary suites in duplexes.
- Explore other land tenure options.
- Relax land assembly rules for co-ops.
- Have to increase density to keep neighborhood diversity – young people can't afford homes. We need ground oriented options, 2/3 bedroom options, social housing, co-ops. single family homes reinforce the generational divide.
- Consider entertaining non-conforming duplex?
- Encouraging narrower lots?
- It would be challenging to add non-residential space along particularly densely populated areas – parking becomes highly challenging and dangerous to pedestrians.
- No mention of importance/presence of schools in the area.
- When increasing density, be careful of building houses that look like boxes in order to maximize the use of building footprint.
- Two groups expressed concerns with regard the fact that the yellowed area in the northeast of the map is not discussed in the document. The representative of the citizens' assembly told the groups that there is an ongoing discussion with regard a gradual increase in densification that will achieve 4 storeys on the North side of Pender. Both groups were against such project. The limit identified by the groups is 3 storeys in the North side of Pender, while no change should occur in the rest of the area.
- Two groups expressed concern with regard the removal of the “fingers” from the Grandview sub-area. In their opinion the fingers should be considered part of grand-view and thus should remain as RS7 zoning and not become 4 storeys townhouses. This concern was already expressed in the previous subarea workshop and is contained in the document at pag. 7 #f.
- Two groups felt that while the parks section of the document reflects the subarea recommendation, the housing section of the document is not developed enough and does not reflect enough the subarea workshops recommendations.
- When building or enlarging a suite the homeowner should be allowed a higher FSR, say from 0.6 to 0.75. At the same time the city would, through the permit process, ensure that the existing character of the neighborhood is maintained. This approach is less

disruptive than large building projects and would likely results in more affordable rental units.

- One for one rate of change regulations should be for all different suites. This would retain (or help retain) rental in the area
- Beautify laneway houses
- Gentle densification: laneways, coach houses within the neighborhood.

Process

- Show the connection between neighborhoods, to see the BIG PICTURE picture of the area!!
- Concern regarding the sub-area workshops summary: since the demographics of workshop participants were not representative of the neighborhood population as a whole (i.e. 64% respondents between 55-74 years old; 82% property owners; 19% have lived in GW for 19.1 years; etc.), that document is not reliable and should not be the only source informing the development of the sub-area recommendations.
- Two groups requested more specific details and examples. They feared that without specific details the recommendations will be weak.
- Two groups requested stronger language, that moves the wording of the plan from “begging” language (4.2 we recommend, 4.3 needs to address, 4.4 & 4.5 & 4.7 & 4.8 request, 4.6 encourage, 4.9 urge, 4.10 should explore), to “rights” language that express the strength of the voice of the community (we expect that, we direct the city to, the city must). Broadway and commercial uses such language, the entire document should do the same. The language should be consistent. Less vague.
- One group recommended to have a final opportunity to give feedback ONLINE. I.e. when the document is close to its final stage post it online so that people can comment on the wording.
- There should be a better acknowledgement of what recommendations from the subarea workshops are shared by a majority of the group of participants, and those that instead are supported by one person. The participants noticed that the summaries provided to the assembly misrepresent the majority opinion of the people at the table during the previous subarea workshop. It is important to add a weight to the voiced opinions. The presence of disagreement might reflect 50/50 split or 90/10 split, it is important that such information is not lost or the assembly will risk to overemphasize minority opinions. The participants criticized the fact that the document described certain point of discussion as contentious, when in their opinion there was at most one person voicing a doubt against an overwhelming majority opinion. In general they detect that this system is used to undermine community claims against densification.

- No spot rezoning allowed for 10 years for the entire neighborhood. After such ten years spot rezoning allowed only if the community is consulted.

5.0 NANAIMO

Draft Preamble:

Recognizing that Nanaimo is currently a designated truck route we have decided that gradual development of mixed use buildings along Nanaimo Street would best balance competing uses of the area. Mixed-use buildings would include office, retail, services and resident friendly combined buildings, including live/work spaces to a maximum of four stories (with the exception of 6 stories allowed at Broadway and Nanaimo). Gradual change will build out from the existing Commercial nodes at Hastings, Broadway, Charles and First. The focus on changes is to improve the walkability, accessibility, and livability for residents in the area. We expect this change will be gradual and in keeping with the existing character of the neighbourhood.

Public realm & transportation

5.1: We recommend that traffic calming speed limits and enhanced intersections should be aligned with school walking routes, for example, between Kitchener and Williams and Venables and East Georgia. The goal is to ensure children are safe as they walk to school.

- Implementation of traffic calming between 1st and Broadway
- Traffic calming between 1st and Broadway at night too
- Another participant said traffic on Nanaimo is not a problem and doesn't bother her at all
- LIKE: traffic calming
- Traffic circles on the side streets (@ 8th/Garden, 7th/Garden etc.)

5.2: We strongly recommend that the City of Vancouver increase speed limit monitoring and enforcement along Nanaimo (recognizing that it is a designated truck route).

- Not strong enough to ensure that Nanaimo is made more pedestrian friendly. Make Nanaimo less of a barrier between GW and Hastings-Sunrise – use a median.
- Crossing Nanaimo is dangerous
- Traffic lights – can they coincide with bus stops? Crossing is an issue. People run across the street to catch a bus when they could be using lights.

5.3: We urge the City of Vancouver to reassess traffic flow and traffic lights with the aim of increasing the number of controlled traffic lights, especially the corridor between Hastings and Grandview. The purpose of this is to slow traffic.

5.4: We request that the City provide increased support for pedestrian routes around and on Nanaimo to improve neighbourhood safety and health. This would include improved sidewalks and maintenance, small green spaces and benches, and well lit pathways.

- Pedestrian safety should be further stressed, especially at the Nanaimo and Broadway intersection.

5.5: We ask the City to encourage use and development of trees, small parks and green spaces along Nanaimo in order to help limit noise and pollution and increase walkability. Specifically we recommend trees along both sides of Nanaimo.

- Fully support the development of Nanaimo to enhance its public realm and traffic safety
- Connections to the street are important

5.6: We encourage the City to use traffic calming techniques such as roundabouts and speed bumps rather than traffic barricades/diverters in streets adjacent to Nanaimo.

- Suggestion that the intersection of Lakewood and Broadway is dangerous for children and should be better monitored.
- Suggestion for more traffic circles along Lakewood between 1st and Broadway.
- Participants suggested synchronizing traffic lights along Nanaimo to force traffic to obey speed limits.
- Suggestion for a median boulevard on Nanaimo north of 1st Avenue to slow traffic and beautify the street.
- There was concern about traffic at the intersection of Charles and Nanaimo:
 - Is it possible to ban left turns onto Charles at rush hour to discourage commuter traffic?
 - Can the intersection be widened to give motorists turning onto Nanaimo more room/ increase visibility?
 - Possible addition of a crosswalk at that intersection for people coming from bus stop.
- This recommendation is moving backwards [there was no further explanation for this]
- Ensure there is traffic calming around Garden Park

5.7: We support the neighbourhood wide recommendation for intra-neighbourhood shuttle services.

Housing & built form

5.8: Recognizing Nanaimo Street is currently a designated truck route, we recommend new development of only mixed use buildings to balance the competing uses of the area. We recommend office, retail, services, and resident friendly combined buildings (including live/work

spaces) to a maximum of 4 stories. This will allow for a senior-friendly neighbourhood with accessibility and aging-in-place, and ensure it is coherent with the wider Grandview-Woodland community.

- Participants at the roundtable argued that planning development to accommodate the fact that Nanaimo is a designated truck route was misguided. They observed that truck traffic on Nanaimo has already been significantly calmed (no cargo trucks etc). Participants noted that the issue of trucks did not come up at the Community Workshop for the neighbourhoods and that concern about speed and volume of traffic was the main issue discussed there. In addition, participants were disappointed that there was wholesale rezoning of the entire street that did not reflect the recommendation of the sub-area workshops or previous community campaigns.
- The first group of participants was firmly against re-zoning Nanaimo for mixed-use and argued that new commercial business spaces created this way would not be filled because of a lack of demand. Instead, the participants of the first group argued that existing nodes at E Broadway and Nanaimo, 1st and Nanaimo and E Pender and Nanaimo should be maintained/expanded and zoned for mixed use and commercial purposes. (There was disagreement between the two groups as to whether Pender and Nanaimo should be developed commercially or left as residential. The first group argued for maintaining residential zoning because of close proximity to existing businesses, while the second group suggested that a commercial node was needed there.)
- Participants suggested instead that 2-3 story townhomes would be appropriate for some parts of Nanaimo (lots facing Nanaimo) and that single-family residential zoning is appropriate elsewhere and that lots not facing Nanaimo should be left as residential.
- The height of new buildings at the existing commercial nodes should be restricted to 3-4 stories and height allowances should take into account the topographical grades of Nanaimo (ie. height allowances should be further restricted at Garden Park and surrounding area to preserve views).
- The second group of participants was more open to rezoning for mixed-use but also agreed that the development of existing commercial nodes (outlined above) should be prioritized.
- Regarding the existing commercial node at Charles and Nanaimo, there was a proposal to downgrade (rezone) the currently unused commercially zoned lot back to residential.
- Eliminate truck route designation on Nanaimo
- Mixed-use is likely to become a dead zone. The dead zone already exists at Charles and
- Nanaimo and it's not working
- Skeptical about Nanaimo as a 'high street', many businesses won't be financially viable.

New built form should be respectful of current occupants and be mindful of surrounding single-

family stock, particularly with respect to shadowing in views, and allow for sensitive transitions to lower density neighbourhoods. Change should be inclusive, gradual and resident-friendly.

- Participants suggested that re-zoning and height allowances should be planned according to the alley orientation of lots in order to avoid shadowing. Lots with North/South alleyways would be suitable for development of 3-4 story buildings. Lots with East/West alleyways are not suitable for this kind of development and any potential rezoning should be sensitive to this issue (“where appropriate” standard for rezoning).
- Maximum height should be 3 stories (with very few exceptions), not 4
- Some participants are okay with some increase in residential density (preference for 2-3 storey townhouses) – and only on Garden, not around the parks
- 4-stories max by Broadway and Nanaimo
- No more than 4 stories at Broadway and Nanaimo
- Supports the idea of increased density along Nanaimo for mixed-use 4-5 storey buildings near the commercial nodes (Broadway, 1st, Charles). Supports the idea of 3-4 storey mixed use or residential in between the nodes. What is missing in the proposal is increased density between Nanaimo → Garden and Kamloops to 2-3 storey residential housing which would allow for greater transition to RS-1 zoning
- LIKE: increased density – gradual transition from 4-stories to RS-1
- Limit height on the west side of Nanaimo between 1st and Broadway to 2-stories – due to shadow factor of high grade. Or no increase in height at all.
- Between 6th and Graveley, there’s a hill – view preservation is important
- Grade changes from Garden to Nanaimo – be mindful of height, a low-storey building can appear really high if it’s built on a hill

5.9: We recommend the City increase setbacks along Nanaimo to ensure safety, walkability, multi-use access, community engagement and allow for potential future development of greenways.

- Make sure to offset back from the road if 3-stories are built on Nanaimo
- Setbacks should not be uniform along Nanaimo
- Encourage more setbacks for new developments – upper levels should be terrace-style with additional setbacks at higher levels. Prevent developers from using up the entire footprint of the site. Leave walking area, and have less uniformity between setbacks on different sites – prevent the ‘canyon effect’

5.10: We urge the City to institute design guidelines to allow for a variety of styles of buildings with various shapes and materials. We urge the City to limit lot assembly to ensure there is not a continuous corridor of buildings with a preference to 2 lot assemblage and a maximum of 3 lot.

- Participants suggested that a 3 lot assembly was too large for the neighbourhood and suggested capping lot assembly at 2.
- No big lot stores – development should mirror the Drive with small storefronts that keep the neighbourhood feel
- Restrict land assembly to 2-lots, maximum 3 but only Nanaimo
- Likes the 3-lot maximum for assembly, but if something really makes sense at a node for something larger, don't discourage it
- Consider 'stepping down' density mid-block from Nanaimo east and west so there is a reasonable and appropriate transition from 3-4 storey buildings on Nanaimo to mid-block
- Do not chop up a block
- No block splitting
- Keep with the character of the neighbourhood
- Terraced 4th floor with setback preferred
- Separation of commercial from residential is done well around the 2200 block of Nanaimo. SF residents are looking at other residences so it's actually okay even if they're looking at people's balconies. If residents are looking at a blank wall – that's design that isn't done well. Oak Street has townhouses that have small yards and fences – that would be okay to live next to as a SF resident.

5.11: Before the City considers any variances the community must be consulted.

- Participants expressed concern that the residents on the East side of Nanaimo had not been consulted and that planning development of Nanaimo without first seeing the development of Hastings-Sunrise was misguided.
- Similarly, participants argued that blocks west of Nanaimo were part of the Grandview neighbourhood.
- In addition, participants expressed disappointment that the Citizens' Assembly had not been provided with the "Friends of Garden Park" petition or summary background information produced in the summer of 2013. The lack of sharing of existing

community-collected information and resources (petitions, data) with the Citizens' Assembly was raised as an issue and described as 'dishonest'.

5.12: We encourage the City to support a building typology that addresses livability with each unit having a quiet side.

- It was unclear what a 'quiet side' is.
- In addition to this, the land side of the building should present a 'friendly face' to the houses across the lane (unlike at Charles and Nanaimo)
- Where density increases, use row houses and ground-oriented townhouses

5.13: New built form should be respectful of current occupants and be mindful of surrounding single-family stock and allow for sensitive transitions to lower-density neighbourhoods. Change should be inclusive and residential friendly.

- Participants suggested that stronger language was needed here to make sure that new residential buildings fit the neighbourhood character. In regard to this, participants were concerned about allowing 3 story buildings – with basement suites and high ceilings – would mean that the new buildings are actually far larger than existing older homes.
- More concrete 'design guidelines' were needed for mixed residential buildings and mixed use buildings in commercial nodes.
- In addition, suggestion to look at form and height of buildings together to make sure that they fit neighbourhood.
- Transitioning and sensitivity to existing homes is very important. Recommendation is to have residential facing residential instead of residential facing commercial.
- One person living behind the marijuana shop has people smoking pot on the other side of her fence

5.14: Before the City considers any development the community must be consulted within the walkability radius (ie 10 blocks).

- In areas surrounding existing commercial nodes, participants suggested that the current residents be consulted in the form of surveys as to whether they were in favour of rezoning and the potential tax increase.
- Really likes this one
- No consultation has been done with residents on the east side of Nanaimo – no change until this has happened

Local economy

5.15: We expect that commercial development reflect the needs of the community, providing a variety of services and amenities in a sustainable manner ie. smaller storefronts, local jobs and independent shops and services, to increase walkability, accessibility and support aging-in-place. The focus of local economy should be on the needs of residents.

- Participants suggested that this language was too vague. For example, instead of “smaller storefronts”, the recommendations should suggest a maximum square footage.
- This commercial development should be limited to existing commercial nodes.

Services, amenities and other planning themes

5.16: We recommend the city undertake an “Active and Safe Routes to School Plan” for Lord Nelson and Templeton.

Draft Map: Provided the conditions outlined in the recommendations above are met, this map illustrates the areas of change along Nanaimo Street over the next 30 years.

- Many participants at the roundtable found the maps difficult to read due to the style of font ('written marker' font) chosen and colour blocking (orange and red too close to identify differences).

General Feedback from Nanaimo tables:

- There should be no increased density in the fingers parks and school. Participants were disappointed to see that the finger development was left in the recommendations after broad consensus was established during the community workshop against densification of this area.

Development around the Parks

- Keep current zoning around the 3 parks off of Nanaimo
- Do not add multi-storey developments around the parks
- Lord Nelson is the only open green space in my area and I go there twice a day. I support not increasing density, height or mass on the periphery to maintain the sense of openness (view, horizon, sky). Same for Templeton and Garden Parks.
- No 4-storey condos or townhouses around the parks
- Leave Templeton and Garden Parks as they are – keep the fingers as they are
- No townhouses around the parks or fingers
- See the Garden Park community recommendations that were collected by the resident group Friends of Garden Park
- Remove townhouses from Garden Park – too much neighbourhood resistance
- Height will destroy the views around the parks, no development
- Preference for duplexes and laneway houses in this area
- Preference for infill as an alternative to condos and vertical development
- Wants to prevent 'canyon effect'

Laneways

- There must be a lane between any new development and an established home

- Laneways behind commercial development should be improved/widened to make sure there's enough of a buffer between commercial and residential.

Zoning

- Do not include North-South facing blocks in any zoning changes
- Keep the nodes as they are – no extensions
- Re-zoning of properties that face Nanaimo only
- If re-zoning, only change blocks with an E-W orientation
- Don't encourage commercial away from the nodes
- Allow for redevelopment of non mixed-use housing
- 3-stories mixed use at Nanaimo and 1st towards Broadway 6th-8th
- No spot re-zoning until a review of rezoning process has been done to be more transparent and inclusive of the community
- Transition around the nodes is okay, but generally no change is preferred
- Changes should be limited to only Nanaimo as the arterial, everything else should be left alone
- Reluctance for continued mixed-use between nodes, preference is for townhouses instead
- Keep existing zoning and maximize development within that
- Don't want to see 'canyon effect'. Don't want to see boxes of stores that end up being empty

Increasing Density

- Generally there is an understanding for the need, but arguments over how much need there is, and whether proposals (even lower buildings and infill) will achieve what's necessary
- Mixed-use won't achieve affordable housing goals, won't achieve density
- Mixed-use won't block the noise (although no agreement on whether noise is an issue for Nanaimo)

- City can provide more options for living, and the increased density will help to increase the choice available, but there should still be transitions into the neighbourhood
- Reducing density around the park and along the fingers, and need for more gradual transition

Process

- Radical disconnect between what people said and the reports/arrangements that get presented
- Some people felt that the City misrepresented/miscommunicated what was captured in the notes along the way – that there was a hidden agenda. At the Wise Hall sub-area workshop on Nanaimo, the City even misrepresented there during the presentation
- People/residents are engaged too late in the process – the process is problematic, and residents should be engaged much earlier, before any decisions are made

6.0: COMMERCIAL DRIVE

Draft Preamble:

We consider Commercial Drive to be the “heartland” of the Grandview-Woodland neighbourhood. It contains the elements that make the area unique, diversified, and accepting, and we want to maintain that ambience. We also want to create opportunities for growth of the local economy while encouraging the continued existence of fine-grained retail and diversity of building form.

- Possible re-wording: “We consider Commercial Drive to be the “heart” of the Grandview-Woodland neighbourhood. It contains the elements that make the area unique, diversified, and accepting, and we want to maintain that ambience. We also want to create opportunities to support and sustain the local economy while encouraging the continued existence of small-scale / independent retail and diversity of building form”.
- Change “heartland” or “heartbeat” to “heart”
- Questions about how growth of local economy will be interpreted; suggestion to write instead “to support and sustain the local economy”
- Questions about the meaning of “fine-grained retail”; suggestion to explain instead that the CA means: “small-scale, independent retail”

Public realm & transportation

6.1: We believe the City should introduce safe bike-lanes (e.g., Union St.) on Commercial Drive from 14th Ave. to Graveley St. (Not full consensus)

- There was general agreement in both groups regarding this recommendation, especially the idea of having protected bike lanes (separated from traffic with parking or planters). Business Society is in support of the proposal if it does not take parking away.
- Minor concerns were raised regarding pedestrian safety and parking spots, but were withdrawn when Assembly members clarified that the proposal considers improvements for pedestrians (wider sidewalks) and retaining parking.
- Some attendees also mentioned the importance of thinking about bike lanes also as spaces for socialization.
- Two written comments:
 - “Bike lanes infantilize cycling. Good cyclist don’t need bike lanes. Bike lanes are unnecessary. See ‘Effective Cycling’, 5th ed. John Forrester (2012) [VPL has copies]

- Bike lane width South of 1st should be detailed; support 2 lane traffic removal.
- The Commercial Drive Business Society does not appear to acknowledge a legitimate body of research discouraging bike lanes and I am skeptical this represents the varied opinions of all Commercial Drive business owners
- Bike lane we need it
- Separated bike lanes yes!
- I passionately support protected/separated bike lanes on Commercial Drive from 14th to Venables. Yay
- Bike Lanes “No” too narrow
- Yes, separated bike lanes would go a long way to improve cyclist safety on the Drive
- “Strongly support points 6.1, 6.2, 6.3. Specifically, in stating “safe bike-lanes” (6.1), I would suggest adding separated bike lanes, as this is the only way to ensure safety as well as making cycling more accessible. (This can be in the form of concrete separator or, as in the case of Union St. & Gore, through parked cars acting as separation)”.
- This was the second most discussed topic at the table and appeared to derive the most controversy in regards to its actual implementation. There was an overall agreement on the benefits of including a bike lane along the Drive, however there was disagreement in terms of whether this should be a protected or painted bike lane. The main concerns are as follows:
 - The BIA is taking a stance against separated bike lanes. This is seen as having a negative impact on businesses. There is concern around the effects caused by the removal of parking spaces to accommodate the bike lane. There is also concern that a protected bike lane will make Commercial Drive to become a major thoroughfare road for cyclists.
 - There is also concern about the integration of accessibility to sidewalks, in particular by individuals with mobility disabilities, if a bike lane was to be implemented.
 - In relation to the integration of points 6.1 and 6.2 there is concern regarding to the logistics of implementing all these recommendations considering the narrowness of sidewalks along the Drive. It is recommended also to unclutter the sidewalks, as an example, by restricting the use of sandwich boards or finding alternative signage mechanisms to enhance the walkability along the street.

6.2: We recommend pedestrian experience improvements, such as widening sidewalks, parklets, access to bus stops, better signals, street furniture, trees and safe bike-parking on side streets.

- Significant agreement on this point.
- There were additional comments raised regarding public realm improvements more generally, including making sure that public spaces are indeed welcoming for the use of the general public.
- Better bus service.
- Recommend shaping to human scale and creating a complete-street.

6.3: In order to improve safety conditions for all users (i.e., pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles, etc.), we recommend the City consider means such as lowering speed limits, intersection improvements, lighting, and parking controls.

- Better Dutch-inspired intersection design should be included here
- Yes again, slow down the street and prioritize improving safety

Housing & built form

6.4: Unless otherwise identified we instruct the City to retain current height of four storeys throughout Commercial Drive, from Grandview Cut to Pender St.

- Support, in general.
- “(The Drive) is an Edwardian Village built 1901-1913. The problem is “retain current height of four storeys” when the heritage buildings are 2-3 storeys. Their destruction = allow density transfers”.
- 4 storeys good
- Comments about the importance of maintaining the “integrity” of the neighbourhood
- Historic character of the Drive should be maintained.

6.5: We instruct the City to retain current height of four storeys on Commercial Drive and 1st Ave, while changing zoning of the NW, NE and SW corners to retail use on the first floor, commercial use on the second floor, and mixed-use on the third and fourth floors.

- Support in general.

6.6: We recommend the City to allow for five storeys in the West block of Commercial Drive between 7th Ave and Grandview Cut, for retail and commercial use.

- Some concerns about shadowing.
- Do not allow 6 storeys max at 7th & Commercial. Should be similar west to Marquee Building”. (4 floors with last floor set back)
- I don't see this recommendation improving the dilapidated state of this area.

6.7: We recommend the City to allow for six stories for the lots in the East side of Commercial Drive between Grandview Cut and the corner of 6th Ave, with retail in the first floor, office space in the second floor, and mixed-use in the third to fifth floors.

- “Improvement 6 storeys too high East of Victoria Drive decrease height”.

6.8: Where height extends above three storeys, we recommend design guidelines requiring setback of the upper storeys, to provide human scale street-level experience, light and air circulation, etc.

- General support for this idea.

6.9: We recommend design guidelines for the length of the Drive, requiring variation of façade, height, depth and materials, to maintain visual interest and preserve the unique and eclectic character of the Drive.

- Comments about maintaining the historic character of the neighbourhood.
- Comments about being open to diversity of built form but also having some consistency.

6.10: To encourage variety of storefronts along Commercial Drive, we recommend lot assemblies be limited to a maximum of two lots not exceeding 25 meters total frontage.

- General support to the spirit of this recommendation. Some questions about whether it is possible to restrict lot assembly or if instead the recommendation should focus on stating maximum frontage of any single retail use.
- It was suggested to look at the proposal made by the Business Society for alternative wording. The BS was also in favour of this idea. Here is the text:

“6.7 Commercial Frontage Widths and Active Frontages:

- *Restrict the width of single-use large format retail frontages, or screen large format retail with smaller, narrower CRU uses.*

- *Very wide single built form frontages are strongly discouraged. Where a new development occupies a frontage wider than 50 ft., use of recesses, courtyards, bays, projections, framing devices, and other architectural strategies.*
 - *Provide frequent entrances to storefronts and businesses along the street.*
 - *Ensure shop fronts are transparent. Transparency refers to where public and private realms meet. Good transparency is when interior uses are visible and accessible from the public sidewalk. The use of public space should be visible from inside buildings to allow for causal surveillance.*
 - *Encourage a diversity of storefront designs rather than a single repeated design for multiple adjacent storefronts” (“Commercial Drive Business Society. Vision + Design Guidelines”, pp. 48-49)*
- Strongly disagree with the lot assembly restriction to 75 feet. A parkade is not feasible at this length. You need a minimum 120X120 to make a parkade viable. Participant does not see any benefit to restricting this. Anything short of 120’ will mean another level of parkade and higher construction costs, therefore higher prices to cover this”.
 - Lot assembly can be 3 lots to give more space/options for creative redevelopment.
 - There were concerns in regards to the restrictiveness of this lot assembly condition based on the conditioning of the type of retail options resulting. Also the overall parkade accessibility is seen as being restricted by this recommendation

Local economy

6.11: We encourage the City to create zoning and guidelines to foster commercial activities in the laneways adjacent to Commercial Drive, to enhance the laneways.

- General support for this idea. Some questions about the type of businesses allowed in laneways and about the use of the laneways for deliveries and other services.
- Love the idea of activating laneways off the Drive.
- Laneways – yes!
- Good use of lanes great idea
- Yes, creating a unified laneway experience off the Drive would be a cultural hit! Services, amenities. –Agree with all points
- There is a strong overall support for the activation of laneways to enhance the livability of the area.
- According to BS, businesses on the Drive feel financially vulnerable. They ask the CA to make recommendations that help maintain independent businesses.

- Concerns about affordability for businesses, especially regarding rents and property taxes.
- One participant suggested a recommendation that independent businesses get a different tax rate, since they contribute to the community and provide amenities.
- Suggestions to expand the “vibe” of the Drive north of Venables and south of Broadway.

Services, amenities and other planning themes

Pending recommendation for Venables/Commercial Drive site:

There was general consensus on the following points, which will form the basis of a recommendation:

- In general, there should be an expansion of social services throughout Grandview-Woodland and this should involve support from the Federal, Provincial and Municipal governments
 - There was general agreement with this idea. Some questions about how to achieve this through a community plan.
- Any project on this site should conform to design guidelines.
- This site should be used as a connector to extend the “vibe” of Commercial Drive North after Venables.
- The project should foster an active, pedestrian-friendly environment with retail and restaurants.
- The project should include public space.
 - General agreement on this, but would like a more detailed explanation of what Assembly Members mean by public space. Also, emphasis on ensuring that public space is accessible to all.
- Greater height should be located at lower points (North).
- Any additional height after a given point should be tied to expansion of social services and support for the Kettle.

There was consensus among most of the members regarding:

Any additional height after 4 (or 6) storeys should be tied to expansion of social services for the Kettle.

There was significant disagreement regarding:

There is significant disagreement regarding what height might be acceptable with additional support for social services. It was proposed to specify some alternative scenarios (6 storeys, 8 storeys, 12 storeys), but this conversation is ongoing.

- Important disagreement on this point.
- Concerns about a large construction blocking views
- Support services should not be tied to commercial developments.
- Daniel Boffo mentioned that Kettle has tried to obtain funding for its expansion since 2005.
- Some suggestions about the importance of spreading out social services throughout the city and not just concentrate them in one neighbourhood.
- Business society is agnostic about this project.
- One participant said that the Boffo site should be maximum 4 storeys.
- I strongly support the Kettle/Boffo development and recognize that there should be additional height and density on the site. I recommend 13-15 storeys. The more density and height allowed for more Kettle facilities the better.
- Recommend max of 4 storeys which matches the neighbourhood. Need a way to support Kettle that does not involve a for-profit developer (see Kettle building on Burrard). Tower on site will significantly alter the neighbourhood and set as a precedent for development on the Drive north of Venable”.
- I support the Kettle Venables project at 12-14 storey.
- I recommend that BOFFO continue to consult with a small neighbourhood group (for) the building of the Kettler.
- To preserve the very historic Astorinos building and keep the historic pedestrian scale streetscape at this historic corner. Hundreds (1,000s) of weddings were celebrated here. It is a historic value for the neighbourhood
- Boffo/K project 4-6 stories
- Kettle – Yes!
- Boffo/Kettle not going to work (financially)
- Preserve sight lines of NS mountains. Limit height
- The prominence of the site supports the demand for market housing in this site without a need to worry about the sale of these units.
- The developer’s risk will leverage the provision of supporting housing.

- There needs to be consideration of the long term effects of separating the social benefits obtained from this type of redevelopment from the height allowance discussion. This will provide continuous support to current and future vulnerable populations.
- There was an overall majority of agreement in regards to the linkage of social benefits as leverage drawn from the discussion of building height.
- The recommendation must be more specific in regards to the benefits returned from redevelopment. There is a particular ambiguity surrounding the definition of the “given point” at which expansion of social services would be required.
- It is important to determine the bottom line for the survival of the Kettle, while considering the viability of redevelopment.
- Overall this site is recognized as an ideal spot for development along the Drive due to the topographic advantages and location. For this reason, there was no strong rejection of increases in height for this site. 12 -14 storeys appeared to be the maximum desirable height.
- Some specific recommendations revolved around the architectural breakage of the frontage to avoid the creation of a continuous solid wall facing the Drive. There is an opportunity for widening the sidewalk through this redevelopment.

Draft Map: Provided the conditions outlined in the recommendations above are met, this map illustrates the areas of change along Commercial Drive over the next 30 years.

General feedback from Commercial Drive tables

- There are important changes coming to the Britannia Centre. Maybe the sub-area working table should consider a recommendation on this point.
- Support Canadian Arts and Culture on the Drive.
- Consider alternative forms of increasing density: i.e., adding horizontal FSR.
- First Nations underrepresented
- Not enough talk about health in the Community
- What about a parkade on/near the Britannia campus to support the theatre district (York/Cultch) and destination shipping? The availability of parkades in general was discussed in comparison to other neighbourhoods.
- Parking restrictions for residents of highrises (Like the Marquee building on 7th Ave.) Should not allow residents ability to purchase 2 parking permits to park on residential

streets when units have parking spaces. Encourages more cars on the street instead of walking/not owning a car. Takes away parking from residents of homes on the street who don't have parking available.

- Include as a recommendation: agreement by the city on a 20 or 20 year moratorium on "spot rezoning" to avoid changes being made by the city on citizens assembly's approved recommendations after plan in place
- Clarify that the Marquee building off of E. 7th Ave. & Commercial is actually 5 storeys high in front & 4 stories in back. Not 6 storeys as was told to some of us at the March session. Current height of the Marquee works well for the neighbourhood

7.0 BROADWAY & COMMERCIAL

Draft Preamble:

The Commercial-Broadway sub-area is a transit-oriented, walkable community, and helps meet regional and city transit goals. We recognize concerns regarding increased height such as shadowing, retaining human-scale development and community character and isolation—however, we recognize the benefits of height as well, such as community amenity contributions, accommodating growth, and potential for affordable housing. We feel the heights we have put in our recommendations have been placed in a way that is sensitive to each location.

Public realm & transportation

7.1: We expect the City to create a welcoming viable public plaza at the Safeway site. This south-oriented plaza should have multiple pedestrian access points from Broadway, preferring ‘desire paths’. The plaza should have an open feel and must connect to the Skytrain greenway.

We want to restrict the height at the Broadway-Commercial station intersection (SE corner) and south along Commercial Dr. to 8 stories. We want to allow a maximum of 12 stories on the east side of the site; however, the developments must have varied heights, and the south side should not cast shadows over the plaza.

We recommend the inclusion of an iconic signature building on the north east side of the site. Development must be mixed-use, integrating small-scale ground floor retail, second storey commercial/office space and residential above. We would like to retain the current grocery retail.

The plaza is not an acceptable place for a bus loop or lines of waiting passengers. The plaza is intended as a pedestrian area, and must be developed with a unified consideration of the human scale.

Developments must be sustainable to help meet the City of Vancouver’s Greenest City goals, and green roofs are preferred. The plaza must also have a high quality landscape design with natural shade, native species, and a mix of hard and soft surfaces.

We also expect co-op housing to be maintained.

- In second paragraph, specify that it is the north east corner of the Safeway site
- Green roofs are ok for commercial buildings, not viable on residential buildings
- Support for plaza
- Good place for it, but concerned there won’t be enough traffic—maybe just north of Broadway on west side would be better?
- Concerned about height just south of plaza, right now it’s all single-family houses

- Plaza needs proper lighting to keep it safe
- Support for this recommendation and would like this to also become a neighbourhood wide recommendation
- Participants want the plaza to be vibrant and safe for everyone
- Ensure green space in the plaza
- Do not want the plaza to be a magnet for loitering and criminal activity
- Participants felt the Assembly listened well to community concerns about this site and it is a good compromise
- This is one of the City's most travelled intersections, and participants supported the height of 12 stories, with some indicating support for more height (16-18 stories)
- Increase density through good urban design
- Grocery store entrance should face Broadway, currently it is an unwelcoming blank wall facing a busy street
- Expand co-op housing. Stronger language is needed for affordable co-ops.

7.2: We are concerned about congestion at Commercial-Broadway. If the Broadway subway is not built within in the next 5 years (?), we expect the city to work with Translink and other stakeholders to consider options that alleviate congestion, such as a new bus loop.

7.3: We urge the City to build 1 or 2 speed bumps for each block in the area west of Commercial Drive, south of Grandview Highway, east of Clark and north of 11th—except major arterial roads such as Clark, Broadway and 12th.

- Speed concerns with increase in development there has been an increase in cars speeding through residential streets (example off East 7th Ave and cut through streets where children and families live
- Support for speed bumps
- Support for speed bumps

7.4: In order to facilitate the funding for building a public plaza and encouraging a transit-oriented community, we recommend the City relax parking requirements for new residential and commercial developments at the Safeway/plaza site. We direct the City to require space for car co-ops and increased bike parking, including end-of-ride facilities.

- Concern that more density will impact residential parking which is already limited

7.5: We direct the City to improve bike and pedestrian safety at the following intersections:

1. Commercial and 10th Avenue
2. Woodland and Grandview
3. Clark and Grandview
4. Broadway and Victoria
5. 10th and Victoria
6. Grandview and Nanaimo

7.6: We direct the City to ensure that sidewalks be widened and trees planted as part of any new development on 12th Avenue, modeled on the current situation on Broadway between Commercial and Clark.

- Redesign 12th based on design between Woodland and Commercial
- Maintain the level of development on 12th
- Change model for 12th Ave to be Broadway between Commercial and Woodland instead of between Commercial and Clark
- Participant support for widening sidewalks

7.7: We direct the City to widen sidewalks and plant street trees on Victoria between Broadway and 12th Ave., modeled on Victoria north of Broadway in order to tie the two sections of the street together and improve walkability.

- Support for this

See also: **7.21**

- Traffic rush and densification: limit north of Broadway densification to 4 stories not 8 because of traffic
- Densification will mean more traffic
- Concern with parking challenges for residents off 7th

Housing & built form

7.8: We direct the City to permit limited lot assembly to allow creative and gentle forms of densification. Lot assembly should be limited to a maximum of four lots to avoid very large monotonous developments that may result in increased housing prices.

- Instead of putting the number of lots to assemble put how many square feet. FYI 15000 square feet is generally considered a minimum

- Need to be specific about site assembly rules regarding Nanaimo. Don't want high density taking over Nanaimo
- Language is too loose
- Lot assembly size limits need to be by square feet not # of lots since lot size differs (FYI, 15000-20000 square feet is general considered the minimum required to build underground parking)
- Concerned about monotonous fronts, encourage staggered frontages to encourage sawtooth character
- Suggestion to restrict to a maximum assembly of two lots
- Support for this limit, one suggestion for 3 lot limit

7.9: We recommend the Broadway corridor (excluding the Safeway site) from Clark to Nanaimo be zoned for midrise development, with the Woodland to Lakewood section zoned as midrise mixed-use development. We demand a height limit of 6 stories along this corridor.

- Safeway site good with 12, would even see this as an opportunity for higher
- No to 6 storeys between Clark and Nanaimo, 3 maybe
- 6 storeys too high for Lakewood and 7th
- 6 storeys is too high
- 6 storey buildings between Victoria and Nanaimo is way too high for many reasons:
 - 1) Broadway traffic impact to streets and alleys to the north of Broadway
 - 2) Commercial traffic due to mix use
 - 3) No transition from six to single family
- 6 storeys is too high for the area west of Commercial
- 10th avenue on Commercial/Victoria and Semlin is the ideal place for density, why is it overlooked? It should be 8 to 12 storeys?
- Concern about 6 storey height, it is too high, would change the neighbourhood
- Maintain community feel of the area, high rises above 8 storeys will create isolation, lose character of the area
- Build underground, limit to 4-6 storeys above ground, use light pipes to bring light underground

- Use underground levels. Heat generation could be used throughout the building
- East of Victoria on Broadway should be 2-3 storeys max
- Sunlight issue
- Keep max density along Broadway with concentration on increase density at Safeway site
- 6 storeys is a lot on 8th and Semlin
- Do not like 6 storeys on Broadway
- 6 storeys is too high between Commercial and Nanaimo—should be max. 2-3 to maintain human-scale/neighborhood feeling. Also concerned about extra traffic density and mixed use would bring to area.
- Concern about extra density making it 'impersonal'—want to maintain the community feeling that currently exists
- Concern that city needs to better manage traffic and parking if more density is added
- Recommendation to address parking and traffic before any additional density goes in
- Worried about not being able to sell my house if it backs on to 6-storey building, concerned about privacy
- More opportunity for growth from Commercial to Clark
- Huge concern regarding 6 storeys in this area
- Discomfort with 6 stories
- Concern about transition of height to single family homes
- No more than 3 storeys. support for this, especially between Victoria and Nanaimo
- Would like to see a variation in heights to avoid a wall-like feeling
- Duplexes/triplexes are acceptable in this area
- This was the area of greatest concern raised by participants
- Participants recommended splitting the Broadway corridor into two sections: east and west of Victoria

- Recommendation that east of Victoria should go no higher than 4 stories, and the Assembly should consider how mixed use raised will increase traffic to the neighbourhood
- Recommendation that west of Victoria (especially between Commercial and Clark) could benefit from 6 stories, mixed use
- Concerns raised about 6 story mixed-use buildings east of Victoria included (note that many participants own homes or live around East 8th):
 - Shadowing on East 8th homes
 - Sunlight, tree and sky views reduced
 - This is a family oriented residential area and mixed use buildings do not fit in
 - Increased traffic due to commercial traffic (delivery trucks) and larger numbers of residents could impact safety, particularly to kids walking to school
 - Concern about parking availability
 - Lack of privacy where residents of taller buildings could look into homes and backyards of homes on East 8th
 - Laura Secord School drop off / pick up times are already a traffic challenge, adding more people and traffic to the area would make it worse
 - The street is only four lanes of traffic, too narrow for this kind of development
 - Transition between 6 stories and single family homes is too abrupt and extreme, need respectful transition and better planning
 - If 6 stories is approved then more height will find its way into surrounding residential areas
- Suggestions about Broadway east of Victoria:
 - Duplexes are the right level of height, or townhomes with ground level access
 - Focus on infill
 - Maintain character
 - Keep it residential, no mixed-use
 - Maintain safety
- Suggestions about Broadway west of Victoria (note that an apartment building owner of this area participated in the table's conversation)
 - 6 stories is insufficient to warrant the economics of redevelopment, especially if underground parking is required
 - Suggestion that new developments within a few minutes' walk of the Broadway/Commercial Skytrain station not include parking
 - Some support for higher density west of Commercial along Broadway while others preferred 4 stories

7.10: In order to create viable mixed-use nodes that create new job opportunities and activates underused intersections, we direct the City to permit mixed use buildings up to 8 stories at:

- 1) Commercial and 12th
- 2) Broadway and Clark

All such nodes would have set back and leave street feeling open. The height of 8 stories represents a careful increase in density relative to the 6 storey height limit along arterials.

- Concern about mixed-use

- Support for focusing density at intersections
- Concern about height at 12th and at Clark

7.11: We recommend the City allow modest re-zoning of the sub-area's peripheral arterial streets—12th, Clark and Nanaimo—for denser residential buildings. Allowable heights should not exceed 4 stories and rental stock should be maintained and expanded.

- You cannot force people to put rental in
- Change model for 12th Av to be between Commercial and Woodland instead of between Clark and Commercial
- Concern about the loss of affordable residential in this area
- Would like to maintain existing zoning

7.12: We recommend that 12th and Commercial be a site of increased density, with significant commercial and amenity components in order to draw people to the south end of the area and revitalize Commercial Dr. between Broadway and 12th, subject to view cones.

7.13: We recommend that along Commercial between Broadway and 12th there be a maximum of 6 stories (max 4 stories with 2 set back) with limited width above four stories to create a varied street wall.

- Concern about this level of height
- Support for more density on Commercial between Broadway and 12th

7.14: We direct the City to permit an 8 storey commercial building at the north east corner of Broadway and Commercial above the Skytrain in order to create more job opportunities at this highly accessible location.

- The max height should be 4-6 storeys to harmonize with existing co-op on Broadway and 12th and condo buildings and planned height on 12th and Commercial
- Concern that 8 stories would cause too much shadowing along 8th, suggestion that it be no higher than 4-6 and that setback be used

7.15: To utilize the Grandview cut as an opportunity for height with fewer residents affected by shadow, we recommend a maximum of 8 stories along the south side of the cut within a radius of a 5 minute walk from the Broadway-Commercial station and a maximum of 6 stories with the radius of a 10 minute walk from the Broadway-Commercial station.

- Replace 5-10 min walk with specific streets such as 5th and Victoria Dr. Or Commercial and 12th

- Awareness of sun, development shadows 8th Ave, max height of north east corner of Commercial and Broadway should be 4 to 5 storeys like the Marquee
- I would like to see more aggressive zoning allowances here. We need to provide more space for people in this agreeable area
- Be more specific about how many meters/kilometers a 5-10 min walk is
- Support for using the cut in this way
- Imprecise

7.16: We expect that the City revitalize laneways in the Broadway-Commercial sub-area, including the pathway below the Skytrain between 10th-12th Aves. This revitalization should result in lively, safe and pleasant public greenways that facilitate active transport and pocket park space throughout the sub-area.

- Support for this recommendation
- Create courtyard feel in lanes
- Support for developing the guide-way underneath the Skytrain
- Extend the character of the businesses that back on to the Skytrain line (along the east side of Commercial from Broadway to 12th) (i.e. have an entrance from the back, no blank concrete walls)

7.17: We instruct that commercial properties with laneways adjacent to Commercial Drive be zoned to permit small-frontage laneway retail. Likewise, revitalization of the pathway below the Skytrain (E. 10th-E.12th Aves) should require building forms that open onto it to create greenway retail that serves as a shopping destination, drawing people to the area.

- Some support for this idea
- Some concern if a commercial property backs on to a residential area (increase in traffic, parking, safety, etc.)

7.18: We direct the City to encourage hidden density in RT zones, requiring duplexes to include lock-off units, permitting laneway and infill development, with the intent of increasing housing and rental stock.

- Support for this recommendation
- Support for this idea

7.19: We recommend all new buildings have green roofs.

- Technology isn't very good yet, people shouldn't be required to do it.
- Why not encourage solar panels?
- Shouldn't apply to houses

See also: **7.1, 7.21.**

- Define terms such as social housing, non-market housing, rental housing as City has changed definition and it may not meet the needs of the area
- Establish a 10 year moratorium on spot rezoning to avoid rendering new place meaningless
- Would like to see more density between Victoria and Commercial Drive
- Broadway and Grandview more density housing
- Increased density equals more anonymous neighbourhood, results in vagrancy, homelessness, crime
- Maintain diversity in heights on street fronts to avoid creation of a 'tunnel'
- Maintaining character and liveability is critical
- Concerned about 4 stories along Nanaimo, don't want it to change
- Concerned about affordability and availability in area—we need space for people to move in, approval of increased density in area from the Cut to Broadway
- Strongly encourage purpose built rental housing, that includes 3+ bedroom units for families
- Victoria and 11th would be a great place for added density (FYI, disagreement from others at table on this point)
- Call for moratorium on spot rezoning for 10 years to make sure plan is stuck to
- Map looks better than it did before, support for smaller towers than in original plan
- Support extension of retail along Broadway
- Most new commercial spaces should be no more than 4 stories
- Support densification of residential uses close to Broadway-Commercial intersection

Local economy

7.20: We encourage development of office space within a 5 minutes walk of Broadway-Commercial and VCC Skytrain stations.

- Retail on Broadway extend it for safety reasons
- Support for this idea

See also **7.1, 7.10, 7.12, 7.14** and **7.17**.

Services, amenities and other planning themes

7.21: We expect that all new multi-use development in Commercial-Broadway sub-area contribute to four classes of public amenities:

- Urge the Assembly to consider how it can ensure there are enough social amenities in response to the density, as other neighbourhoods have not seen direct benefit (like Chinatown), residents don't have a say in how CACs are used – the City decides
- 1) Greenway creation and sidewalk revitalization, particularly to “stitch” the currently divided sub-area together with the rest of Grandview-Woodland
 - Want to see more green space
 - Support for stitching the area together
 - 2) A keystone arts/cultural space
 - 3) Meeting/programming spaces for sub-populations currently not supported by existing amenities in Grandview-Woodland. These amenities must be planned through consultation with community organizations including but not limited to:
 - a. Aboriginal/First Nations (e.g. Longhouse location)
 - b. Cultural minorities
 - c. Youth & elder organizations
 - Support for this
 - 4) Subsidies and financial support for the creation and retention of co-op, below-market rental, supported and market rental housing in our sub-area.
 - Want to see more emphasis on social housing
 - Want to see stronger wording for rentals, affordable housing and co-ops.
 - Current older housing stock provides affordable rentals, often with multiple rental units in one building. Concern that new development will remove these from the market.

- Create a hardscape plaza from closing 8th Av at Commercial Drive because more walk-by traffic will walk there that 10th and Safeway
- If Safeway offers great take out foods this might entice more people to use the plaza for lunch
- Support for this recommendation
- Would like to be explicit about not reducing rental stock or displacing people
- Include suggestion for purpose built rental

Remaining issues/recommendations:

- Extending plaza south beyond 10th Ave
- Suggesting added density proposed in recommendations be contingent on Broadway subway

Draft Map: Provided the conditions outlined in the recommendations above are met, this map illustrates the areas of change within Broadway & Commercial over the next 30 years.

General feedback from Broadway & Commercial tables:

- Need to be clear about assembly role
- Make sure the feel of the neighbourhood does not change
- Do not create an impersonal neighbourhood: people who are not connected, feel that people will lose the sense of connectedness
- Keep the village feel
- More than 8 storeys is too hard to connect
- Affordable housing in the area is an issue
- How can the City use CACs for housing on the Drive?
- Generally support the recommendations
- Make sure language used in recommendations doesn't open any of them up for further consultation
- Make own definitions of what social housing and housing mean for the assembly, because otherwise the city will interpret as they want

- Want to ensure gardens are encouraged even with increased density, especially in backyards as it's an important characteristic of G-W, prefer lock-off suits to laneway homes in order to preserve gardens
- There needs to be clarity around rental replacement
- Need more attention to creating independent businesses/markets as area redevelops
- Want stronger urban design guidelines at the street level (commercial frontage)
- Moratorium on spot zoning for 10 years after plan is in place to ensure the plan is implemented, after the 10 years, rezoning applications would be subject to an intense review process
- No commercial development on key traffic corridors like Victoria
- Ensure there are vibrant public spaces throughout the neighbourhood
- Have car free weekends to provide space and an opportunity for local artists to showcase their work
- No bikes on Commercial Drive
- City should provide more notice on neighbourhood changes such as trees being cut down by developers
- Area kitty corner to St. Augustine's needs to be improved
- Unify the language in the Assembly's recommendations, currently there are a variety of terms: "direct", "urge", "recommend" etc.; use the strongest language possible: "We direct the City..."
- Examples of recommendations that should be neighborhood wide not just in the sub area: **7.18, 7.19, 7.1**
- The document needs more clarity on land use and zoning to avoid miscommunication

General feedback from 'Other' table:

- Worried about height
- Wants to protect coops
- Concerned about density
- Concerned about what can do with our property

- Loves the character of the area and is worried about change. Concerned about lot assemblage, also that other neighborhoods in the city don't seem to be doing their part to take on density
- Some sub areas not doing their part in terms of taking on additional density
- Taking on density should depend on the character of the area
- Language of recommendations needs to be more precise
- Prevent lot assembly because it generates speculation
- Is concerned about creating incentives for undertaking maintenance – if plan allows an increase in height of one storey no one will both to upgrade because it doesn't makes sense financially
- What about converting to multi family buildings that could be rental properties?
- Problem with older buildings that the cost of converting to 4 or 6-plex is too high
- Likes the idea of encouraging laneway houses
- It seems like some of the subarea recommendations should be neighborhood wide recommendations
- Likes idea of building more density on arterial streets
- Need more small affordable housing units
- But what counts as affordable? Lots of small units are quite expensive
- Do density around transit nodes -20 storey towers – lots of amenities
- Mixed feeling about how to fund social housing
- Is ok with increased height for affordability
- Likes the diversity of the neighborhood – lots of small shops. Now lots of the shops don't own building and increasingly can't afford rent
- Affordability goes with increasing in density – but still need to control heights – keep heights in character with the neighborhood
- Would like to ensure that increases in density go with the scale of the existing neighborhood

- Likes idea of strategically placed density – on corners – not mass buildings. Broadway and Clark not attractive – could be improved – maybe affordable housing here
- Likes the wide diversity of housing types on her street
- Likes that there is lots of affordable housing – is concerned about renovictions
- No spot rezoning at this point in time
- I'm not confident that the advise and the info resulting from the citizen's assembly is actually going to be truly respected and used by the city planners
- Keeping plans vague and general and the language "mushy" are methods useful to allowing the city to follow their own agenda by default due to the lack of clarity and specifics
- What is "not" said is as important as what "is" said. Half-truths and/or lack of inclusion of information (by city planners) amounts to manipulation of citizens' rights and the ability to form a well-informed opinion
- The whole of G-W is my home! I'm interested in keeping the character and livability of all of it! –not just my subarea