

**Submissions received by the Citizens' Assembly  
on their draft sub-area recommendations**

April 29, 2015 to May 8, 2015 at 5:00pm.

## **CEDAR COVE:**

### **Received April 30:**

I think you generally did a good job drafting this plan for the benefit of the area.

I'd like to make a suggestion for Cedar Cove.

2073 Dundas should be considered for higher density. Next door at 2019 Dundas is a property owned by BC Housing.

Both 2073 Dundas combined with 2019 Dundas would provide an ideal property size to build rental housing. The strip mall at 2073 Dundas has not been included in the plan. I think this may be an oversight.

Thank you and great work by all.

Karim Winsor

### **Received April 30:**

Hi – I was wondering if 2073 Dundas has been left out of the residential mixed use area intentionally? I understand it was originally included in the plan.

BC Housing owns 2019 Dundas and would advocate for inclusion of higher density of affordable housing on 2073 Dundas.

Looking forward to your comments.

Regards,

Gorka Zabala

Sr. Project Officer, Real Estate Services| BC Housing Management Commission

### **Received April 30:**

Hi Rachel,

Just received a call someone in the community who wanted to pass along the following comments:

- Seeking clarity on the Cedar Cove map (p6) hard to read. Why is the green (M-2) area circled?
- What is the Assembly saying about industrial/job-space in this area? Or are they anticipating something else.

I suggested that the circling seemed to be more connected to possible public realm/active transportation improvements – but that I would pass along the feedback.

- Andrew Pask

### **Received May 6 (the full letter from Barbara Cameron/OCOP is filed under 'General' below):**

### 1.5 INDUSTRIAL ODOURS

The language should clearly reflect area residents' expectations that the issue will be addressed satisfactorily. In the last five years there were 1,168 complaints about West Coast Reductions' odours to the Metro Vancouver air quality line.

### 1.10, 1.12, 1.13 HOUSING/BUILT FORM

I recommend that you limit these noted areas to 4 storeys instead of six and 8 respectively.

### 1.11 SOCIAL HOUSING

There is a need here and throughout the report to clearly define social housing as mentioned above. Does the CA agree or disagree with the recently changed definition of social housing by the city? Your point of view should be made clear.

#### **Received May 7 (Full letter from Susana Harder/OCOP filed below under 'General'):**

1.5 tighten up language to reflect area residents' expectations. Note that the last 5 years drew 1,168 complaints about West Coast Reductions to the Metro Vancouver air quality line.

1.10, 1.12, 1.13 Prefer 4 storeys over 6.

1.11 Define social housing (note City recently changed its definition).

#### **Received May 8:**

To Whom It May Concern:

It seems unfair that buildings would be allowed next to next to housing in the 2300 blocks. This was NEVER shown to be an option in any plans. The earlier maps showed whole blocks being rezoned. Why would some areas remain RS-1 if everything immediately surrounding is condo/commercial/retail or duplex?

We understand change will come but because the neighbourhood had no notice about this option, we feel that lacks ethics. Allow development of the remainder of the 2300 blocks that are just west of Nanaimo Street.

Mae and Koo

## HASTINGS:

### Notes from the OCOP meeting:

- 1) In general, height is a big concern, especially along Broadway and Hastings Streets.
- 2) "Demand that language in the recommendations be sharpened. The recommendations have some soft language in places - language that basically will allow the city to do whatever it wants. For example, look at Hastings street recommendation 2.12 page 4. Here is some of 2.12:
  - > We recommend that the allowable height on Hastings be kept at 4 storeys... 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; .... etc
  - > Yikes! Rein the city in! 4 storeys is OK unless you want to go to 20 storeys. What the ..."

### Received May 6 (the full letter from Barbara Cameron/OCOP is filed under 'General' below):

The Hastings Area Business Improvement Association has expressed concern that any increased height along the corridor beyond 4 storeys will shut out small and medium sized merchants who currently make up the bulk of retail in the corridor and who contribute significantly to the eclectic and pleasing high street character of the area. I strongly echo this concern and therefore ask the CA to express a firm recommendation of building height to a maximum of 4 storeys along the entire length of the corridor, and NOT to hold out the possibility of further height increases in the future which would open the door to future spot rezoning with significant added height/density and a fundamental change in character.

### Received May 7 (Full letter from Susana Harder/OCOP filed below under 'General'):

The height proposed along Hastings conflicts with previously stated expectations from the local BIA for no higher than 4 storeys to retain existing independent businesses. 2.12, 2.15 These are examples which will open the door to future spot rezoning with significant added height/density, but not sufficient to earn new amenities that would be required to support them.

2.18 Appears in conflict with 2.12.

### Received May 8 (Full letter from Jim Fraser filed below under 'General'):

My first comments centre on the Hastings sub-area. First let me start with the positive. I support the public realm and transportation recommendations, with the possible exception of 2.8, which I will include in my comments below. I also strongly support recommendation 2.17 – to support the expansion of key aboriginal services such as the Vancouver Aboriginal Friendship Centre and the Urban Native Youth Association. I will have a few more comments about this recommendation below.

Recommendation 2.12 recommends a maximum allowable height of 4 stories, but then goes on to say that as demand for housing grows "*...we are open to increase conditional height as follows:*

- *NE corner of Hastings and Clarke – up to 20 stories;*
- *Hastings, between Clarke and West of Commercial – up to 15 stories;*
- *Hastings, Commercial to Kamloops up to 8 stories;*

*This is to ensure that the need for non-market social housing and much needed community services can be met..."*

The discussion with the CA member at the table clarified that the idea was that the higher heights were intended to capture CACs that could be directed to community amenities as suggested in the quote. In my submission, that is an entirely wrong basis for determining the built form for the Hastings corridor for the following reasons:

1. 'Selling height' to try to get CACs is a strategy that many communities in the City want discontinued because the process is so undemocratic and non-transparent.
2. It's my understanding that CACs are negotiated with developers when an area is rezoned above what is allowed in the plan or zoning in effect at the time. If that is correct, then setting out these conditional heights in the recommendations effectively sets the starting point for negotiations at the conditional height not the initial height.
3. It's also my understanding, from developers, planning experts and former planners with the city, that any CAC's coming from an increase in height from 4 stories to eight would be negligible. So the conditional height addition between Commercial and Kamloops would generate little, if any additional benefits for the community, but would change the nature of a major shopping area to one overshadowed by much taller buildings and the loss of the characteristics that are making it a re-vitalized area (affordable rents, sunlight, a diversity of shops and restaurants, etc) and the loss of sunlight on the north side of Hastings and the loss of views for those to the south of Hastings.

Recommendation 2.8 recommends wider sidewalks and street furniture to encourage public interaction and avoid tunneling. Buildings at 8 stories on busy street like Hastings is going to generate tunneling, whatever one does to the sidewalks. Similarly, there are studies that have shown that public interaction decreases as the height of residential buildings increases.

4. As an architect in the community recently wrote: "Building height should consider the width of the street, height of neighbours, street character, views, shadow and sunlight studies to name just a few determinants. It is not an opportunity to pick a number out of the air. I think it's a pretty complicated matter and really hope whoever is making those decisions is very clear about what urban design principles they are following. It's a question with asking every time building heights are discussed."
5. The Aboriginal Friendship Centre and the Urban Native Youth Association own their properties and may want to develop those properties in the future to provide additional housing aimed at aboriginal residents. I support that idea, but it seems to me that limiting the height to 4 stories now, with the potential for increased height depending on negotiations with the city, can only complicate attempts to finance and develop those sites.

For the above reasons I would urge the CA to change recommendation 2.12 to a series of single allowable heights along Hastings. I would suggest that a 'hard' maximum of 4 or 5 stories be implemented for Hastings between Victoria and Kamloops. I think that heights can be increased between Victoria and Commercial, because the elevation falls as one travels west on Hastings from Victoria, and because there is not a strong, pedestrian oriented shopping area there. This section I would suggest could perhaps allow as much as 8 stories on the East side of Commercial, especially on the North side of Hastings where the impact of shadowing, and on adjacent residential buildings would be less. West of Commercial, I have no specific section, although at the recommendation for up to 20 stories at the NE corner of Hastings and Clarke, is higher even than what, from my recollection of a Hastings sub-area public meeting, the developer was asking for.

Regarding the building form on either side of the Hastings corridor, I also support recommendation 2.14 that suggests the creation of transitional building forms North and South of Hastings. I especially see this as a possibility for the North side of Pender Street between Victoria and Nanaimo, (e.g. allowing row-housing) because of the width of Pender St and the fact that there is a fairly wide landscaped median down the centre of the street, which would create an effective 'buffer' between the more and less dense sides of the street.

## **BRITANNIA-WOODLAND:**

### **Received May 6 (the full letter from Barbara Cameron/OCOP is filed under 'General' below):**

A cautionary note: very few residents of this sub-area actually attended this particular sub-area workshop and those who did attend cited inaccurate reporting by city staff.

Point 3.7 regarding the possible removal of the Georgia and Dunsmuir viaducts: there has NOT been any decision taken on the removal proposal. The impact of the possible removal of these two pieces of city infrastructure on the Grandview Woodland community would be considerable. It would be inappropriate for your report to suggest a "fait accompli" here. There is much discussion yet to take place on this issue, which is also contentious in many adjoining neighbourhoods.

Point 3.12 to retain existing ratios of rental, co-op and ownership units: this is an example where 'rental' should be clearly defined as affordable and/or non-market, to be clear on meaning. In addition, asking for a 'one to one' replacement ratio does not ensure affordability, and could result in more expensive rental units in the future.

Point 3.19 - these items should be generalized to relate to all sub areas.

### **Received May 6:**

Hello,

I was at a Britannia-Woodland discussion table for the first half of last night, and got into an unhelpful ranty space while we tried to sort out what exactly "bike route" means other than "we painted some bike icons on this side street so we can yell at people to not ride on the high street."

Once I got home this solidified into a more concrete and (I hope) constructive recommendation:

That a distinction be made between bike "routes", which are very helpful for people riding bikes THROUGH the neighbourhood on their way to somewhere else, and bike "lanes" on the high streets, which should have full and reasonably proportional infrastructure for all the transport modes that people are using to go about their life and business there. (Which on the Drive is overwhelmingly skewed towards walking.)

One of these is not a replacement for the other, nor should they be confused or conflated, and the proposed improvements to the bike route along Woodland shouldn't be traded against the necessary support for safe multi-modal transport infrastructure a block away on Commercial Drive.

Further to this, the idea of supporting two-wheeled travel along Commercial to Graveley and then "diverting the bike lane to Salisbury" is an obvious conflation of these two distinct and necessary types of accommodation, and is, therefore, malarkey.

I get that the Drive is narrower below first; I'm sure there are solutions. Angle parking like Columbia in New West, remove parking to parkades or side streets, turn the whole strip into a bus/pedestrian mall like Granville, I don't care: it's flagrantly unfair for the businesses from first to Broadway to have the advantage that a complete street design brings, while the established destination strip from Graveley to Venables suffers (despite their higher

rents/taxes) because of some imagined need to preserve it as a through-way for people driving.

Thanks for your work, and for your time.  
AJ

**Received May 7 (See full letter from Noam Doglin under 'General'):**

B. Lot assembly limits if they are used at all need to be:

- a) Based on maximum lot sizes, not number of lots, as lot sizes vary
- b) There are engineering and City code mandates that require minimum lot sizes. These often require a minimum of 15,000-20,000 sq ft lot to allow for underground parking. Lot assembly limits should be large enough (20,000-25,000 sq ft) to achieve the goal of allowing approved density while at the same time protecting the city scape.

3.14 *"We urge the city to amend RM4 zoning to allow for the infill or addition of existing buildings to a floor space ratio from 1.45 to 2"*

Remember, if the city changes zoning outright it loses all control and a developer can do what they like within the new rules. Instead, I recommend "We urge the City to conditional permit a FSR of 2.0 in RM4 zones to allow for the infill or addition of existing buildings." This will allow the city to give the density, but require something in return such as nicer sidewalks, \$, etc.

3.15 *"we urge the city to amend RM4 zoning to allow for 2 long term rental suite."*

I believe this should be a neighbourhood wide recommendation, not just in RM4 zones, but in all single family dwellings of all zoning types (RT, RS, etc.)

3.16 See above regarding lot assembly

**Received May 7 (Full letter from Susana Harder/OCOP filed below under 'General'):**

Note: Very few residents attended the sub-area workshop and those who attended cited considerable misreporting by City staff.

3.7 The word 'removal' should be replaced by 'future'.

3.12 This is an example of where 'rental' should be defined as affordable, non-/market, etc to be clear on meaning. Don't recommend 'one for one' as this leads to more expensive rental units than existing.

3.19 Example of item shared by all sub-areas: 7<sup>th</sup> bullet refers to maintaining existing view cones.



## GRANDVIEW:

Received May 4:

Dear Citizens Assembly,

First, I'd like to thank you all for the time and energy you've put into this exercise - it's a pretty huge commitment and I'm very appreciative. Second, I think there is a lot of good stuff in the April 29th document, so please consider my comments below as constructively tweaking, rather than critiquing.

**1) Pedestrian controlled crossing at 7th not the most logical** since it doesn't align with crossing at Commercial. 6th (which gets far more pedestrian traffic) or 8th (which is already a bike route) would make more sense. Linked to this, 6th or 8th are the logical choices for an East-West bike route at the south end of Grandview. Further north = too hilly; Further south = overlap with 10th.

**2) Bike lane on Victoria should be in the mix.** This was a strong element in the community workshop and isn't reflected here. While I appreciate the notion of having a bike lane on Commercial (and am open to it), my feeling is that bike traffic would be better suited to Victoria (because it is flat) while space on Commercial should go to Pedestrians (not bikes, and certainly not cars). As a keen cyclist, I'd flag that those who bike on Commercial tend to be more reckless cyclists (no helmets, no lights, etc.) while the commuter cyclists (with bright clothing, lights, helmets, etc.) tend to use Victoria.

**3) Toilet facilities are VERY much needed in McSpadden Park.** Human defecation is commonplace and highly unsanitary. Conversely, I'm not sure an exercise circuit is really needed - I have never seen one in use anywhere in Vancouver. Garbage bins at McSpadden are fine. Recycling and composting (dog waste) are what are needed.

**4) Dog parks need to be revisited** throughout the entire GW area as there are not nearly enough resulting in people simply ignoring current requirements. I was surprised not to see this anywhere.

5) I think **off-peak parking on 1st** is not a great idea from a traffic flow perspective (I think it is likely to lead to a lot of "cutting through", backed up traffic and angry drivers), but will leave that to others.

6) I strongly support adding **zoning modifications** to RT-4, RT-5 (and possibly a modification to RS-1 in GW) to enable more rental space via an increase to the FSR in the cases of secondary suites. Nobody wants to see monster homes, but people want affordable rentals and dislike tall condos far more. This feels like a no-brainer and I'm living proof of someone who would happily have built a rental unit, but didn't have enough FSR to do so (1750 sq.ft. with a family of 4 makes it tough to put in another unit; 1350/400?).

7) I still feel that **12 stories at Commercial & Broadway is a bit high** and would suggest that the group aim for 8 with a stepback. Anything above 5 stories erodes community wellbeing, so if we are going to give extra density at that location (and take a hit on social cohesion), then I would also want there to be **additional community services in that building (a la Woodward's)**. My suggestion would be to have artist space/galleries in such a building - something that is always a good investment and could help bring the culture crawl to a new section of East Van.

8) Lastly, I would suggest that there be a **10-year spot-zoning moratorium in GW**. Without

such a moratorium, all of the effort we've all gone to really goes to waste since the city can make changes at will.

I hope these are helpful suggestions.

Many thanks to you all for your ongoing efforts.

Sincerely,  
Alexis Morgan  
1815 East 6th Ave.

**Received May 5:**

Dear Citizen's Assembly for the Grandview Woodland Community Plan:

I recently read your Draft recommendations for Grandview Woodland and wanted to provide some comments on two points in particular that should, I believe, be modified to better reflect the wishes of those people living in the immediate neighborhood.

First: As a resident of 2nd Avenue, I disagree with your proposal for 4 storey townhouses and/or apartments on 1st Avenue in Grandview. My main concern is with the proposed building heights, which I believe would further separate the two halves of what is a relatively homogeneous single family residential neighbourhood. Further, tall buildings on 1st would lead to shadowing and a lack of privacy for adjoining homes. This is compounded by the fact that these lots are shorter than the standard lot size. Views of the north shore mountains would be lost for homes to the south--in an area noted for its grand view. And parking, already an issue in the alleyway, would become even more of a problem.

I understand the need to find ways to increase density and diversity of housing options in Grandview Woodland, but for the above noted reasons I believe that 1st Avenue is not an appropriate location for 4 storey units. I could, however support zoning allowing row houses in the 2.5 storey or 35 foot range--which is higher than the 31 feet currently permitted in the existing RS-1 zone, so long as consideration is given to design, aesthetics and limiting lot amalgamation so as to avoid a tunnel effect on the block. One creative solution raised at a recent community meeting involved 'facing' the 1st Avenue lots towards the alleys, such that 1st Avenue was the parking access and the house front was away from the arterial.

Secondly, I am perplexed by your recommendations for Nanaimo Street. With regards to the designated "truck route" label, I must note that since 2011, in response to increased truck traffic, the city has actively discouraged truck use, requesting truckers use an alternate route to the Port and adopting a truck specific speed limit of 30km. From my experience, this has been largely effective at reducing truck use.

In addition, though I am not against the idea of enhanced commercial at nodes on the street, given the abundance of new mixed use that will be available on Hastings, at Broadway and Commercial, and that is already available on Commercial and on Renfrew, I do not see the need for the development of a new mixed use only zone the length of the street--indeed beyond any political difficulties with adopting this new zone, I wonder about the economic feasibility of such a new area.

I have attended many of the workshops hosted by the city, including sub area workshops, and though I have heard comments about improving retail at the nodes, I am quite surprised by the magnitude of the change proposed for this street. I can see a possibility for an incremental increase, but a requirement for mixed use only seems very extreme.

Beyond this issue of the character of new development on Nanaimo however, my chief concern is with ensuring new development is at a height that will not vastly overshadow the neighboring homes, particularly since Nanaimo street is the peak rise from between approximately 6th Avenue and Gravely. Buildings much taller than the existing permitted height would have an undesirable shadowing effect on the neighboring homes to the east and west.

I hope that the Assembly is aware of the efforts in 2013 of the Garden Park neighborhood to canvass and inform local residents of changes proposed under the city's emerging directions. This effort, which resulted in a petition that garnered hundreds of signatures from residents of the Garden Park and Lord Nelson school areas was specific in its opposition to 3-4 storey apartments and townhouses on 1st Avenue, Nanaimo street and in the "fingers" around school and the park that had been proposed by the city. I hope that the Assembly consider the wishes of the residents of this neighborhood when developing proposals that impact it so directly.

I read with interest many of your other proposals, including tunneling traffic on 1st Avenue and look forward to seeing your revised outputs.

Yours truly,  
Jennie Wang

**Received May 6:**

With respect for your deliberations, I do not agree with your proposals about First Avenue or Nanaimo St. Many participants argued for gentle densification in the sun area. Instead you are proposing to ramp up the height of new buildings, destroying light and views and the continuity of community we feel. The back lanes on either side of First are inadequate. There is no public transit on this street. Many suggested that the neighborhood should be in keeping with surrounding streets. There is already far too much traffic on First, and traffic is already dangerous for pedestrians. Please reconsider these proposals. Yours truly,

Margaret Davidson,  
Active participant in the CA workshops and resident of the Garden park area.

**Received May 6:**

Hi there:

At the Round Table last night, I sat at the Grandview table for the first half. There was a long conversation about putting in a new north-south bike route east of Commercial. I believe this would be an additional Recommendation as it is not mentioned in the draft, and I support it in principle.

The route that was eventually inscribed on the map consisted of using Salsbury Drive from Hastings to Graveley (at which point it would join up with the proposed bike lane on Commercial south of First). However, there are three serious issues with that plan and I would like to propose a different route.

Issue one: The proposed new bike route would intersect with an existing east-west bike route on Adanac. The existing bike route is on a steep hill when traveling west, and the bikes travel very quickly at that very point. That would make the crossing of the two routes very dangerous at that intersection.

Issue two: The proposed new bike route would use the path at Salisbury Park to get from Adanac to Venables. Salisbury Park and its small pedestrian-only road is constantly used by children and mothers. Having bikes race through there would be very dangerous.

Issue three: Salisbury Drive crossing Venables is not direct; there is a half-block jink in the road. Given the volume of car traffic on Venables, this would be a very dangerous situation for the bikes.

Solution: I believe all three of these issues would disappear if the bike route began on Victoria Drive going south from Hastings. The route could then turn right at Parker and join Salisbury from Parker.

The problems and the solution are seen more easily on a map than in text.

I hope this is of value.

Regards

Jak King

**Received May 6 (the full letter from Barbara Cameron/OCOP is filed under 'General' below):**

Point 4.13 - modifications to single family and duplex zoning: your report requires greater clarity around types of housing recommended here, as the wording is unclear as to meaning: such as 'infill housing', 'array of housing opportunities', 'attic or lock-off suites' etc.

**Received May 6 (full letter from Cheryl Campbell filed under 'General' below)**

- 1) The proposal to have up to 4 stories on 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue from Commercial to Nanaimo remains largely unchanged from the city's original draft and show an abrupt transition from high to low density.
  - 1<sup>st</sup> already has a tunnelling affect on some blocks. Increasing the height to 4 stories will exacerbate this affect.
  - Shallow lots will not allow for set-back along 1<sup>st</sup> to ensure safety or walkability.
  - 4 stories would shadow the homes behind affecting light, privacy and access to views of the North Shore Mountains.
  - The alleys between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> and Gravely are very busy and already pose safety concerns. The children on my block (including mine) and the children who attend the two daycares on 1<sup>st</sup> between Semlin and Lakewood use the alleys to walk to each other's homes to visit. Children from the daycares visit and feed the backyard chickens from the alley. Putting 4 story apartments would make the alleys too busy for such activity. Also, it would all but destroy the tight knit community feel that exists here.
  - There is already significant pressure on parking in the area, especially close to Garden Park. The park is used on week nights and weekends for Micro Footie (Soccer) and gets very crowded with cars and other traffic.

**Received May 7 (See full letter from Noam Doglin under 'General'):**

B. Lot assembly limits if they are used at all need to be:

- a) Based on maximum lot sizes, not number of lots, as lot sizes vary
- b) There are engineering and City code mandates that require minimum lot sizes. These often require a minimum of 15,000-20,000 sq ft lot to allow for underground parking. Lot assembly limits should be large enough (20,000-25,000 sq ft) to achieve the goal of allowing approved density while at the same time protecting the city scape.

4.12 See above regarding lot assembly

4.13 "*create an array of housing opportunities...*" This will not be feasible in light of current lot assembly recommendations

**Received May (Full letter from Susana Harder/OCOP filed below under 'General'):**

4.11 Good example of specifying the zoning, but will not necessarily lead to more affordable housing if rental units are lost to duplexes, etc.

4.13 Good example of specifying maximum height and maximum land assembly. Needs clarity around types of housing as wording is unclear: 'infill housing', 'array of housing opportunities'. Encourage the types of housing e.g. laneway that add rental units rather than coach houses which are sold off. Recommend potential to add attic or lock-off suites.

4.14 **May** contradict 4.13 which specifies 3 storeys and no land assembly. In 4<sup>th</sup> bullet, recommend replacing 'Development permits' with 'Demo permits'.

## NANAIMO:

**Received April 30**

Hello Rachel,

Thank you for keeping us informed on the Grandview citizens assembly. We have noticed that proposed changes along Nanaimo directly affect our current property located at the southeast Charles and Nanaimo (1310 nanaimo st)

On the map provided the area between Kitchener and Charles is designated to be 3 story commercial with no mixed use component. We do not think that this makes the best future land use for us, the neighboring tenants, and local population.

We feel that a mixed use project of 4/5 storeys (much like the one proposed across the street on the northeast corner) would best serve the community by keeping the ground floor retail for local tenants while at the same time allowing for the local population to age in place.

Furthermore, a current mixed use project directly across rarely has vacancy for both commercial and residential, proving that the concept of mixed-use in the area is far more sound than a strict commercial node.

In closing, we would like to address the needs of the community that we serve, but feel that the current land use plan is too limiting and we would be opposed to what has been shown.

Feel free to email us back or give us a call to discuss.

Kindest regards,

Derek Dalla-Zanna  
**Censorio Development Corp**

**Received April 30:**

Dear Ms. Magnusson,

On August 4, 2013 the City of Vancouver received a petition from the neighbourhood group, "Friends of Garden Park." The petition contained over 317 signatures plus an additional 129 online signatures through Change.org, primarily from those residing around Garden Park, Lord Nelson School, and the 2300 blocks from 2nd Avenue to 6th Avenue and Charles Street to Gravelly Street. The petition represents qualitatively and quantitatively the desire of the neighbourhood residents. It stated:

"Specific concepts not supported by our community are:

- *\_6 storey mixed-use apartment zoning on East 2nd and Nanaimo Street,*
- *\_4 storey apartment/stacked townhome zoning in the 2300 blocks of East 2nd and 3rd Avenue,*
- *\_3-4 storey townhome development on the 2200 or 2300 blocks of Grandview, and*
- *\_4 storey stacked apartment or townhouse zoning along 1st Avenue."*

The petition also outlined specific neighbourhood support for increased density and affordable housing as follows:

- *We support the draft Community Plan's key land use to allow 'gentle' forms of densification via laneway houses, coach houses and secondary suites.*
- *We want to see this standard applied to the Garden Park area, including on 1st Avenue, Nanaimo Street, and the 2200 and 2300 blocks of Grandview.*
- *We believe new development should follow the existing design guidelines to retain the heritage character of the neighbourhood.*

The recent release of the Draft Sub-Area Recommendations by the Grandview-Woodland Citizens Assembly is not in keeping with our stated expectations as the 4 storey apartment proposal for 1st Avenue has been retained and the 3 storey mixed-use proposal does not differ significantly from the previously proposed 4 storey stacked townhouse proposal.

Respectfully yours,  
Philip Hill  
cc: Friends of Garden Park

### Received May 1:

I wish to express my extreme dissatisfaction and sense of betrayal with the Citizens' assembly recommendations for land use changes in the area of Nanaimo Street. I attended both the sub-area workshop for Grandview and the following separate workshop for the Nanaimo corridor. At the former workshop, **every table** commented directly that the Nanaimo Corridor should not have been hived off. The city's divide and conquer motivation in this matter was obvious to all.

At the Nanaimo Corridor workshop, every table again objected to the exclusion of the Nanaimo corridor from the rest of the neighbourhood. At the sub-area workshop, tables recommended gentle densification largely by way of coach houses and laneway houses. The point was consistently made that **only** properties actually facing onto Nanaimo should be considered for a height increase. There are four blocks which face onto Nanaimo on the west side of the street and quite a few which face Nanaimo on the east side of the street. It was noted that very few residents of the area in question were present, in particular the east side of Nanaimo was unrepresented. Most tables resisted city pressure to upzone at all along that corridor, with a few tables suggesting only minor height increases to no more than three stories to apply only to Nanaimo-facing properties. All the other residential blocks are east-west oriented and residents present understood clearly that those blocks should not be subject to what amounts to spot re-zoning. To up-zone one or more of these north or south-facing properties at the eastern edge of Nanaimo is simply to pursue the original city objective of creating the 'thin edge of the wedge' which will destroy the single family home nature of the area. This idiocy will result in the replacement of single family homes plus their actually affordable basement suites with townhomes which very few can afford to buy. This will result in a **net decrease** of affordable housing in the area.

It will also result in increased density in an area underserved for parks and underserved for bus access. Additionally, Lord Nelson School is destined for demolition due to seismic vulnerability; the rebuilt school has been designed for 400 children, not the current capacity of 800 children.

So, given these sub-area recommendations and the information supplied by the 446 Friends of Garden Park petitioners, how exactly could the Citizens' Assembly have come up with recommendations so at odds with the wishes of local residents? Is it possible that the city misreported the sub-area workshop recommendations to the Assembly? I will be looking for answers from planners on the 4th and from CA members on the 5th. I will also be expressing my anger to other Grandview-Woodland Area Council Directors.

Sincerely,  
Micah Waskow  
Membership and Communications Secretary  
Grandview-Woodland Area Council.

**Received May 5 (from letter above filed under 'Grandview'):**

Secondly, I am perplexed by your recommendations for Nanaimo Street. With regards to the designated "truck route" label, I must note that since 2011, in response to increased truck traffic, the city has actively discouraged truck use, requesting truckers use an alternate route to the Port and adopting a truck specific speed limit of 30km. From my experience, this has been largely effective at reducing truck use.

In addition, though I am not against the idea of enhanced commercial at nodes on the street, given the abundance of new mixed use that will be available on Hastings, at Broadway and Commercial, and that is already available on Commercial and on Renfrew, I do not see the need for the development of a new mixed use only zone the length of the street--indeed beyond any political difficulties with adopting this new zone, I wonder about the economic feasibility of such a new area.

I have attended many of the workshops hosted by the city, including sub area workshops, and though I have heard comments about improving retail at the nodes, I am quite surprised by the magnitude of the change proposed for this street. I can see a possibility for an incremental increase, but a requirement for mixed use only seems very extreme.

Beyond this issue of the character of new development on Nanaimo however, my chief concern is with ensuring new development is at a height that will not vastly overshadow the neighboring homes, particularly since Nanaimo street is the peak rise from between approximately 6th Avenue and Gravelly. Buildings much taller than the existing permitted height would have an undesirable shadowing effect on the neighboring homes to the east and west.

I hope that the Assembly is aware of the efforts in 2013 of the Garden Park neighborhood to canvass and inform local residents of changes proposed under the city's emerging directions. This effort, which resulted in a petition that garnered hundreds of signatures from residents of the Garden Park and Lord Nelson school areas was specific in its opposition to 3-4 storey apartments and townhouses on 1st Avenue, Nanaimo street and in the "fingers" around school and the park that had been proposed by the city. I hope that the Assembly consider the wishes of the residents of this neighborhood when developing proposals that impact it so directly.

**Received May 6:**

I am writing to express my extreme disappointment with the most recent proposal for development along Nanaimo Street from 1st to Broadway.

The current plan to allow 4-6 story development on half of the block, including streets like 2nd and 3rd Avenue, where there is NO alley to provide separation between existing single family homes and multi-family high density development is completely unacceptable. The homes on the portion of the block not rezoned will have a towering building right adjacent to their property completely eliminating their light and privacy.



If you wish to rezone along these streets (2nd Avenue to Broadway) rezone the entire block so you don't trap existing family homes beside large scale developments. At the very least only allow multi-family development along Nanaimo where there is an existing alleyway which provides a small buffer between single family homes and high density development.

I sincerely hope to reconsider this most recent proposal for Nanaimo Street densification. This new plan is the worst option put forward yet for this community.

**Received May 6 (the full letter from Barbara Cameron/OCOP is filed under 'General' below):**

Your report remains silent on what has been a very contentious issue - the areas around Garden Park, Lord Nelson Elementary and Templeton Park, which fall into the Nanaimo sub-area. It was stated emphatically by many participants in the Grandview sub-area workshop and elsewhere that adding four storeys around these parks would effectively cut them off from the entire Grandview community, creating a wall of exclusion around these much loved and much used local parks. It would be very positive for the CA to make mention in your final report of the clear public input on this matter and to take a positive stand on this important community consideration.

Point 5.10 regarding lot assemblage: replace 'preference to' with 'maximum of 2 lot assemblages' and eliminate 'maximum of three'.

Points 5.11, 5.14 - community consultations requested. These points should be eliminated as they open the door to spot re-zoning which ostensibly would be "OK" as long as the community is being consulted.

**Received May 6 (Full letter from Cheryl Campbell filed below under 'General'):**

The proposal to have an enhanced commercial node at 1<sup>st</sup> and Nanaimo makes sense for the neighbourhood if done on a reasonable scale. However, the height proposed at this corner does not. This is the top of the rise. Tall buildings here will completely overshadow neighbouring homes.

The proposal to drastically increase retail space along Nanaimo does not seem reasonable. This area is far from transportation routes, so parking would again be a significant issue.

**Received May 7:**

As the current owner of 1775 Nanaimo St, Vancouver, BC, I have attended two community roundtable meetings, and two community walkabouts. I would like to offer my input regarding the upcoming zoning proposals about the density of dwellings in the Grandview – Woodlands area, specifically E. 1st St. & Nanaimo corridor. The Vancouver City Planners have suggested that our particular property may be eligible for "up to six stories". I would like to officially express my support in this regard.

I have spoken to Andrew Pask, Vancouver Midtown Division Planner, who recommended that I submit an email regarding my thoughts of how I would like to develop my property.

Since purchasing this property in 2009, I have seen the comings and goings of various businesses due to their economic struggles. There was a couple who owned a family owned computer business located at 1745 Nanaimo Street. I believe it was their financial difficulties which resulted in them closing said reputable business, in my opinion. This allowed a marginal business to take that space, in this case, a marijuana dispensary business. Since then it appears that another

marijuana related business has opened up beside them. As a health clinic, this is discouraging for us, our patients and those whom we market to.

By increasing the density of the Nanaimo - East 1st Area, you will support the success and expansion of local retailers, thereby creating a more successful, cohesive community, deterring marginalized businesses from coming here.

If you have any further questions or concerns, please email me.

Sincerely,

Surj Singh Dhugga

**Received May 7:**

Hello,

I am concerned about the effects the proposed 'up to 3 storey mixed use' will have on adjacent residential housing, especially in blocks without a lane to divide. It is hard to imagine how a 3 storey building with retail can aesthetically share a property line with single family housing. I would be in favour if development were extended to Garden Drive.

Jason Mark

**Received May (Full letter from Susana Harder/OCOP filed below under 'General'):**

Note: there is no mention of the areas around Garden Park, Lord Nelson Elementary or Templeton Park. The zoning should be stated and reflect the desires of the residents. We must note the great efforts of residents like the Friends of Garden Park and refer the CA to their petitions which state: "Specific concepts not supported by our community are:

- 6 storey mixed-use apartment zoning on East 2nd and Nanaimo Street,
- 4 storey apartment/stacked townhome zoning in the 2300 blocks of East 2nd and 3rd Avenue,
- 3-4 storey townhome development on the 2200 or 2300 blocks of Grandview, and
- 4 storey stacked apartment or townhouse zoning along 1st Avenue."

5.8 The map does not reflect the recommendations – correct inconsistencies.

5.10 Replace 'preference to' with 'maximum of'.

5.11, 5.14 Remove entirely as they open the door to spot rezoning.

5.13 Does not specify the desired built-forms, height, massing, etc.

**Received May 8 (Full letter from Jim Fraser is filed under 'General' below):**

I'll be more brief about the Nanaimo recommendations. The text and the map are not consistent so they should be modified to be so. The text allowing up to 4 stories is higher than what many people have expressed as desirable in workshops so I would recommend changing the text to read "to a maximum of 3 stories" to be consistent with the map statement "3 story mixed use (long-term vision)".

The text also doesn't mention the additional heights shown on the maps at the 'Nodes'. At the workshops I've attended there has been considerable opposition expressed about adding additional height at those areas, and it was not made clear to me in the May 5 public meeting that there was any compelling reason for additional height at the nodes, other than to say that the CA sub-committee working on the area wanted to avoid a monotonous streetscape with the same height all along it. That could be achieved in other ways than by allowing up to 6 stories in some areas, which in light of community concerns is far too high.

Recommendation 5.12 encourages the city "...to support a building typology that addresses livability with each unit having a quiet side." I think the recommendation should go further and direct the city to require a building typology that also interacts well with pedestrians on the Nanaimo side and with neighbouring buildings on the laneway side. This has been done reasonably well in buildings in the 2100 block of Hastings, and the Marquee building on Commercial at 7<sup>th</sup>, although there is probably room for improvement still. A counter-example is the building at Charles and Nanaimo (W. side) that presents a horrible blank concrete wall to its neighbours. Recommendation 5.13 perhaps is intended to cover this, but if so, it needs to be made more explicit.

Recommendation 5.2. strongly recommends the city increase speed limit monitoring and enforcement along Nanaimo. This is far less than what I understood city planners to be suggesting was possible at the public workshop on the Nanaimo sub-area - i.e. a median along the centre, bulges at the corners, or a separated bike lane. A key concern about Nanaimo is the difficulty with crossing it safely, and design elements to make that happen would do far more than suggesting more speed limit monitoring and enforcement.

Still on the issue of traffic, recommendation 5.6 ventures, oddly, outside of the sub-area, to recommend that adjacent streets to encourage the city to use traffic calming measures such as roundabouts and speed bumps rather than traffic barricades/diverters in streets adjacent to Nanaimo. After significant community concern about traffic counts and speed, the city placed traffic calming barricades and diverters into my sub-area many years ago. Subsequent traffic counts after the measures were put in place showed they reduced numbers overall and spread the remainder more evenly through the community. It took some work and experimentation to get the pattern of barriers/diverters right, and there was one significant redesign several years ago to address a flaw in the design. Although, I haven't heard from everyone, I have only heard support for the measures since that time.

Nevertheless, this is a sub-sub-area issue and what is done in my neighbourhood (First to Adanac, Nanaimo to Victoria) has no impact on traffic South of First Avenue. Even the implementation of traffic calming measures North of Adanac (between there and Hastings) was done largely independently of the area South of Adanac because Templeton School and park largely separates the traffic flows.

**Received May 8:**

Hi,

My name is Kegan Doyle, and I am a long time resident of East Third Avenue (near Garden Park). I would like to say that I share many of the concerns expressed by OCOP in its report.

I would like to add that I am concerned with the impact that increased density will have on traffic along Nanaimo (**Section 5**) and that much should be done to ensure that traffic is calmed and controlled on Nanaimo between Hastings and the Grandview Highway.

I would strongly endorse the decision to add a new pedestrian-controlled light at East Third Avenue. The traffic at the intersection of Broadway and Nanaimo is a major concern as

well, especially given the number of children and teens in the area.

Needless to say, traffic calming and control are concerns for the entire area. Due to traffic volume, families here have to deal with a lot of reckless "rat-running" and other irresponsible behaviour.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. Kegan Doyle

**Received May 8:**

Dear Ms. Magnusson,

The neighbourhood group, "Friends of Garden Park" sent a petition on August 4, 2013 to the City of Vancouver. The petition contained over 317 signatures plus an additional 129 online signatures through Change.org, primarily from those residing around Garden Park, Lord Nelson School, and the 2300 blocks from 2nd Avenue to 6th Avenue and Charles Street to Gravely Street.

The petition represents the desire of the neighbourhood residents. It stated:

"Specific concepts not supported by our community are:

- *6 storey mixed-use apartment zoning on East 2nd and Nanaimo Street,*
- *4 storey apartment/stacked townhome zoning in the 2300 blocks of East 2nd and 3rd Avenue,*
- *3-4 storey townhome development on the 2200 or 2300 blocks of Grandview, and*
- *4 storey stacked apartment or townhouse zoning along 1st Avenue."*

The petition also outlined specific neighbourhood support for increased density and affordable housing as follows:

- *We support the draft Community Plan's key land use to allow 'gentle' forms of densification via laneway houses, coach houses and secondary suites.*
- *We want to see this standard applied to the Garden Park area, including on 1st Avenue, Nanaimo Street, and the 2200 and 2300 blocks of Grandview.*
- *We believe new development should follow the existing design guidelines to retain the heritage character of the neighbourhood.*

The release of the new Draft Sub-Area Recommendations for the Grandview-Woodland area in no way reflects the wishes of the residents of this area.

I would very much like to state my disappointment in the information set out in the new recommendations with regard to the height of building for Nanaimo and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue.

Specifically the retention of the 4 storey apartment proposal for 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and the 3 storey mixed-use proposal is not very different from the proposed 4 storey stacked townhouse proposal.

I disagree with the proposed 4 storey apartment proposal for 1st Avenue. As a resident of the North side of 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, the building heights would eliminate any privacy we have in our back yards and the views of Grouse Mountain will be eliminated altogether. Parking in the alley, which already is congested, will be more problematic.

The other main area of concern is the proposed height of building on Nanaimo Street between 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Gravely Street. The land naturally rises to meet Nanaimo and the

addition of building height would add significantly to the proposed height of the buildings. This would overshadow the homes on the adjacent streets.

In the 20 plus years I have lived in this neighborhood, we have seen densification of this area with the addition of secondary suites, laneway and coach houses and support these endeavours. Continuing in this fashion is what the residents are calling for.

We are appealing to the Citizen`s Assembly to respect and honour the process and our wishes to develop this very special Garden Park neighborhood without these two recommendations.

Sincerely,

Nicole de Margerie

**Received May 8:**

See separate letter from Kevin Trawin (PDF)

**Received May 8:**

See separate letter from Leonard Paul (PDF)

## **COMMERCIAL DRIVE:**

**Received May 6 (the full letter from Barbara Cameron/OCOP is filed under 'General' below):**

The retention of a 4 storey height limit along the entire length of Commercial Drive is essential to retain the character of The Drive. I strongly recommend that you limit the east and west sides of Commercial between 6<sup>th</sup> and the Cut to four storeys, rather than the five and six you have recommended.

As you know, the Venables/Commercial site (Astorino's/Kettle Society) remains highly contentious. The city is proceeding to hold public consultations on this proposal, which is a for-profit condo tower of at least 14 storeys with between 100 and 150 market condo units and 30 social housing units. For the site to be workable from the developer's point of view, they would require the addition of an abutting city-owned piece of land, which is currently a parking lot. This land could be much better be used as a much-needed park.

This proposed development is massive and completely out of character and scale with the remainder of The Drive. Holding out the hope of socially supportive housing is the developer's main calling card for this invasive, precedent-setting proposal.

For the CA to approve in principle this development as it now stands would set a dangerous precedent for further destructive spot re-zoning under the guise of social amenities.

I firmly believe it **is** possible to provide much-needed supportive social housing in other ways NOT tied to massive, over-scale developments with the prospect of huge negative impacts on the character of our neighbourhood.

I urge you to reject this approach in the interests of preserving the scale and character of The Drive.

**Received May 7 (Full letter from Susana Harder/OCOP filed below under 'General'):**

The retention of a 4 storey height limit along the entire length of Commercial Drive is essential to retain the character of The Drive. I strongly recommend that you limit the east and west sides of Commercial between 6<sup>th</sup> and the Cut to four storeys, rather than the five and six you have recommended.

As you know, the Venables/Commercial site (Astorino's/Kettle Society) remains highly contentious. The city is proceeding to hold public consultations on this proposal, which is a for-profit condo tower of at least 14 storeys with between 100 and 150 market condo units and 30 social housing units. For the site to be workable from the developer's point of view, they would require the addition of an abutting city-owned piece of land, which is currently a parking lot. This land could be much better be used as a much-needed park.

This proposed development is massive and completely out of character and scale with the remainder of The Drive. Holding out the hope of socially supportive housing is the developer's main calling card for this invasive, precedent-setting proposal.

For the CA to approve in principle this development as it now stands would set a dangerous precedent for further destructive spot re-zoning under the guise of social amenities.

I firmly believe it **is** possible to provide much-needed supportive social housing in other ways NOT tied to massive, over-scale developments with the prospect of huge negative impacts on the character of our neighbourhood.

I urge you to reject this approach in the interests of preserving the scale and character of The Drive.

**Received May 8:**

The high rise structure proposed by Boffo has alarmed a great many people here in Grandview-Woodlands and I am certainly one of them. The great number of new market priced condo units proposed by Boffo will be disruptive to our community and the high rise structure is wholly contrary to the character of GW.

It is alarming also that the Kettle has gone along with this proposal and is showing surprisingly little regard for the character of GW or for the concerns of its residents.

The process is clear. The Kettle asks for a number of new shelter units perhaps as many as they can handle and why not, its "free" for them. Boffo then takes that number and multiplies it by a factor of 3 or so before proceeding to obtain approval from CoV.

Even using Boffo's dull penciled arithmetic anyone can see the benefits of this approach. The more shelters requested by the Kettle, the more market suites that Boffo expects to build. And ultimately the better the return will be to its shareholders.

In reality this process is an affront to the residents of GW, certainly to those individuals that are trying to retain the character of GW and especially to those individuals that participated in good faith in the ongoing community planning process.

The Kettle gets its "free" units. Boffo seeks ever more generous profits for its shareholders and for its efforts GW receives a precedent setting poke in the eye.

The project must conform to the existing character of GW and its height limited to four stories.

D Smith

**Received May 8:**

I was thinking about a recent post on CA website, saying that the CA members had agreed to disagree on the Boffo/Kettle Proposal. It's probably too late to change that since it seems like parties have become entrenched. But as the process moves forward, it may be helpful to keep in mind that part of the problem may be that the way the sub-areas have been designed, and the way it is being discussed, are leading it to be considered too narrowly. I was telling a friend who lives near Hastings-Sunrise and who hasn't been involved much but who was, until his retirement, involved in planning issues at a senior level with the Parks Board. His comment, was that thinking about the controversy he thought that by itself the site could handle a higher building but that it shouldn't be allowed to become a pattern for the area.

When I think of the area North of Venables along Commercial to Hastings there may be other future projects that are equally as supportable on social grounds as the Kettle - I'm thinking of possible future developments on the sites of UNYA or the Aboriginal Friendship Society intended to provide housing for aboriginal residents. So when I think of the area as a whole, I think the height limit should not be so low as to preclude any development, nor so high as

to 'poison the well' in the community for future, socially supportable projects, which may also need to find some private funding. That's not to say that the building form and height should necessarily be the same at Venables as at Hastings, but one should consider what realistically could be proposed in future for the whole area when looking at the Boffo/Kettle proposal.

I hope this is helpful; if not, my apologies.  
Jim



## **BROADWAY & COMMERCIAL:**

### **Notes from the OCOP meeting:**

1) Safeway site isn't so crazy-dense/high as the original plan, but everything else looks pretty much the same - or even more dense/high. In general, height is a big concern, especially along Broadway and Hastings Streets.

2) Here are some examples of comments for some of the Broadway-Commercial recommendations (apologies that I have only focused on parts - I hope to have highlighted annotated document from OCOP for points in all subareas)

-- 7.8 page 34. "Lot assembly should be limited to a maximum of four lots". Recommended change: "maximum of two lots - with frontage no greater than 66 feet" - particularly in areas adjacent to single family zones, to lessen shadowing concerns and to have better integration into the surrounding neighbourhood

-- 7.9 page 34 "height limit of 6 stories" along Broadway - this has all of Broadway lumped together. I hope you will object strenuously to this - it is too high when next to the single family zones east of Commercial. At the Broadway-Commercial subarea workshop, there was recognition that Broadway east of Commercial had a different character than that west of Commercial. I think, for a 30 year plan, keeping property on Broadway as single family is unrealistic and will have no traction. Max of 2-3 stories is something suggested that is not NIMBY-ish.

-- we are concerned about traffic issues around Laura Secord Elementary School but these are not addressed in the recommendations

### **Received May 2:**

Dear Sir/Madame,

I would like to put my request in that development along Broadway east of Commercial Drive be kept to no more than small two story or multi family buildings as the height of buildings has a huge effect on the enjoyment of this neighbourhood.

We don't want to block the sun and sky from our lives.  
thank you

Albert Murphy

### **Received May 4:**

Hello,

We received a flyer in the mailbox today (May 4th) detailing proposed land use changes along Broadway. To say we were shocked to read about the suggestion to allow six-storey mixed-use buildings right behind our house is an understatement. We never received any literature or communication regarding these proposed changes until today - and the flyer goes on to say that the final chance to voice any opinion on the proposed changes is tomorrow, May 5th at the Croatian Cultural Centre. Is this a joke? This stinks of special interests trying to railroad through changes and avoid any opposition. Who are the people advocating for this change? Not likely the residents of East 8th or East 10th - the people who will be most affected by the proposed changes.

We are not particularly fond of the monolithic duplexes and triplexes now sprouting up everywhere around us, but when we bought our house in 2007 we knew there was the potential for this kind of development. However, when we dropped a fortune to buy our house we didn't sign up for a six-storey building looming behind us.

We don't want a tall building of people overlooking our backyard. We don't want commercial tenants in our alley. The back alley is where our kid rides her bike and plays hockey. We don't want delivery trucks and customer vehicles idling up and down the alley. We don't want patrons of a bar or coffee shop smoking and socializing in our back alley, right next to our yard.

We're extremely upset about this proposal and the fact that no earlier notice about it was even provided to the residents of our street. We will fight tooth and nail to ensure these plans do not proceed.

David and Mary Carman  
1950 East 8th Avenue

**Received May 4 (from letter filed under 'Grandview' above):**

I still feel that **12 stories at Commercial & Broadway is a bit high** and would suggest that the group aim for 8 with a stepback. Anything above 5 stories erodes community wellbeing, so if we are going to give extra density at that location (and take a hit on social cohesion), then I would also want there to be **additional community services in that building (a la Woodward's)**. My suggestion would be to have artist space/galleries in such a building - something that is always a good investment and could help bring the culture crawl to a new section of East Van.

**Received May 5:**

What's the matter with four story buildings? That's lots, you're going to take away all our sun and turn our lane into a truck route. We already have lots to deal with in our lanes and we have families and kids. You people are so greedy for money, why don't you learn how to spend wisely instead of punishing us who live here for the benefit of all the people you want to move here.

Glenn Smith  
1944 E. 8th ave.  
Van,B.C.

**Received May 6:**

Dear Assembly / City of Vancouver,

I am a single parent living with my two boys, 10 and 14, in the 1900 block East 8th Avenue on the south side of the street and after reading the draft report am shocked to find that there are zoning plans for six storey buildings immediately south of the alleyway just 20 feet from our property. Our family has lived in our one storey 1940s home since 2001 and I have worked very hard to pay the mortgage and to cover our expenses for my family even when my wife passed from cancer seven years ago. It has been a struggle to continue to live in Vancouver and the idea of the zoning changing from duplexes to six storey commercial/residential buildings which will obscure most of the winter months is both saddening and stressful.

The goals of the assembly and the plan to support character homes, livability, sunlight, the character of The Drive and more are defeated by the placement of a corridor of six storey building which will blot out the sun for most of the year even with a slanted profile. I don't know why this proposal has been drafted to change the zoning for this block when the density for our area is fine for developers as it is. There should be a better way of helping to preserve our beautiful row of seven 1940s character homes from being crowded out by development when many new Vancouver developments are already being left empty as

investment properties. You can see from the overhead view that even the four storey building at the NE corner of Victoria and Broadway already blots out the sun for the character home next to it: <https://goo.gl/qbJlnS>

Although it is difficult for us to attend tonight, as it is a school night, my boys and I will be at the meeting tonight in the hope that we will be heard.

We request the zoning changes in the draft plan for 1900 block Broadway and 1900 block of East 8th be removed and for the zoning to remain at duplexes at most.

What else can I do to help make sure that my family's voice is heard in the Grandview-Woodland plan?

-Leonard Paul

**Received May 6 (the full letter from Barbara Cameron/OCOP is filed under 'General' below):**

Many issues remain outstanding regarding this key area. Point 7.2 mentions the possibility of a new bus loop if a subway isn't built, but where would this loop go? And any such proposal would allow more spot rezoning.

Regarding point 7.9 - Broadway east of Victoria Drive, 6 stories is too high for this area for a number of compelling reasons, many of which were articulated last night at the Commercial sub-area tables discussions. They include:

- serious safety concerns about traffic and congestion around Laura Secord Elementary School particularly at the Lakewood and Broadway crossing
- the possible creation of an unacceptable wall / tunnel effect closing off the adjacent single and duplex zoned areas on both sides of Broadway which now make up a pedestrian friendly, vibrant and low scale area on both sides of Broadway
- additional parking concerns which the neighbourhood already is experiencing to a certain extent due to the walkable proximity to the Broadway/Commercial Skytrain station.

Following on a strong recommendation from residents last night, I urge you to change this portion of the Broadway corridor to a 3 storey maximum height recommendation.

Point 7.12 is vague and wide open to exploitation given the current wording "site of increased density, with significant commercial and amenity components".

Point 7.15 relating to possible 8 storeys along the south side of the cut is quite problematic and would create a disjointed scale with the surrounding built form. Eight stories here would allow massive change to the character of the entire area. I recommend this be scaled back to a height restriction of 4 storeys.

Point 7.18 makes no mention of retaining the character and scale of neighbourhoods. For consideration - should properties with character homes get incentives to increase floor space for rentals to prevent demolition in favour of a 'monster home' with a laneway house – all very expensive housing options.

Green roofs (point 7.19) should apply to commercial and/or mixed-use buildings only.

Overall, all developments in this transit area need careful consideration of parking and congestion impacts which are already being felt on local, streets which are within walkable distance to the Skytrain station. No relaxation of parking space requirements should therefore be allowed.

**Received May 7 (Full letter from Noam Dolgin filed under 'General' below):**

7.0 10<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup> Avenues between Commercial and Victoria/Semlin are ideal for density, especially in light of the new proposed plaza. This location is less than 5 minutes from the transit hub, Commercial Drive and 2 large parks and it is already cut off from the rest of the community by Broadway, 12<sup>th</sup> & the cut. Tying these 3 blocks into the vision for the new plaza would be ideal, and would also facilitate a few other recommendations such as wider sidewalks and safer bike access on Victoria Dr, and expanding the plaza across 10<sup>th</sup>.

7.1 Shadowing – the City has done extensive modelling on the effects of shadowing. I don't know if you've seen the shadowing reports down for Commercial-Broadway, but basically shadowing effects are much smaller than we imagine. If you have not seen them, I highly recommend asking Andrew for them, you may discover that shadowing is much less of an issue than you think and that taller towers will add very little shadow effect to the neighbourhood.

7.2 *"Broadway subway not built within 5 years"*

It will definitely take more than 5 years to build the Broadway extension. Maybe you should reword to say something like "If the Broadway subway extension is not in development within 5 years"

7.8 See above regarding lot assembly

7.18 Requiring lock off suites – you can't require people to use their personal residences for rental. You can permit and/or encourage lockoff suites, but you can't require them.

**Received May 7:**

We are residents of e10. Our opinion is no to a six storey tower in our back alley. My ten year olds opinion is this is stupid, and he will stand in the alley to block this. We use are alley for parking and adding that many more apartments to the alley would make it a very dangerous area. Also bringing all these people into one small area increases theft and break ins to our homes. This is alley is a in out and access for residents and with delivery trucks and others coming into the alley this would cause a traffic problem. If you haven't noticed already there is a problem with traffic with children crossing roadway. How is adding all these extra properties going to effect the traffic flow on already very busy street. The only people benefiting from these plans our developers, that are increasingly getting richer and richer. Its time to think about our community that we have built.

**Received May 7:**

Your proposal would ruin all the backyards of the houses on the south side of east 8th the buildings would shade the yards and block the sun it is totally unfair to these property owners. Peter Harris

**Received May 7:**

Hello:

I have been living on 8 th ave between Victoria and Semlin Dr. on the south side of the street,

for 8 years. My back yard faces onto the alley and I am absolutely NOT in favour of a six storey development along the block.

At best I would support two stories in order to preserve some semblance of a residential neighbourhood that is not marred with unattractive housing complexes.

I do not want increased parking traffic in my back alley, not to mention the huge amount of construction that will take it over. It is peaceful here and building rows of apartments will kill that. I do not want people up on their balconies looking down onto my deck. I think this development will be a blight on our community.

I do not subscribe to the manic marketing campaigns of developers and city councillors, that we must "densify" every square inch of the city.

I also do not trust that what is being proposed is at all architecturally attractive. Look around this city and see the monolithic, cookie cutter developments that already plague us. What a sickening legacy. I will not support the maximization of profits for these developers. Build some thing small and beautiful and then maybe then a conversation can begin.

Sincerely,

-Heather Brown

**Received May 7:**

Dear Grandview Woodland Assembly,

We are writing to express our concerns regarding the proposed changes as outlined in the Grandview Woodplan Community Plan. We purchased a house at 2070 East 8th approximately 4 years ago and did an extensive renovation. We purchased in this neighborhood as it is a vibrant community where neighbors know each other and kids are playing in the yards. It is this family oriented feel that attracted us and drove our desire to want to live here.

And, it is with deep concern for the fabric of this neighborhood that we appeal to you regarding the proposed plans for this community.

Please consider the following with regards to this plan. If the area between Victoria and Nanaimo is to include 4-6 story buildings along Broadway:

1. The safety of the children will be at risk. The Laura Secord School at the corner of Broadway and Lakewood has young kids that walk to school and play at the school yard during weekdays and weekends. An increase in traffic, parking, and additional people causes concern for the safety of the children.
2. The family oriented neighborhood feel will likely dissolve. With the addition of apartments and condominiums and the increase in number of people in the neighborhood it will likely alter our community feel and make the neighborhood more like a bunch of anonymous people sharing space.
3. There will be a loss of privacy and light. We have a garden in our back yard and south facing solar hot water system. If a 4-6 story building goes in we will lose the sunlight that is needed to grow our garden and will reduce the efficiency of heating our water.
4. There will be a significant increase in traffic and noise in the alley. This will cause noise and risk to children in alleys as the alley is a main corridor for the people that live in this neighborhood. We play hockey, teach our children how to ride bicycles, and often find time to talk with each other in the alley.
5. There will be a parking issue and a higher number of cars.

6. The value of our house will likely go down. We work very hard for our income and to see the value of our house diminish would be unfortunate.

Thank you for taking the time to read and empathize with our concerns regarding the Grandview Wood Community Plan.

If you require any clarification or have any questions please don't hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,  
Dave MacIver  
2070 East 8th Ave

**Received May 7:**

Please accept this email as my opposition to the proposed zoning changes along Broadway between Victoria Drive and Nanaimo Street. A 'large' zoning change from single family dwelling to density allowed by 6 storeys is unacceptable. I would like the zoning to remain as it is (which I believe is single family with duplex with laneway house) (Although this has definitely created parking issues in the neighborhood.) Thank you for allowing this input.

Sincerely,

Tony Bordignon

**Received May 7 (Full letter from Susana Harder/OCOP filed below under 'General'):**

7.2 Mentions possibility of a new bus loop if subway isn't built, leaving door open to future spot rezoning.

7.4 Last sentence should state these requirements apply to the Safeway/plaza site.

7.8 Lot assembly should be accompanied by specifications on built form and massing.

7.9 For Broadway east of Victoria, 6 stories is too high and mixed use brings cars and deliveries through the lane; there are safety concerns about traffic around Laura Secord Elementary School.

7.10 Buildings up to 8 storeys at these 2 intersections seems out of place given heights of nearby buildings, especially at Broadway and Clark across from the elementary school.

7.11 Current zoning allows for up to 4 storeys along these routes. Specifics would be needed around maximum land assembly, built form, massing, etc.

7.12 Wide open to exploitation given wording "site of increased density, with significant commercial and amenity components". Negotiations for CACs would likely result in high density as seen elsewhere in City, e.g. Cambie Corridor. Expand view cone from Trout Lake, westward from Safeway site.

7.15 Wording must be tightened around exact locations affected, e.g. west of Commercial Drive, immediately adjacent to the Grandview Cut.

7.18 Makes no mention of retaining character and scale of neighbourhoods. Specify zoning to prevent land assembly, limit height and density, indicated acceptable built forms (what does infill housing look like?). Should properties with character homes get incentive to increase

floor space for rentals to prevent demolition in favour of 'monster home' with laneway house?

7.19 Apply to commercial and/or mixed use buildings only.

7.20 Needs careful consideration of parking and congestion impacts.

**Received May 7 (Full letter from David Williams filed under 'General'):**

*Broadway & Commercial Sub-Area*

7.1 I agree with the varied heights, and reduced heights along Commercial and 10<sup>th</sup>, I think the east side and Broadway sides of the site should have 16-18 stories. I think that this could be a very good candidate for extremely reduced parking requirements.

7.2 I disagree, a bus loop is not the solution

7.3 I disagree, this is too prescriptive, change to urge the Transportation department to do a neighbourhood traffic calming program.

7.4 I agree

7.5 I agree, and think Broadway and Commercial should be added

7.6 I agree

7.7 I agree

7.8 I agree, unless breezeways are added to break up the massing

7.9 I agree, but think that 4 would be more palatable for the neighbourhood. Also, maybe change the mixed-use to live-work studios or something other than commercial space.

7.10 I agree, and think the heights should be increased to 12 stories with relaxed parking requirements.

7.11 I agree, and for 12<sup>th</sup> since it's basically a highway perhaps the buildings could actually face the back lanes? Clark, and Nanaimo have decent transit maybe these could be increased to 6 stories.

7.12 I agree, but isn't this the same as 7.10?

7.13 I agree, and think we could go to 8 stories

7.14 I agree, and think we could go to 12 stories

7.15 I agree, and think the heights should be relative to the width of the cut and that given the awkward walking connections due to the cut, that a 'true' walking distance with included delay for traffic signals be used rather than a simple circle.

7.16 I agree

7.17 I agree

7.18 I agree and think creative relaxations to setbacks can help increase food security and

backyard gardening for modest income residents to stay in the neighbourhood. I also question the actual sustainability of laneway houses being built alongside a new main house, lumping the square footage into 1 principal building is much more cost effective and energy efficient.

7.19 I agree

7.20 I agree, but think the walking radius could be increased to a 10 minute actual walking path as mentioned above

7.21 I agree

**Received May 8:**

Hi there,

We are not in favor of the proposed plan to build 6 storey buildings on Broadway.

Lam Family

**Received May 8:**

Hello

I am sending a comment on behalf of my mother a elderly, long term home owner in the area that will be affected by apparent proposed zoning changes along Broadway between Victoria and Nanaimo (affecting homes on East 8th and East 10th).

She does not support the rational to allow for 6 storey residential housing/commercial buildings.

Ultimately it would appear that the neighbourhood should be a pleasant place to reside rather than constructing buildings of that height and size that are totally out of place on lots of a size intended to meet the needs for a family home.

Thank you

Bonnie Thomas

**Received May 8:**

See attached note from Sol Paul (JPG)

**Received May 8:**

This email is to express my opposition to six storey buildings along Broadway between Victoria Drive and Nanaimo Street. I cherish the neighbourhood we have and the proposed increased density will make the area impersonal and busy. The retention of the current zoning is preferred and if any change does occur it is to a MAXIMUM of 2 1/2 storeys. Three storey (and higher) units will increase lane way traffic to unacceptable levels. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Darcy Campbell



**Received May 8:**

As a resident of the 2200 block of East 8th Avenue I am deeply concerned about some of the recommendations in the most recent draft of the Citizens Assembly recommendations to the City of Vancouver. I feel that the Citizens Assembly does not accurately reflect the position of the residents in my area. I was not in attendance at the most recent meeting on May 5, but the recommendations dated April 29, 2015, suggest the Broadway corridor between Victoria and Nanaimo be zoned to allow for a maximum height of 6 storey mixed use buildings and did not set reasonable limitations on land assembly or footprint.

My view is that the maximum building height be 2 storeys, residential buildings only, with a maximum land assembly of 2 lots, with frontage no greater than 66 feet - particularly in areas adjacent to single family zones, and that the existing front and back setbacks remain.

My reasons for this include:

- The importance to preventing shadowing of homes directly adjacent to Broadway. There is a narrow alley between the buildings on Broadway and those directly behind, and 6 storeys would create very significant shadowing.
- The buildings on Broadway need to be better integrated into the surrounding neighbourhood
- Safety concerns with the increased traffic on the streets around Laura Secord School - Many children are crossing Broadway and using the surrounding streets on foot and on bikes as a means to get to Laura Secord school. These roads are already congested and are problem areas with an increased number of accidents happening not only on Lakewood but on 8th Avenue. This issue would only worsen with more traffic that would come with building higher structures.
- Parking concerns caused by increased traffic.

I believe the densification that the city needs can come from less drastic changes to Broadway as well as incorporating other means of densification such as duplexes and laneway houses. The building of 6 storey residences does not suit the area nor help with providing more family housing.

Sincerely,

Kerry Sizer

**Received May 8:**

Hello Citizens Assembly,

I attended the round table session on Tuesday and like almost every other participant at the Broadway/Commercial tables, I too voiced my displeasure with the proposed zoning changes on Broadway between Victoria and Nanaimo. Everyone was in favour of retaining the current zoning which allows for massive duplexes and triplexes - many of which are already built or being built. We all thought this was a manageable way for densification to continue in this specific area.

The only two participants who spoke in favour of the proposed zoning changes were these two people with high ranking positions in the land and retail development industry - neither of whom disclosed this fact when presenting their ideas and opinions.

I sincerely hope you take into to consideration the feedback of the vast majority of the local residents. This matter is really important to us.

Thank you,  
David and Mary Carman

P.S. The two places in that stretch of Broadway that might be OK to consider for a higher building would be the empty lot on the southeast corner of Victoria/Broadway and/or the empty lot on the northeast corner of Broadway/Nanaimo.

**Received May 8:**

To the Grandview Woodlands Citizens Assembly,

My wife and I live at 2030 E 8th Ave. We are vehemently opposed to the Citizens' Assembly proposal to change zoning to allow for residential/commercial development on E Broadway between Nanaimo and Victoria. This part of Grandview-Woodlands is predominately single family dwelling. By plunking down high rises on it's southern edge the whole character of the neighborhood will be altered irreconcilably.

The presence of 6 storey high-rises directly to the south of us will negatively impact our quality of life in the following ways;

- Underground parking for tenants and shoppers at these buildings will have to be accessed from the alley directly behind us. This includes delivery trucks all day.

- Loss of privacy.

- Blocked out sunshine all day.

- Parking, bad already, will be impossible to find.

- Owners on E 8th deciding to rent out their houses creating potential for a deteriorating neighbourhood.

- Laura Secord Elementary School nearby. With increased traffic coming and going children will be more vulnerable to conflict with vehicles especially in the laneways.

- Houses on E Broadway some of which are less than 5 years old will be demolished. For a council which prides itself on its' green creds will be responsible for the increased volume of building materials going to our landfills.

Our neighborhood has evolved into something special. We have an annual block party for example. We all know each other. Vancouver is always accused of being unfriendly. This is not the case on E 8th by any measure. The presence of 6 storey monster buildings will destroy all that we have created.

To accomplish the objective of higher density desired by city council the stretch of E Broadway west of Commercial which already has 3 storey walkups could be allowed to increase their heights and that the Broadway Skytrain Station area allow for medium height (15-28 meters) towers.

In closing it feels as though our area has been sacrificed in order to accomplish higher density goals set by Vancouver city council and developers with the other areas not having to pay an equal price. This is not fair and in my opinion has been decided on in a hasty and arbitrary manner.

Yours truly,

Brian R Harvey

**Received May 8 (phone call):**

- Resident of East 8<sup>th</sup> Ave, Harry Steer
- Opposed to proposed 6 storeys along Broadway
- Shared concern by neighbourhours
- Would like things to stay the same
- Concerned about: increase in parking problems, stress on infrastructure that isn't designed for so many people

**Received May 8:**

Dear Grandview-Woodland Citizens Assembly,

I have reviewed the draft sub area recommendations, and primarily the recommendations pertaining to the Broadway-Commercial sub area, and I have some concerns I would like to express about the proposed zoning changes on Broadway from Victoria to Nanaimo.

I live on the south side of 8th avenue a few houses east of Victoria Drive with my spouse and two boys, aged 5 and 3.

I cycle downtown to work from here - regularly taking the grandview or 8th route - or traveling down Victoria Drive - or crossing Broadway up to the 10th. I also take transit all of the time, being a fair-weather biker. My eldest starts at Laura Secord elementary at Lakewood and Broadway and I will be walking him there - and my youngest to daycare at Boat on Victoria Drive north of 12th, starting in September.

I am highly concerned for the safety of children walking to and from Laura Secord - and particularly crossing Broadway to get to school. The proposed mixed use of the area east of Victoria on Broadway would make an already unsafe traffic area much busier and more chaotic. It would put the schoolchildren in danger. As a mother with 2 kids about to go to this school, these recommendations cause me a great deal of concern.

The lane way behind our house is where the boys learn to ride their bikes. It is where we and our neighbours walk everyday. The proposed mixed-use 6th story development on the south side of our lane would have a significant adverse effects on what is now a safe family neighborhood public space.

The lane way is also a route bigger kids take back and forth to school at Laura Secord. It is the way we and our neighbours walk to the Skytrain and cycle to join onto the bike routes

We live very close to the 4-story building on the north-east corner of Victoria and Commercial. Right now there is some traffic which comes out of the underground parking lot there, into the lane, but not a great deal of traffic. This may be because it is seniors' housing and everyone does not drive and those who drive, don't do a lot of driving. If instead the north side of our lane was a row of 6-story mixed residential and retail buildings, there would be vehicles coming and going from multiple parking garages all down the lane. This would essentially take away this safe strolling and riding lane from us and would make the area dangerous for children. I would have to put a lock on my back gate to ensure no one ever wandered out for a moment because the lane would resemble the already incredibly busy arteries surrounding us on Victoria and Broadway and even 8th Avenue.

At this time, I understand that Victoria & Broadway and Commercial & Broadway are 2 of the most dangerous intersections in the city, either in terms of collisions generally or injuries to

pedestrians/cyclists. To extend the development from these areas right to Laura Secord would deprive the school of its current buffer zone of 2 blocks of residences between it and those busy and dangerous intersections. Even with that, the intersection of Lakewood and Broadway is a fast and frightening place for small children to be crossing. For the safety of the neighborhood, **I urge you to recommend a 30km zone from one block east of Laura Secord to one block west of Commercial Drive.** Right now it feels like we live on the edge of a highway, this recommendation would make the kids in the neighborhood safer and slow the traffic down right through the most dangerous intersections. It has worked in the downtown eastside on Hastings Street and it would work here too.

I would also ask that you consider putting in a light at Semlin and Broadway - right now there is no possible way for pedestrians to safely cross there. Doing this would again slow the traffic down around the school. Another light east of Secord and west of Nanaimo would do the same thing. Our children are going to school here and many commuters are congregating in this area for transit - it ought to be made safer from the cars treating Broadway as a highway. These suggestions would also apply around Queen Alexandria school further west.

As noted we live on 8th Avenue - which is a heavily traffic bike route. There is no safe crossing at 8th and Victoria for the bikers and pedestrians - and this area is often clogged with impatient drivers trying to get through the Broadway and Victoria intersection. **I recommend a bike/pedestrian controlled light at 8th Avenue.** - I note that you have recommended one at 7th - but 8th really is a busy bike route and I recommend one here as well or instead. It may be 6th is a better place for the second light - there is a lot of foot traffic there too, going to the popular JJ Beans coffee shop - Rogue Dance - the Legion - Donalds.

I believe you are recommending traffic calming on my street (8th Avenue) - I support this recommendation. There are cars which travel very quickly down this street to avoid congestion, I imagine, on the busier thoroughfares. I would ask that more be done to discourage this.

We grow a great deal of vegetables in the back gardens here - in our yard and our neighbour's. I am very concerned that 6-story buildings across the lane will cause significant shadowing and interfere with our gardens and those of our neighbours. There are other people along this lane way with productive gardens like ours who would have the same problem.

There is a large tree just north of our lane on the east side of Victoria. An iconic raven - or his relative - has lived in this tree for years and one of the familiar sounds of this neighborhood is his call. He even got a mention in the "Best of Vancouver" feature in the Georgia Straight one year. I urge you to preserve this tree - it adjacent to land that is likely to be redeveloped soon. These nature hold-outs in this urban area should be preserved. Likewise there is already a lovely roof/balcony garden in the 4-story building at Victoria and Broadway (the seniors' home) - this would be lost with the development and is the home of many song birds.

I appreciate your recommendations to improve the safety of the sidewalks on Victoria south of Broadway - this is our route to Trout Lake community and my youngest's daycare (Boat) on Victoria north of 12th. At the moment it is very unsafe route to walk with (slightly unpredictable - as kids are) 3- and 5-year old boys. Anything to slow the traffic down and widen the sidewalks (particularly the minuscule sidewalks at the intersection of 12th and Lakewood and 12th and Victoria) - would be very much appreciated. These areas feel so dangerous when walking with children - the cars whiz by and especially at the northeast corner there is little space to stand and the cars traveling west may not see the pedestrians.

I will leave it at that for now. I appreciate all the work which has gone into these recommendations. I just urge you to **slow things down** around our elementary school - it is already a dangerous route for our kids to take each day. Please calm things down near it and keep the zoning residential. At the present, I believe lane way houses are not permitted on our lane, please allow them so densification can occur more gently by the school and around this family neighbourhood - laneway house and duplexes north of the lane on 8th and four-plexes or three-story condos to the south of the lane, with some parking entrances onto Broadway and more lights and 30km zones on Broadway to slow everything down and keep kids and other residents and commuters and cyclists safe.

Thank you very much for considering my suggestions.

Lisa Sturgess  
1938 E. 8th Avenue  
Vancouver

**Received May 8:**

Dear Grandview Woodlands Citizens Assembly,

I was surprised to learn last night of the proposed zoning changes. I understand the need for more housing in Vancouver but do not believe that building high rises with mixed commercial and residential uses in a family neighborhood by an elementary school is a good fit. It brings up many concerns.

The zoning change will encourage real estate speculation. We've seen this happen in the city. Investors buy houses, let them run down and sit empty for vandals and squatters until they get a good price from a real estate developer.

The high rise construction site will be a dangerous hazard with so many children in the neighborhood. The recent construction site at Broadway and Nanaimo was unsafe. Building materials were left out on the public street at night for us pedestrians to trip over.

And will we be seeing a medicinal cannabis store open in the bottom of one of those highrises right next to an elementary school with a high school a few blocks away?

What kind of city are we becoming where children cannot play ball hockey in the alley behind their house because of the traffic from the underground parking lots of high rises?

Sincerely,

Lai Lee

**Received May 8:**

I am writing as a resident of the 2200 block of East 8th Avenue to inform the Citizen's Assembly of my views of their most recent recommendations for the Broadway-Commercial sub area, dated April 29, 2015. I feel that the Citizens Assembly does not accurately reflect the position of the residents in my area.

I believe the recommendation to allow for mixed use buildings on Broadway between

Nanaimo and Victoria is not in line with what would be suitable for our neighbourhood. Buildings of this height would cause significant shadowing of adjacent homes that are all single family dwellings. I urge the Citizen's Assembly to recommend the maximum building height to 2-3 storeys of mixed height and residential buildings only, with a maximum land assembly of 2 lots, frontage no greater than 66 feet, and that the existing front and back setbacks remain.

My reasons for this include:

- The importance to preventing shadowing of homes directly adjacent to Broadway. There is a narrow alley between the buildings on Broadway and those directly behind, and 6 storeys would create very significant shadowing.
- The buildings on Broadway need to be better integrated into the surrounding neighbourhood
- Safety concerns with the increased traffic on the streets around Laura Secord School - the crosswalk at Lakewood and Broadway is heavily used every day to access the school.
- Parking concerns caused by increased traffic.

I believe the densification that the city needs can come from less drastic changes to Broadway as well as incorporating other means of densification such as duplexes and laneway houses. The building of 6 storey residences does not suit the area nor help with providing more family housing.

Sincerely,

Kevin Bennett

**Received May 8:**

I am writing to express my concern that the citizen's assembly is proposing rezoning all of Broadway east of Victoria to 6 stories/mixed use. During the last sub area committee meeting this area was to be rezoned as 2-4 stories residential, and I have to question this process and what led to this sudden leap.

My concerns include:

Increase in traffic around Laura Secord Elementary School  
Increase in traffic in alleys, and on residential streets, including increased commercial traffic  
Decreased livability due to noise, pollution and safety issues

As a citizen and voter I'm surprised that the city of Vancouver would move forward with such a proposal given the response to date from our neighbourhood. Currently along Broadway we have single family homes and duplexes, 6 stories is quite a leap for a quiet family oriented neighbourhood.

Finally, on a personal note, my 9 year old son was hit by a car in front of our home in September of 2014. Traffic, decreased visibility because of parked cars and human error were issues in this accident. He sustained several injuries but in the end we were very lucky that he has had almost a complete recovery. We are a high pedestrian traffic neighbourhood with many children walking to school, vehicle traffic is already unmanageable our residential streets, this rezoning will make it even worse.

I appreciate you taking the time to consider my concerns and hope that our neighbourhood

remains accessible and safe for its residents. Please reconsider this proposal to rezone Broadway east of Victoria Drive to 6 stories mixed use.

Sincerely,

Sara Abbasakoor  
Resident  
2054 E. 8th Ave

**Received May 8:**

Dear assembly members,

Following on from the draft plan and this weeks round table.

I appreciate that there were many comments relating to the plan, especially on the 6 stories on Broadway, and I would ask that rather than using a general principal of 6 stories on Broadway, from Clark through to Nanaimo, that thoughtful consideration is given to the uniqueness and differences of the areas, even though all are within the targeted 10 minute walk from the skytrain.

From the sessions for the sub area, prior meetings and workshops, and from this week, all those that voiced an opinion were in agreement that there were significant differences in this stretch, and this is easiest defined by East of Victoria and West of Commercial.

In our area East of Victoria, this has Laura Secord school, which has a wonderful swarm of adults and children each morning walking to school, This area is also just half a block off the Grandview sub area, which is noted as a heritage and family neighborhood, which everyone wishes and agrees to preserve under that sub plan. On Broadway and 8th (as although 8th is under Grandview has the largest impact), people live in the houses, rather than as we see in other areas with vacant, for investment or pending redevelopment opportunities. This area is mixed in its heritage and diversity and with basement suites in most houses, and new laneway houses supporting a gradual growth, should perhaps align closer to the Grandview sub area plan,

West of Commercial, has many apartment buildings already and so again, the majority agreed that this area should and could support growth, and would benefit from that. Also this area, an increase from 3-4 would be a gradual change, and so have a far lesser impact on the neighborhood and would align with Saveway and the Commercial plan.

Also for consideration, and based on the drawings and other plans (under this and other areas in the city) placing 6 stories next to a single family homes goes against recommendations for a respective transition, (thus acknowledging loss of privacy and light, especially south facing in gardens) and where the best divide is noted by a street rather than an alley, and so this is difficult to reconcile when we see 6 stories go next to single family, rather than to 3-4 story triplex zoning with laneways.

I am passionate about the area, and this community. My son goes to Laura Secord and even though it is large, it is absolutely wonderful and has the feeling of small community school. Place this amidst the 6 stories it will lose this, and while safety is already a concern would be far worse.

For us retaining the integrity of our neighborhood would be a wonderful outcome from this

replanning, and while I can appreciate how difficult this has been, having lived in this area for over 10 years, and raising my family there, I want to retain this. There are very few areas left in Vancouver like this and putting 6 stories will change this, and while additional housing is needed, there is already a lot on this plan, and more in-fill and mandating suites in the building would still see growth, while allowing the neighborhood to continue to thrive. As other neighborhoods change, in 30 years time, wouldn't it be great to reflect back and have preserved this small and special part of Vancouver

Please do consider this and the other output from this week, and the sub committee findings in February, which I also attended, and where, when grouped into the 4, no table had more than 2-3 stories, with one table had no change, and two others had had 2-3 stories with a view of row houses, and 3 stories allowing triplex with coach houses for Broadway, East of Victoria,

Thank you for your time and effort. I am really very hopefully that we can see the draft revised and 2-3 mixed family / laneway approved for stretch of Broadway East of Victoria.

Jane Concannon

**Received May 8:**

To the members of the Citizen's Assembly,

I was not able to attend your Roundtable Meeting on May 5th, but received feedback from those who live in my area, and who did attend .

Before I go on, you should know that I attended the Workshop and Focus Group on February 21st, so I do know there was ' Divergence' in regards to Housing issues.

I have also Read the Draft Synopsis from the outcome of that Workshop. To make sure I didn't miss something on the issue of Housing ,as it especially pertains to E. Broadway, I also read the Synoptics for Nanaimo and Commercial.

Hmmm? Trying to figure out WHERE the CA found any indication of convergence, or even suggestion there was any majority of the public ,who thought lining E. Broadway with 6 stories of Residential/ Commercial buildings was going to be a Recommendation that was going to be submitted to the City?? And, also have the gall to increase the Zoning to be even greater than the Land Use Plan that was REJECTED In 2013!!

Here is an education for you all, as none of you live here ,nor are familiar with the area. If you were you would never have had such ridiculous densification ideas.

I have lived here for 40 years ,in this pocket we call the Grandview Triangle. The borders are natural, being Broadway, Nanaimo, N. Grandview Highway( Central Valley Greenway) to the tip at Victoria Drive.

I am very familiar how the streets work; how traffic works; where there are near accidents due to traffic. Most importantly, I and my husband have a connection with residents in every block. Our "calling " is to build Community and make sure there is NO sense, if possible, that people feel they live in isolation.

Our homes may be mostly single family, but many of those have basement suites- legal or not.

New builds come with basement suites, and some of those have created LaneWay houses. Other existing older homes are putting in Lane Way houses if they can afford the process. There are existing Duplexes, mainly on E. Broadway. At Lakewood Dr. at E.10th will be in the



Fall a newly built Triplex home. Next to that will be a Duplex. Density is happening here , but it is in a manageable, non invasive , neighbour friendly way. Those units will be able to be a part of the community. They will be on the street and have a garden, and the people around them will befriend them.

Oh yes, we also have many young parents ( in their 30's and 40's) who have purchase here, or, are renting here, and raising their kids. THAT, is a category that is a big welcome in The Triangle.

I have great ADMIRATION for ANYONE who chooses to live on an arterial such as Broadway, Nanaimo, E12th Ave.

They have to put up with The CONSTANT, DEAFENING, POUNDING NOISE of vehicles, that include huge semi-trucks ( mainly on E. Broadway and Nanaimo, as there are restriction, thank God, on E. 12th Ave.) Then there is the speed and close calls, or actual accidents, that can involve pedestrian or vehicle, at Victoria Dr. / Nanaimo intersection/ Lakewood Drive by Laura Secord School/ Lakewood and E12th Ave. To top that off, there is the BAD AIR QUALITY they have to put up with.

Obviously that waft and echoed noise from all those places also infiltrates to the rest of us in "the middle". We do also live with the noise of the Millennial Skytrain and the trains in The Cut.

BUT, people choose to live here because they sense Community. We are close to amenities and the craziness that is Broadway and Commercial , but far enough to retain quality of living.

The REASONS for E BROADWAY ( the NORTH and SOUTH sides) from VICTORIA to NANAIMO to ONLY have Duplex/ Street-level Townhouses allowed zoning are:

1) No one can use there front yards to have pleasant visits with the residents next door, or take a book and read ,or let kids play and throw balls---so they use their yards in the back, where there is a semblance of peace and quiet? The back is attached to the lane that is shared by residents of E. 10th , and I can say the same for the North side, which shares the lane with E. 8th residents. Kids often play street games in the safety of these shared back lanes.

2) There is NO 24/7 PARKING allowed on E.Broadway, so residents park in the car ports or garages in the lanes. So, any car owner ENTERS their homes by the back door. We who live on the side streets have options to park in front, or use a garage if you have one.

3) Multi storey units WILL have residents with cars, even if a Skytrain / Bus service is close by.

All people go on holidays; they shuffle their kids to activities; they need to shop at big box stores ; they go visit others or go out to dinner across town,etc. etc. Visualize this please. When you have an ENTRANCE through a SHARED BACK lane ( with another street) to go into an underground parking facility there is likely a serious mishap in the waiting, never mind the loss of a back yard for peace and quiet or play.

4) THE AREA OF E BROADWAY FROM VICTORIA TO SEMLIN DRIVE

a) access to the existing 4 homes on EB, is off Semlin Drive via a 30 FT WIDE country style lane . The development that tried to go into the peak corner lot a few years back was nixed because the entrance to underground parking for a commercial use 2-3 building would be via this country lane . The community petitioned against this project.

b) That same lane gives only two options to go WEST-- drive straight ahead on the shared back lane of 9th and 10th to Lakewood Drive ( at the front door of Laura Secord School !!) Go left and left again at the traffic light, OR, turn right and go to 12th Ave.,and turn right at the flashing light. OR! take N. Grandview Hwy, that shares cars with the Bikeway and make

your choice at Lakewood----Left or Right???

To go EAST, you can turn right off Semlin Drive onto Broadway. In case you didn't know --- Semlin Drive going North has only a RIGHT TURN at Broadway, that was fortunately put in place when the Central Valley Greenway was completed in 2002. If you decide you want the Freeway, the choice is the n. Grandview to Lakewood to 12th Ave.

5) THE AREA ON E BROADWAY FROM SEMLIN DRIVE TO LAKEWOOD DRIVE.

EXACTLY the same choices of the above. The only street that has a pedestrian pushed light is at Lakewood Drive. Turning left or go across on E Broadway or E12th makes the lights crucial to avoid an accident on those heavily trafficked streets. One hopes a kid from the School, or a dog walker to Trout Lake is there to push the buttons.

6)THE AREA ON E BROADWAY FROM LAKEWOOD TO GARDEN DRIVE.

a) The School playground fence is perpendicular to the shared back lane of 9th and 10th. A VERY NARROW single car alley comes from E10th behind the school fence and joins to the shared back lane. Only the local residents use that lane . Again, visualize.

E. 10th has NO parking on the school side ( There are restrictions by the School front as well.)

To get to a back lane parking spot here can be depending from where you are coming -- a RIGHT turn off Broadway, or a precarious left turn around a median on Broadway---come off E Broadway at Lakewood or Semlin and go along E10th with their speed bumps by the school to the narrow alley, or, make a left at Garden into the lane. There is also E12th Ave to Lakewood, OR, if on E Broadway, do a left and a right onto E 10th to Garden Drive... Maybe one is coming from Superstore on Grandview Highway, so the best option is to turn right on Nanaimo and make a Left on E. 11th to Garden Dr ( or take the BACK LANE between Nanaimo and Garden to E 10th). You can't turn LEFT on Nanaimo at E10th, because there is a median there and you can only go SOUTH on E 10th.

HAVE I LOST YOUR INTEREST YET? OR DID I LOOSE IT A LONG TIME AGO?

I CAN GO ON AND ON ABOUT WHAT IS THE 'WAY OF LIFE ' IN THIS TRIANGLE FOR ALL OF US WHO LIVE HERE. We are used to it , but ANY big development CANNOT be accommodated as I have tried to illustrate, and I hope you can map out in your minds.

LAST BUT NOT LEAST.

7) THE AREA ON E BROADWAY FROM GARDEN DRIVE TO NANAIMO

a) The WEST facing homes between E Broadway and Garden Drive, AND the SOUTH facing four homes on E10th at Garden, between Garden Drive and Nanaimo, are a part of this Triangle community.

A VERY BUSY Back Lane separates them from the Businesses on Nanaimo, at what you call a Commercial Node. This lane is used mostly for parking access for the TD Bank on the corner. To get to the bank there is a right turn off E Broadway into the lane or the below.

Many neighbours who live on Nanaimo or Garden Dr ( between E 10th and E 11th have legitimate complaints about speeding cars coming left off Nanaimo onto E 11th ( REMEMBER? no left turn onto E 10th). They ZOOM along that lovely paved back lane to the TD Bank at E Broadway.

FYI-- Two traffic circle roundabouts were installed on Garden Drive back in 2002 to try to hinder the cars on E Broadway from cutting through our quiet streets, if there happened to be an accident at Nanaimo.

There is absolutely NO ACCEPTANCE for the residential existing housing stock at this location to be amassed as a BLOCK for Multi-Storied Residential/ Commercial use proposals for the the corner Commercial Node. Again, VISUALIZE!

WHAT is built will affect this whole neighbourhood . The need for parking spaces---the

difficulty of getting in or out of the Triangle, as I have lengthily tried to make you understand---the vulnerability around the Laura Secord School with all of the children. The areas at the traffic lights on Lakewood Drive become even more stressed than they are already.

Someone should come and observe the mayhem of cars for drop off in the am, and pickup in the pm of children at the school.

You see, there is no time for discussion of the above things in Roundtables or Workshops. No City Planner wants to really know too much about the streets and blocks all having different and unique criteria-- as to HOW, or even WHY they work as neighbourhoods. No blinders are better, or just treat each area the same and decide they all should be densified in basically the same way.

After all, we HAVE to make places for a least a million more NEW people coming here in the next decades. And, it doesn't really matter if the EXISTING residents have to find somewhere else to live. Oh! They may not still be alive!

I wonder if in any of the meetings, the question has been asked about WHAT life will be like here after a Major Earthquake? Will the people still want to come, once the City is rebuilt?

I do have a lot of thoughts re the other parts of the B/ C sub-areas Plan ideas, but the area I have described is the one I love, care about, and know the best.

THANK YOU. I HOPE YOU READ THIS LONG LETTER. I HOPE YOU TAKE TO HEART ITS CONTENTS. I HOPE YOU VISUALIZE THEM.

Sincerely,  
Linda Fox  
@ 2652 Templeton Drive @ E. 11th Avenue

**Received May 8:**

Hello,

We live at 2123 E 8th Ave.

Six is too high. I support densification especially around transit centers.

We would support three stories townhouses, condos or row housing.

Thanks,

Emily and Fionna Chong

**Received May 8:**

I live right across from Laura Secord elementary. Street traffic is out of control as it is let along adding massive population density with your 6 storey building proposal. Perhaps try west of Clark, or east of Nanaimo. Use the Safeway site. Traffic is exceptionally dense in the triangle between Broadway and Grandview, Victoria and Nanaimo. I am not in favour of your proposal.

Thanks for listening, Katie Randall

**Received May 8:**

Thank you for representing our communities in this important initiative. I attended the round table on May 5th and would like to re-iterate some of the points raised:

- 6-storey mixed use developments with access from the alley ways from Victoria to Nanaimo would be dangerous in this high pedestrian area where there are numerous families and children walking to and from school daily as well as considerable bike traffic from the greenway.
- We recommend maximum 3 storeys with a preference for row, townhouse or duplex developments and increased allowances for rental suites and laneway houses.
- We recommend NO commercial use buildings along this stretch to avoid any delivery traffic that might endanger children, families and cyclists
- Any added vehicle traffic in the neighborhood on the south side of Broadway from Victoria to Nanaimo would cause considerable stress to this area which already has limited parking and limited access points in and out of the neighborhood
- Public safety needs to be considered with the addition of a public square at the current Safeway parking site. This area already has issues with drug use in the bushes along the bike path (especially in summer months). We'd suggest adding a community policing office at the public square and increased police foot patrol along the bike path in the summer months

Permit parking in the neighborhood would greatly reduce added traffic and increase bike and pedestrian safety

## GENERAL

**Received May 2:**

Hello Andrea and Andrew

Can you please advise me as to why there has been no mention in the ongoing community planning process of increasing the Floor Space Ratio in Grandview Woodlands. Currently, in one area of GW zoning is RT4, which as I understand it allows for a structure coverage of 0.6 of the size of the lot. In other words, the maximum size of house allowed on a typical 33 foot city lot in this neighbourhood is approximately 2400 square feet.

Would it not make sense to upgrade the coverage so that current homeowners in the area could enlarge their house and build or enlarge rental units within their homes? It may not result in a flashy new condo that developers love to construct but I believe that an increase in affordable rental accommodation would result from this upgrade. Furthermore existing homeowners as well new tenants would stand to gain rather than the usual large scale developers and wealthy offshore investors. I also believe that by encouraging numerous small changes versus a unwelcome blockbuster high rise, such as the unfathomable proposed tower at the corner of Venables Street and Commercial Drive, will result in new accommodation which will be more affordable and less disruptive to the neighbourhood.

The City could focus this upgrade to those instances where the homeowner is to provide new or increased rental accommodation. I believe that only a small change in this ratio, for example an increase from 0.6 to 0.7 or to 0.75 is required and that it would go a long way in bringing about the desired results. I believe there are clear benefits to this approach as opposed to the questionable and disruptive offerings that are a product of the boundless imagination of large scale developers.

Is the City or its representatives so enraptured by large scale developer driven construction that it cannot envision utilizing such a simple remedy?

Your comments would be appreciated.

Regards.

Richard Penneway

**Received May 2:**

Hello,

I've not been able to attend meetings as I am travelling in India but have been following most of the email and would like to offer the following points:

\*writing a new neighbourhood plan is an opportunity to develop NEW policy ( zoning, design guidelines), building forms ( height, FSR, setbacks) and land use ( single family, multi-family, coach houses, infill houses, lock- off suites) that meet the needs of the neighbourhood. We know what these needs are now. If not, we are in trouble.

\* there may be existing zoning, policy, etc that may fit some of our needs, but in no way should our choices be limited to these. The test for the planners is to ensure any changes or no changes in zoning fit our need. THIS SHOULD BE PART OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANING PROCESS AND NOT LEFT FOR THE PLANNERS TO DEVELOP AFTER THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING PROCESS IS "OVER". TRANSLATING

GENERAL/ASPIRATIONAL STATEMENTS INTO CLEAR INNOVATIVE, RESPONSIBLE POLICY IS THE ONLY REAL REASON TO EMBARK ON THIS PROCESS.

\* many many planners and designers feel the lack of an overall plan for the city creates a vacuum for neighbourhood planning: how on earth could the density/ height for the boffo/ kettle site be determined without a clear understanding of the overall area including the relationship between GW/Strathcona/ the Venables corridor and its relationship to downtown and even the future of the viaduct. We are in this mess partly because " spot reasoning" is akin to spreading a sheet over the entire city, cutting a hole over one property and then be crazy enough to think the new development will make the city a better place. Designing a neighbourhood, in this way, is just a bigger hole in the sheet, The discussions around how tall/what shape/ lan use for the kettle site is using the same flawed, short sighted thinking. The pressure from the developer combined with the good work by the kettle foundation should not make a ripple in our neighbourhood without understanding its context.

\*thanks to everyone for hanging in there.

\*sorry for the CAPS...can't find the bold...

I will go and weave my way through the sleeping street dogs, stray cats, families living on the sidewalks and the odd expired rat for a cup of chai from the Mumbai street vendor.

Cindy Brenneis

## Received May 2:

In my first pass at reviewing the CA's draft sub-area recommendations, I've attempted to ignore the fluff ('park benches everywhere') and identify the serious issues and flaws. I put these flaws into five categories, below. It may be possible to re-categorize these to have more or less, but five was the number that fell out of my preliminary analysis.

(1) **'mushy language' around zoning.** The email that Dorothy forwarded from Nancy Heckman has several examples, but to cite one here its that buildings on Hastings should be limited to 4 stories, but "...as the demand for housing grows, we are open to increase conditional height as follows... Hastings, Commercial to Kamloops - up to 8 stories." The concern about such mushy language is that demand for housing is growing now, so the condition has been met and the plan can be immediately used to justify 8 stories now. Not sometime in the future. That's only one example. Another example is the recommendation around the Astorino's/Kettle site (p. 21). I'll attach my copy of the sub-area recommendations on which I've highlighted many of the recommendations that people at the OCOP meeting had concerns about and has a few notes attached that I added during the meeting.

(2) **Recommendations that appear to go beyond, or contradict what many of us heard at the workshops lead by the city.** This may not be entirely the fault of the CA members, it may reflect that comments from the public at the workshops were not reported accurately, or it may be that the CA members have been so swamped that they haven't had time to read the summaries. Micah's letter reflects that concern - i.e. it is not a matter of 'mushy language'; it is a problem of a clear recommendation that the residents are opposed to.

(3) **Internal inconsistencies.** The text on allowable heights for the Nanaimo corridor says we recommend office, retail, service, and resident friendly combined buildings (including live/work spaces) to a maximum of 4 stories (recommendation 5.8). If one looks at the notation on map for the sub-area (p. 19) the notation says up to 3 story mixed-use (long-term vision). Everyone at the OCOP meeting supported the s story limit rather than 4. Also

in the same section on the Nanaimo sub-area there is no mention in the text of any allowance for buildings higher than 4 stories, but the map shows stretches around 1st Ave., around Charles St. and perhaps around Broadway where up to 6 stories would be allowed. There may be others, I haven't had time to do a thorough check of the text versus the maps.

**(4) Inconsistencies between area or recommendations that are too narrowly focussed.** For example, in the section on Grandview-Woodland recommendation 3.19 includes that statement that "Mountain views are highly valued - preserve these wherever possible." It seems like if this is a principle for one sub-area it should be a principle for all, and would be a reason for instance to limit the height along Hastings to 4 stories, without the conditional allowance for up to 8. Similarly, recommendation 1.11 for the Cedar Cove area states: "We request that the City preserves rental stock in the area and supports development of social housing (add target for increases in social housing?)" Why is support for social housing limited to one sub-area of one neighbourhood? Shouldn't it be at least a neighbourhood-wide recommendation or perhaps even a recommendation to support social housing in the city as a whole?

**(5) Weak or Missing Elements**

*For an example of a missing element,* amenities related to a major development should be public amenities not privatized amenities (such as private plazas or walkways that are presented as 'green space' but really function as private selling features.

*An example of a weak element* is that there was general support both from city staff and residents for altering the form of Nanaimo street with either bulges at the corners, a green median in the middle, and or a bike lane to effectively narrow Nanaimo street and to make it more pedestrian and bike-friendly. Recommendation 5.2 on the subject is limited to the following statement: "We strongly recommend that the City of Vancouver increase speed limit monitoring and enforcement along Nanaimo recognizing it is a designated truck route." First, it fails to recognize the efforts of residents to get large trucks off of Nanaimo, secondly it includes no measures to make Nanaimo more bike/pedestrian friendly, especially for those attempting to cross Nanaimo (i.e east-west).

All of that said, I recognize that these are draft recommendations, and that it has the appearance of an early draft created under a serious time constraint. So I'm not attacking the CA members at all. However, this draft has serious deficiencies, and they should be corrected. Although it may not be possible for GWAC to take a position on the draft recommendations before the May 5 meeting, I think it will need to do so in the near future. In the meantime, there is still time to help the CA have a better next draft, and I urge everyone to take as much time as they can afford to identify inconsistencies and deficiencies and to make their views known on May 5.

**Received May 6:**

Dear Rachel,

I know that I speak for many in our GW neighbourhood who appreciate the chance to provide feedback to the Citizens Assembly, as you work towards consensus, in these final stages, on many challenging issues. Thank you.

The bulk of the following points have emerged from recent discussions at an Our Community Our Plan (OCOP) meeting, where significant concerns were noted regarding your Draft Sub area Recommendations dated April 29, 2015. I do hope you will ensure that these issues will be taken into serious consideration as your group drafts its final recommendations to Vancouver City Council.

The process which divided CA and public input discussions into sub-areas has resulted in a disjointed report. Some areas fare worse than before your process began. Some remain the same and many are unclear. Any lack of clarity in your report will allow city planners to do as they wish in the future, rendering your effort and many hours of contribution void.

**Establish a moratorium on spot rezoning**

At the top of my priority list is a strong recommendation to come from the Citizens Assembly, for a ten-year moratorium on spot rezoning. Allowing spot rezoning after the community plan is approved renders the entire public consultation process redundant as any property can be rezoned without regard to the plan.

A number of long-standing Grandview Woodland neighbourhood groups have made this recommendation to you. I hope you will take their views to heart and include this recommendation in your final report.

**Be clear on land use / zoning / building heights / wording**

Work hard to ensure that the wording of your final document is tightened to avoid any possible misinterpretation by city planners, which will leave the door open to spot rezoning later.

It is vitally important to state exactly what you do and do not want to see in the recommendations and maps. For example, state whether the existing zoning or new zoning should be applied and indicate exactly where. Consider form and massing in addition to height.

There is much, inconsistent language throughout the report. Words such as “urge”, “demand”, “request”, “recommend”, “expect” leave huge opportunities for interpretation. I would suggest adopting a universal approach in the report by using the word “recommendation” throughout, to emphasize desired outcomes which leave no room for interpretation.

**Apply key recommendations to the entire community**

Some recommendations are best applied to the entire community rather than only to a sub-area, and could perhaps be included in your overall recommendations section. These include recommendations on social and affordable housing, maintaining existing view cones, etc.

Also your report must define terms such as ‘social housing’, ‘affordable housing’, ‘rental housing’ etc. as the City has established very different meanings for each of these terms. A glossary of meanings would be a good approach.

**Ensure public amenities remain public**

Indicate clearly that community amenity contributions (CACs) provided by developers, such as a green space, cultural/social amenities or plazas remain public property in perpetuity, ensuring that they do not become private at some point in the future.

**Specific Sub-Area Concerns**

**Cedar Cove**

**1.5 INDUSTRIAL ODOURS**

The language should clearly reflect area residents’ expectations that the issue will be addressed satisfactorily. In the last five years there were 1,168 complaints about West Coast Reductions’ odours to the Metro Vancouver air quality line.

**1.10, 1.12, 1.13 HOUSING/BUILT FORM**

I recommend that you limit these noted areas to 4 storeys instead of six and 8 respectively.



### 1.11 SOCIAL HOUSING

There is a need here and throughout the report to clearly define social housing as mentioned above. Does the CA agree or disagree with the recently changed definition of social housing by the city? Your point of view should be made clear.

#### **Hastings**

The Hastings Area Business Improvement Association has expressed concern that any increased height along the corridor beyond 4 storeys will shut out small and medium sized merchants who currently make up the bulk of retail in the corridor and who contribute significantly to the eclectic and pleasing high street character of the area.

I strongly echo this concern and therefore ask the CA to express a firm recommendation of building height to a maximum of 4 storeys along the entire length of the corridor, and NOT to hold out the possibility of further height increases in the future which would open the door to future spot rezoning with significant added height/density and a fundamental change in character.

#### **Britannia-Woodland**

A cautionary note: very few residents of this sub-area actually attended this particular sub-area workshop and those who did attend cited inaccurate reporting by city staff.

Point 3.7 regarding the possible removal of the Georgia and Dunsmuir viaducts: there has NOT been any decision taken on the removal proposal. The impact of the possible removal of these two pieces of city infrastructure on the Grandview Woodland community would be considerable. It would be inappropriate for your report to suggest a "fait accompli" here. There is much discussion yet to take place on this issue, which is also contentious in many adjoining neighbourhoods.

Point 3.12 to retain existing ratios of rental, co-op and ownership units: this is an example where 'rental' should be clearly defined as affordable and/or non-market, to be clear on meaning. In addition, asking for a 'one to one' replacement ratio does not ensure affordability, and could result in more expensive rental units in the future.

Point 3.19 - these items should be generalized to relate to all sub areas.

#### **Grandview**

Point 4.13 - modifications to single family and duplex zoning: your report requires greater clarity around types of housing recommended here, as the wording is unclear as to meaning: such as 'infill housing', 'array of housing opportunities', 'attic or lock-off suites' etc.

#### **Nanaimo**

Your report remains silent on what has been a very contentious issue - the areas around Garden Park, Lord Nelson Elementary and Templeton Park, which fall into the Nanaimo sub-area. It was stated emphatically by many participants in the Grandview sub-area workshop and elsewhere that adding four storeys around these parks would effectively cut them off from the entire Grandview community, creating a wall of exclusion around these much loved and much used local parks. It would be very positive for the CA to make mention in your final report of the clear public input on this matter and to take a positive stand on this important community consideration.

Point 5.10 regarding lot assemblage: replace 'preference to' with 'maximum of 2 lot assemblages' and eliminate 'maximum of three'.

Points 5.11, 5.14 - community consultations requested. These points should be eliminated as they open the door to spot re-zoning which ostensibly would be "OK" as long as the

community is being consulted.

### **Commercial Drive**

The retention of a 4 storey height limit along the entire length of Commercial Drive is essential to retain the character of The Drive. I strongly recommend that you limit the east and west sides of Commercial between 6<sup>th</sup> and the Cut to four storeys, rather than the five and six you have recommended.

As you know, the Venables/Commercial site (Astorino's/Kettle Society) remains highly contentious. The city is proceeding to hold public consultations on this proposal, which is a for-profit condo tower of at least 14 storeys with between 100 and 150 market condo units and 30 social housing units. For the site to be workable from the developer's point of view, they would require the addition of an abutting city-owned piece of land, which is currently a parking lot. This land could be much better be used as a much-needed park.

This proposed development is massive and completely out of character and scale with the remainder of The Drive. Holding out the hope of socially supportive housing is the developer's main calling card for this invasive, precedent-setting proposal.

For the CA to approve in principle this development as it now stands would set a dangerous precedent for further destructive spot re-zoning under the guise of social amenities.

I firmly believe it **is** possible to provide much-needed supportive social housing in other ways NOT tied to massive, over-scale developments with the prospect of huge negative impacts on the character of our neighbourhood.

I urge you to reject this approach in the interests of preserving the scale and character of The Drive.

### **Broadway & Commercial**

Many issues remain outstanding regarding this key area. Point 7.2 mentions the possibility of a new bus loop if a subway isn't built, but where would this loop go? And any such proposal would allow more spot rezoning.

Regarding point 7.9 - Broadway east of Victoria Drive, 6 stories is too high for this area for a number of compelling reasons, many of which were articulated last night at the Commercial sub-area tables discussions. They include:

- serious safety concerns about traffic and congestion around Laura Secord Elementary School particularly at the Lakewood and Broadway crossing
- the possible creation of an unacceptable wall / tunnel effect closing off the adjacent single and duplex zoned areas on both sides of Broadway which now make up a pedestrian friendly, vibrant and low scale area on both sides of Broadway
- additional parking concerns which the neighbourhood already is experiencing to a certain extent due to the walkable proximity to the Broadway/Commercial Skytrain station.

Following on a strong recommendation from residents last night, I urge you to change this portion of the Broadway corridor to a 3 storey maximum height recommendation.

Point 7.12 is vague and wide open to exploitation given the current wording "site of increased density, with significant commercial and amenity components".

Point 7.15 relating to possible 8 storeys along the south side of the cut is quite problematic and would create a disjointed scale with the surrounding built form. Eight stories here would allow massive change to the character of the entire area. I recommend this be scaled

back to a height restriction of 4 storeys.

Point 7.18 makes no mention of retaining the character and scale of neighbourhoods. For consideration - should properties with character homes get incentives to increase floor space for rentals to prevent demolition in favour of a 'monster home' with a laneway house – all very expensive housing options.

Green roofs (point 7.19) should apply to commercial and/or mixed-use buildings only.

Overall, all developments in this transit area need careful consideration of parking and congestion impacts which are already being felt on local, streets which are within walkable distance to the Skytrain station. No relaxation of parking space requirements should therefore be allowed.

If these key issues are not addressed, your plan may well open a path for misinterpretation and exploitation by city planners in years to come.

In final summary, I would urge the CA to consider holding one more public event, in early June **after** your final report is completed but **before** you present to city council. As has already been said, this final neighbourhood event would represent a respectful completion of the dialogue you have had with us - the keenly interested members of the Grandview Woodland community.

Thank you for the work you have done to date and for your careful consideration of these important points for the wellbeing of our community.

Sincerely,

Barbara E. Cameron

**Received May 6:**

Dear Ms. Magnusson,

I am writing to express my concern with the draft recommendations for the Grandview Woodland Community Plan. After reviewing the draft, it does not appear that residents' ideas have been incorporated or that concerns have been addressed.

- 2) The proposal to have up to 4 stories on 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue from Commercial to Nanaimo remains largely unchanged from the city's original draft and show an abrupt transition from high to low density.
  - 1<sup>st</sup> already has a tunnelling affect on some blocks. Increasing the height to 4 stories will exacerbate this affect.
  - Shallow lots will not allow for set-back along 1<sup>st</sup> to ensure safety or walkability.
  - 4 stories would shadow the homes behind affecting light, privacy and access to views of the North Shore Mountains.
  - The alleys between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> and Gravely are very busy and already pose safety concerns. The children on my block (including mine) and the children who attend the two daycares on 1<sup>st</sup> between Semlin and Lakewood use the alleys to walk to each other's homes to visit. Children from the daycares visit and feed the backyard chickens from the alley.

- Putting 4 story apartments would make the alleys too busy for such activity. Also, it would all but destroy the tight knit community feel that exists here.
- There is already significant pressure on parking in the area, especially close to Garden Park. The park is used on week nights and weekends for Micro Footie (Soccer) and gets very crowded with cars and other traffic.
- 3) The proposal to have an enhanced commercial node at 1<sup>st</sup> and Nanaimo makes sense for the neighbourhood if done on a reasonable scale. However, the height proposed at this corner does not. This is the top of the rise. Tall buildings here will completely overshadow neighbouring homes.
  - 4) The proposal to drastically increase retail space along Nanaimo does not seem reasonable. This area is far from transportation routes, so parking would again be a significant issue.

The place where my family lives, plays and goes to school will be significantly impacted by these proposed changes. I do not believe this proposal is in keeping with your stated goals of having gentle transitions to lower-density neighbourhoods mindful of current residents. There are many creative ways to densify this neighbourhood without ruining its homogenous and cohesive feel. I sincerely hope you will consider options for gentle densification as desired by the current residents of this neighbourhood.

One of the things that stands out to me the most in this proposal is the lack of expansion to community centres or green spaces that would be necessary to support this huge increase in density. Grandview-Woodlands already has some of the scarcest park area in the city. The pressure on the parks and community centres is huge. I would like to see how the city plans to address this issue. As you know, adequate access to recreation is essential for the health of a community.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Campbell

**Received May 7:**

Further to discussions on 5 May, I would like to reiterate the following:

\* Through traffic is never increasing problem in Grandview Woodlands, especially in the area between Victoria Drive and Nanaimo Streets. Short cut seeking drivers use the side streets and back lanes in this area on a 24/7 basis in order to save a few minutes driving time. These "time constrained" drivers have little or no respect for the residents on this area as they are solely focused on getting to and from the downtown in the shortest possible time. One of the ongoing "hot spot" is on Venables where vehicles travel directly between Victoria and Nanaimo, often dangerously crossing the bike route at Lakewood and then proceeding to cross Nanaimo at Venables. Similarly, short cut seeking drivers hurry through the lane between Venables and Parker Streets, ignoring all traffic calming signage.

Proposals were made at the Workshop to mitigate these occurrences and I support those measures including a median at Nanaimo designed to prevent traffic from crossing at Venables and in reducing access to the back lane between Parker and Venables.

\* Increasing the FSR in GW was proposed as a means of encouraging existing home owners to add or increase the size of rental units in the area. For example, where the FSR is 0.6 it should be increased to 0.7 or 0.8 which in turn, would lead to more affordable rental accommodation in the area. This process is much less disruptive than the large scale

developments and high rise process that nobody in GW wants. The character of GW can be preserved using the FSR enhancement approach, especially in the RT4 area, through the CoV permit process.

I support the proposal of increasing FSR, especially in Grandview.

\* I have been a long standing supporter of the Venables Greenway and I believe that the unwelcoming drab corridor that is Prior Venables could be replaced with a pedestrian friendly, welcoming destination containing artist workshops and retail facilities etc. Possibly a public urban transportation system could be built to link with Chinatown and the rest of the Downtown. The Greenway along Venables is a logical extension of Commercial Drive which is supported in writing by the Commercial Drive BIA.

I support the creation of the Prior Venables ( or if you prefer the Strathcona-Grandview) Greenway.

\* The Boffo/Kettle Proposal is completely unwarranted and I absolutely do not support a structure that exceeds four stories. This is a clear excess profit grab by Boffo using the Kettle as a wedge to get their usurious rewards and it will only lead to more of the same.

The Boffo/Kettle structure should be restricted to four stories.

Regards.

Richard

**Received May 7:**

Dear Assembly Members,

Thank you for all your hard work, dedication and service!

As a local resident, sustainability consultant and real estate professional, I was excited a year ago when the City announced it would allow local residents to take on the next phase of planning for our neighbourhood. I saw this historic moment as a real sign of trust from the City that our community could balance local, regional and global needs to create a plan that was truly sustainable for all. I appreciate all the hard work the Assembly has done to try to achieve this balance.

Unfortunately, the issue of density is one that is often misunderstood as being only of benefit to the City or the Planet, while being to the detriment of the local community. This could not be further from the truth.

Grandview Woodland is already suffering from market and social forces leading to a loss of housing. Ownership and rental prices are sky high, with limited options for families and lower income individuals. Rental accommodations are quickly being lost as more homes are converted to single family ownership. Historic businesses are being forced out in favour of fancier establishments.

The status quo in Grandview Woodland is unacceptable! We have become one of the most desirable neighbourhoods in Vancouver, yet our population is dropping annually. This is a lack of supply, not a lack of demand. We must address this imbalance. The community plan is our chance to change these trends. Our neighbourhood desperately needs more housing of

all types. Social housing, subsidized housing, purpose built rental, and Strata properties particularly between 800-1400 sq ft, plus parks, community services and much more. Density is not our enemy, it is what we need to protect the character of our community by ensuring sufficient diverse housing types and prices to supply and support our diverse community. Plus, it makes good sense from an environmental perspective as GW is well served by transit, shopping, entertainment and more.

The Community Plan is a tool city planners can use to build our city and solve our problems. Fortunately, it is not an outright rezoning map and as such it allows the City the power to make demands on developers to meet these community's needs in exchange for proposed upzoning. Unfortunately, much of the current proposal, with its limited new density proposal, lot assembly restriction, etc., will tie the City's hands and ensure that these issues not be addressed and that gentrification and loss of affordability will continue unchecked.

By adopting a community plan with flexibility, vision, and higher theoretical limits to density and housing scale (in specific locations and in exchange for much needed services), we can give City planners tools to protect our neighbourhood and its residents from the frenzy that is Vancouver housing.

I commend the Nanaimo and Hastings subgroup who I believe did a good job with this balance and I strongly encourage the Assembly as whole to follow their lead when developing the final proposal, especially in areas well served by transit. This is our opportunity as residents to shape the growth of this neighbourhood and to ensure that it addresses our community's social and housing needs and effectively integrates us with the needs of an ever expanding city, many of whom want to live, eat, shop and hang out in our community.

Detailed feedback below.

If anyone has any questions, feel free to contact me.

Noam Dolgin  
Sustainable Real Estate  
[www.noamdolgin.com](http://www.noamdolgin.com)  
[noam@noamdolgin.com](mailto:noam@noamdolgin.com) 604-254-2549

### **Detailed Feedback to CA regarding Draft Sub Area Recommendations – April 25, 2015**

#### **General:**

A. Arterials – consideration should be given to expanding densification along arterials to include adjoining ½ blocks on either side of arterials (such as the South side of E 8<sup>th</sup> & North side of East 10<sup>th</sup>). This help facilitate transition in scale into the single family neighbourhood, and allow for a rejuvenation of laneways as an alternative pedestrian and bicycle route to arterials.

B. Lot assembly limits if they are used at all need to be:

- a) Based on maximum lot sizes, not number of lots, as lot sizes vary

- b) There are engineering and City code mandates that require minimum lot sizes. These often require a minimum of 15,000-20,000 sq ft lot to allow for underground parking. Lot assembly limits should be large enough (20,000-25,000 sq ft) to achieve the goal of allowing approved density while at the same time protecting the city scape.

C. Spot rezoning - We need spot rezoning. The entire community plan process is based on the concept that outright zoning remains the same and that through spot rezoning, developers can apply to upzone **within** the guidelines designated by the community plan and the City can demand amenities or \$ in exchange for those bonuses. Without spot rezoning the entire neighbourhood would be outright rezoned inline with the community plan and the City would lose any ability to make demands on developers. I believe the proper language to convey the intention of this recommendation is something similar to "We demand a 5 (10) year moratorium on any rezoning not explicitly approved of within the Grandview Woodland Community Plan."

**Specific:**

3.14 *"We urge the city to amend RM4 zoning to allow for the infill or addition of existing buildings to a floor space ratio from 1.45 to 2"*

Remember, if the city changes zoning outright it loses all control and a developer can do what they like within the new rules. Instead, I recommend "We urge the City to conditional permit a FSR of 2.0 in RM4 zones to allow for the infill or addition of existing buildings." This will allow the city to give the density, but require something in return such as nicer sidewalks, \$, etc.

3.15 *"we urge the city to amend RM4 zoning to allow for 2 long term rental suite."*

I believe this should be a neighbourhood wide recommendation, not just in RM4 zones, but in all single family dwellings of all zoning types (RT, RS, etc.)

3.16 See above regarding lot assembly

4.12 See above regarding lot assembly

4.13 *"create an array of housing opportunities..."* This will not be feasible in light of current lot assembly recommendations

5.10 See above regarding lot assembly

6.10 See above regarding lot assembly

7.0 10<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup> Avenues between Commercial and Victoria/Semlin are ideal for density, especially in light of the new proposed plaza. This location is less than 5 minutes from the transit hub, Commercial Drive and 2 large parks and it is already cut off from the rest of the community by Broadway, 12<sup>th</sup> & the cut. Tying these 3 blocks into the vision for the new plaza would be ideal, and would also facilitate a few other recommendations such as wider sidewalks and safer bike access on Victoria Dr, and expanding the plaza across 10<sup>th</sup>.

7.1 Shadowing – the City has done extensive modelling on the effects of shadowing. I don't

know if you've seen the shadowing reports down for Commercial-Broadway, but basically shadowing effects are much smaller than we imagine. If you have not seen them, I highly recommend asking Andrew for them, you may discover that shadowing is much less of an issue than you think and that taller towers will add very little shadow effect to the neighbourhood.

7.2 *"Broadway subway not built within 5 years"*

It will definitely take more than 5 years to build the Broadway extension. Maybe you should reword to say something like "If the Broadway subway extension is not in development within 5 years"

7.8 See above regarding lot assembly

7.18 Requiring lock off suites – you can't require people to use their personal residences for rental. You can permit and/or encourage lockoff suites, but you can't require them.

**Feel free to contact me with any questions, 604-254-2549 [noam@noamdolgin.com](mailto:noam@noamdolgin.com)**

**Received May 7:**

Attention: Citizens' Assembly on the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan

Re: Comments on the Citizens' Assembly's Draft Sub-Area Recommendations (April 29, 2015)

On April 30<sup>th</sup> Our Community, Our Plan (OCOP) members met to review the Citizens' Assembly's April 29<sup>th</sup> draft recommendations and sub-area maps. Since the greatest concerns voiced so far by the community are about future land use (rezoning), OCOP has opted to focus its attention on this highly sensitive issue. Collectively OCOP members reviewed each sub-area and identified general and sub-area specific concerns which are listed below. We strongly encourage the CA to strengthen its recommendations and maps to accurately reflect the thoughtful input of the community and prevent the potential misinterpretation and exploitation by City Planning.

General Concerns

The process that has divided CA members into sub-area focus groups has resulted in a disjointed community plan overall. Some sub-areas assume a disproportionate amount of density, e.g. Hastings. Others have blocks with density exceeding that originally proposed in the 2013 Emerging Directions. Lacking guidance from City Planning regarding the allocation of future population to this community has clearly presented a challenge to the CA.

In general, the recommendations and maps would benefit from the following improvements:

**Establish a moratorium on spot rezoning**

Of paramount importance is the need to establish a ten year moratorium on spot rezoning. Allowing spot rezoning after the community plan is approved renders this entire public consultation process meaningless as any property could be rezoned without regard to the plan.

**Be clear on land use / zoning**



The wording of the recommendations must be tightened up to avoid misinterpretation by City planners and leaving the door open to spot rezoning later. Clearly state the proposed zoning, density, building form and massing as much as possible.

**Avoid inaccurate reflections of sub-area workshops**

Some recommendations don't accurately reflect the comments from the public at the sub-area workshops, e.g. Nanaimo, Broadway east of Victoria.

**Correct inconsistencies in recommendations**

There are instances where recommendations conflict with each other around height, land use, etc. Many were reported by attendees at the May 5<sup>th</sup> public roundtable.

**Apply recommendations to entire community**

Some recommendations are best applied to the entire community rather than only to a sub-area. These can include social and affordable housing, maintaining existing view cones, etc. Define terms such as 'social housing', 'affordable housing', 'rental housing' as the City has established very different meanings than one would think appropriate for our community.

**Avoid weak or missing elements**

Indicate whether an element such as a greenspace or plaza should be public or it may become part of a private development scheme.

Sub-Area Specific Concerns

**Cedar Cove**

- 1.5 tighten up language to reflect area residents' expectations. Note that the last 5 years drew 1,168 complaints about West Coast Reductions to the Metro Vancouver air quality line.
- 1.10, 1.12, 1.13 Prefer 4 storeys over 6.
- 1.11 Define social housing (note City recently changed its definition).

**Hastings**

- The height proposed along Hastings conflicts with previously stated expectations from the local BIA for no higher than 4 storeys to retain existing independent businesses.
- 2.12, 2.15 These are examples which will open the door to future spot rezoning with significant added height/density, but not sufficient to earn new amenities that would be required to support them.
- 2.18 Appears in conflict with 2.12.

**Britannia-Woodland**

- Note: Very few residents attended the sub-area workshop and those who attended cited considerable misreporting by City staff.
- 3.7 The word 'removal' should be replaced by 'future'.
- 3.12 This is an example of where 'rental' should be defined as affordable, non-/market, etc to be clear on meaning. Don't recommend 'one for one' as this leads to more expensive rental units than existing.
- 3.19 Example of item shared by all sub-areas: 7<sup>th</sup> bullet refers to maintaining existing view cones.

**Grandview**

- 4.11 Good example of specifying the zoning, but will not necessarily lead to more affordable housing if rental units are lost to duplexes, etc.
- 4.13 Good example of specifying maximum height and maximum land assembly. Needs clarity around types of housing as wording is unclear: 'infill housing', 'array of housing opportunities'. Encourage the types of housing e.g. laneway that add rental units rather than coach houses which are sold off. Recommend potential to add attic or lock-off suites.

4.14 May contradict 4.13 which specifies 3 storeys and no land assembly. In 4<sup>th</sup> bullet, recommend replacing 'Development permits' with 'Demo permits'.

### **Nanaimo**

Note: there is no mention of the areas around Garden Park, Lord Nelson Elementary or Templeton Park. The zoning should be stated and reflect the desires of the residents. We must note the great efforts of residents like the Friends of Garden Park and refer the CA to their petitions which state: "Specific concepts not supported by our community are:

- 6 storey mixed-use apartment zoning on East 2nd and Nanaimo Street,
- 4 storey apartment/stacked townhome zoning in the 2300 blocks of East 2nd and 3rd Avenue,
- 3-4 storey townhome development on the 2200 or 2300 blocks of Grandview, and
- 4 storey stacked apartment or townhouse zoning along 1st Avenue."

5.8 The map does not reflect the recommendations – correct inconsistencies.

5.10 Replace 'preference to' with 'maximum of'.

5.11, 5.14 Remove entirely as they open the door to spot rezoning.

5.13 Does not specify the desired built-forms, height, massing, etc.

### **Commercial Drive**

6.6, 6.7, 6.8 Concerns have been expressed about appropriate land use, assembly, height, building form, etc. to keep the character and vitality that is the Drive. Limit assembly to encourage smaller store fronts and more independent shops. Consider effect of shadows on nearby properties.

Venables/Commercial site (Astorino's/Kettle Society): last bullet leaves the door wide open for spot rezoning and CACs in lieu of additional height/density. The key is to identify the means by which the kettle can grow and still maintain the neighbourhood character.

### **Broadway & Commercial**

7.2 Mentions possibility of a new bus loop if subway isn't built, leaving door open to future spot rezoning.

7.4 Last sentence should state these requirements apply to the Safeway/plaza site.

7.8 Lot assembly should be accompanied by specifications on built form and massing.

7.9 For Broadway east of Victoria, 6 stories is too high and mixed use brings cars and deliveries through the lane; there are safety concerns about traffic around Laura Secord Elementary School.

7.10 Buildings up to 8 storeys at these 2 intersections seems out of place given heights of nearby buildings, especially at Broadway and Clark across from the elementary school.

7.11 Current zoning allows for up to 4 storeys along these routes. Specifics would be needed around maximum land assembly, built form, massing, etc.

7.12 Wide open to exploitation given wording "site of increased density, with significant commercial and amenity components". Negotiations for CACs would likely result in high density as seen elsewhere in City, e.g. Cambie Corridor. Expand view cone from Trout Lake, westward from Safeway site.

7.15 Wording must be tightened around exact locations affected, e.g. west of Commercial Drive, immediately adjacent to the Grandview Cut.

7.18 Makes no mention of retaining character and scale of neighbourhoods. Specify zoning to prevent land assembly, limit height and density, indicated acceptable built forms (what does infill housing look like?). Should properties with character homes get incentive to increase floor space for rentals to prevent demolition in favour of 'monster home' with laneway house?

7.19 Apply to commercial and/or mixed use buildings only.

7.20 Needs careful consideration of parking and congestion impacts.

If the above are not addressed by the Citizen Assembly in its final report, the recommendations and maps will open the path for potential misinterpretation and

exploitation by City Planning. We have only to look at the community plans of the West End, Marpole, and the Downtown East Side to find evidence.

OCOP is very concerned that the community will not be given an opportunity to review the Citizen Assembly's final recommendations and maps before submission to City Council. At the CA public roundtable held May 5th, when asked whether the CA report to City Council will become available for public review, the CA Chair announced 'No'. There remains valid concern that public input has not been accurately reflected in the sub-area workshop summaries and the CA recommendations and maps. Many roundtable attendees and those writing in have voiced their dissatisfaction with the CA process, expressing their frustrations over 'observation only' CA public sessions and inaccurate meeting recording practices. In an open and transparent public consultation process the community has an opportunity to see and comment on the final product before proceeding further. If the community is prevented from such an opportunity, the record will show the CA process was not an open and transparent process as noted in the CA Terms of Reference and professed by City Planning at the outset.

Sincerely,

Our Community, Our Plan (OCOP)

**Received May 7:**

Attention Citizen Assembly: I am writing to express my support for the OCOP review of the Citizen Assembly's draft recommendations and sub-area maps. Of particular concern is the issue of rezoning. OCOP has stated its general and sub-area specific concerns listed below. I have lived in this neighbourhood for the past 24 years and share the concerns of the OCOP. This is a critical time in ensuring that the Grandview Woodland neighbourhood retains the qualities that make it such a vibrant, livable community in Vancouver. I support the OCOP's request that the CA strengthen its recommendations and maps to accurately reflect the thoughtful input of the community and prevent the potential misinterpretation and exploitation by City Planning.

Yours truly,  
Georgia Scott

**Received May 7:**

See UNYA's attached letter (PDF)

**Received May 7:**

Hello, I would like to thank all of you for your hard work over the last year. It must have been very difficult to make such a time commitment and then face such public scrutiny. Your dedication is appreciated, and looking through all of the briefings and presentations you've watched I wonder if a copy of SimCity is in order? It would certainly be more fun!

I attended the event earlier this week and was pleased to hear that there was representation from both those against growth and those who understand that we must accommodate some growth. I was also pleased to hear that generally most people agreed about things like bike lanes and pedestrian improvements.

I have included my comments on the draft recommendations below separated into Neighbourhood-Wide, and into my specific Sub-Area (Commercial-Broadway) for inclusion into the process. Thanks.

David Williams  
2218 E. 11<sup>th</sup> Ave.

*Neighbourhood Wide*

Housing

- 1.1 I agree
- 1.2 don't visible and hidden = all?
- 1.3 I agree
- 1.4 I agree and support the Kettle/Boffo proposal
- 1.5 I agree, but too wordy
- 1.6 I agree
- 1.7 I agree
- 1.8 I agree
- 1.9 I agree
- 1.10 I agree, and think this should be more strongly worded
- 1.11 I disagree. All developments should have reduced parking requirements. Most arterials have transit routes, which supports parking reductions as well as reduces traffic on the arterial itself.
- 1.12 I'm neutral. I don't think coach houses are really that affordable, especially for new construction. The floor space should go into a larger main building to free up yard space and increase energy efficiency
- 1.13 I agree
- 1.14 I agree
- 1.15 \*\*your numbering is off
- 1.16 I agree
- 1.17 I agree
- 1.18 I disagree, I don't think the City should be financing housing construction
- 1.19 I agree, but very similar to 1.10
- 1.20 I agree
- 1.21 I disagree, rezoning can be a big opportunity for amenities and increased housing supply
- 1.22 I agree
- 1.23 I agree
- 1.24 I agree, but wonder if this is within the City's jurisdiction
- 1.25 I agree
- 1.26 I agree

Transportation

- 2.1 I agree with improving the pedestrian experience, but question putting resources towards trying to improve it in industrial areas. Perhaps change it to transit routes in industrial areas.
- 2.2 I agree
- 2.3 I agree, and think this should include ICBC and the Provincial Government who regulate drivers
- 2.4 I agree with expanding the cycling network, but task forces take resources away from implementing what are already difficult projects
- 2.5 I agree
- 2.6 I agree but question the City's role in planning regional transit
- 2.7 I agree, but question the City's role in providing transit information
- 2.8 I disagree. Firstly, some of those streets already have off-peak hour parking. Secondly, we need arterials to flow so that traffic calming on local streets is desired and effective. It's a road *network*. Also, contradicts your support in 2.14 for Emerging Policy 4.2 which is a very good policy. Parking creates more problems than it solves.

- 2.9 Too wordy
- 2.10 I disagree, goods movement is crucial to a healthy economy and 30km/h is an unrealistic speed for trucks.
- 2.11 I agree
- 2.12 I disagree, this is not within the City's jurisdiction
- 2.13 I agree
- 2.14 Did you guys run out of steam?

#### Public Realm

- 3.1 I don't think this is a big problem, but understand that lots of people do. To be effective I think this program needs to include requirements on private property owners, in conjunction with Vancouver Coastal Health or other such authority.
- 3.2 How did you get from Park Land acquisition to the Powell St. bike lanes? I support both, but some tidying up is needed.
- 3.3 I disagree, this is not a good use of resources so close to Trout Lake, and beside an existing greenway.
- 3.4 Demands are such a rude way of asking for something. Improved lighting and drainage are definitely needed, however paving is very expensive, increases speeds and is actually worse for drainage so I'm split on this. Also, paving is at odds with E.P 3.5.
- 3.5 I agree
- 3.6 I agree
- 3.7 I agree
- 3.8 I agree with the covered area, but think the programming and indoor space are too expensive
- 3.9 I agree
- 3.10 I agree, but think that the existing wayfinding boards are effective and business neutral which makes them time insensitive and low cost.
- 3.11 I question how the City would gauge support from residents? The businesses will be the most vocal about the unfair competition. Perhaps a portion of the truck license fee could go back towards the City's BIA's?
- 3.12 Again with this demand word. Was this on the list of suggested action words? Maybe, there's something equally strong like expect. I don't even work for the City and it makes the hairs on my neck stand up. I agree with the point though, wider sidewalks are needed.
- 3.13 I agree
- 3.14 I agree
- 3.15 I agree
- 3.16 Do you really think they can maintain the existing pool and ice rink while they build replacements? I think you could reword this to be more realistic. I think a complete shutdown for 2 years is better than 4 years of mixing children and construction.
- 3.17 I agree, the increased population on Hastings will still need a pool
- 3.18 I agree, perhaps Port Metro Vancouver could be involved given the importance of the ocean in Coast Salish culture relating to E.P. 2.3

#### Heritage

- 4.1 I disagree
- 4.2 I'm unclear as to what this means.
- 4.3 I'm unclear as to what this means.
- 4.4

#### Arts & Culture

- 5.1 I agree
- 5.2 I agree, but think that there's only so much space the City can require a developer to provide and that maybe only in industrial zoned areas this is a requirement
- 5.3 I agree
- 5.4 I agree

- 5.5 I disagree, these already exist.
- 5.6 I disagree
- 5.7 I agree
- 5.8 I agree
- 5.9 I disagree
- 5.10 I disagree
- 5.11 Neutral
- 5.12

#### Local Economy

- 6.1 I disagree, transit brings more people per hour than street parking ever could. The City has no role in deciding which businesses locate on a property. Or is there a grammar issue? If you're saying to concentrate commercial areas along transit routes, then yes I think that's a good idea, but I still think it's not the City's role to choose tenants.
- 6.2 I agree
- 6.3 I agree
- 6.4 I disagree, office space can be more easily located close to residential areas. Industrial needs to be away from residents where possible, and once it's gone it will never return. Industrial space must be protected at all costs, even if it sits vacant.
- 6.5 I agree
- 6.6 missing
- 6.7 I agree
- 6.8 I agree
- 6.9 I agree
- 6.10 I agree

#### Community Well-being & Health

- 7.1 I agree
- 7.2 I agree
- 7.3 I agree
- 7.4 I agree
- 7.5 I agree
- 7.6 I agree
- 7.7 I agree
- 7.8 I question the City's role in this matter
- 7.9 I disagree, too broad
- 7.10 I agree with improved garbage, recycling and compost bins, but question the claim of health costs of the current situation as motivation.
- 7.11 I agree
- 7.12 I disagree
- 7.13 I agree
- 7.14 I agree

#### Energy & Climate Change

- 8.1 I question the City's role in energy supply discussions, other than District Energy.
- 8.2 I agree
- 8.3 I agree
- 8.4 I agree
- 8.5 I agree
- 8.6 I agree
- 8.7 I agree
- 8.8 I agree
- 8.9 I agree
- 8.10 I agree
- 8.11

Wild Card

9.1 I agree

9.2 I agree

9.3 I disagree

9.4 I disagree

9.5 Neutral

Addtl.

1. Perhaps reword the 'stay at home' phrase as it kind of sounds like you want them to stay inside.
2. I disagree
3. I agree, and that is should use English spelling to be inclusive of everyone.

#### *Broadway & Commercial Sub-Area*

7.1 I agree with the varied heights, and reduced heights along Commercial and 10<sup>th</sup>, I think the east side and Broadway sides of the site should have 16-18 stories. I think that this could be a very good candidate for extremely reduced parking requirements.

7.2 I disagree, a bus loop is not the solution

7.3 I disagree, this is too prescriptive, change to urge the Transportation department to do a neighbourhood traffic calming program.

7.4 I agree

7.5 I agree, and think Broadway and Commercial should be added

7.6 I agree

7.7 I agree

7.8 I agree, unless breezeways are added to break up the massing

7.9 I agree, but think that 4 would be more palatable for the neighbourhood. Also, maybe change the mixed-use to live-work studios or something other than commercial space.

7.10 I agree, and think the heights should be increased to 12 stories with relaxed parking requirements.

7.11 I agree, and for 12<sup>th</sup> since it's basically a highway perhaps the buildings could actually face the back lanes? Clark, and Nanaimo have decent transit maybe these could be increased to 6 stories.

7.12 I agree, but isn't this the same as 7.10?

7.13 I agree, and think we could go to 8 stories

7.14 I agree, and think we could go to 12 stories

7.15 I agree, and think the heights should be relative to the width of the cut and that given the awkward walking connections due to the cut, that a 'true' walking distance with included delay for traffic signals be used rather than a simple circle.

7.16 I agree

7.17 I agree

7.18 I agree and think creative relaxations to setbacks can help increase food security and backyard gardening for modest income residents to stay in the neighbourhood. I also question the actual sustainability of laneway houses being built alongside a new main house, lumping the square footage into 1 principal building is much more cost effective and energy efficient.

7.19 I agree

7.20 I agree, but think the walking radius could be increased to a 10 minute actual walking path as mentioned above

7.21 I agree

#### **Received May 8:**

See Nancy Heckman's letter attached (PDF)

**Received May 8:**

Dear Citizens' Assembly,

Thank you for your contributions toward the Grandview-Woodland community. The amount of time and dedication that you have devoted over the past eight months is commendable. Grandview-Woodland is a remarkable and unique community. I have spent many years enjoying the welcoming nature of the Drive, the eclectic mix of restaurants and the cultural spaces that shape its distinct character. And as a strong proponent of this community, I decided to purchase 1926 East Broadway in early 2013 .

I understand that the Assembly and the community are considering 6-storey mixed-use buildings along Broadway between Woodland and Lakewood, and I am writing to express my support. In fact, I would like to propose a 6-storey mixed-use rental building at the above-mentioned site in the future.

The need for more affordable, long-term rental is growing- and secure rental for students, couples, families and retirees is becoming increasingly difficult to find. This corridor is an ideal location for new rental units, given its proximity to the busiest transit node in the region. Current and future residents will soon benefit from a SkyTrain station expansion, as well as further frequency improvements and upgrades associated with a successful transportation referendum.

In addition, a mixed-use Broadway would contribute to a warm, pedestrian-oriented streetscape and better integrate with the Grandview Cut and the station. New retail would complement the nearby activities {e.g. schools, after school programming) and additional community/cultural spaces would help extend the vibrant "heartbeat" of the Drive.

I wish you success with the last meeting of the Assembly on Saturday, and I look forward to meeting many of you in the community in the near future.

Sincerely,

Sam Hanson  
South Street Development Group

**Received May 8:**

I attended the Grandview and the Nanaimo sub-area workshops and can substantiate the claim that the city's recorders radically misrepresented the residents' wishes. Along with others, I pointed that out to the CA reps at both tables. I am concerned that CA members may have become fonder of Andrew Pask than is called for. He is a very nice young man, but he is also a man with a family to support and a boss who expects him to deliver CA results very different than those favoured by the local community. I like him and I sympathize with him because he is in a nasty career position, but my community's needs have to come first.

I wish to support and echo the solid recommendations provided by Our Community, Our Plan members as follows:



Micah Waskow  
2336 Kitchener

**Received May 8:**

Attached is my submission on the draft recommendations as discussed at the May 5 public meeting, in both PDF and Word format. Because of the short time frame available for comments, I've limited myself to feedback on only two sub-areas: Hastings and Nanaimo. I apologize for the submission being longer than I would like, but there simply isn't time to make it shorter. In other areas, I may agree or disagree with certain elements, but haven't had time to crystallize my thoughts in writing.

Finally, a comment on process at the May 5 meeting about the recommendations. While I've heard from several people that they found AJ's comments offensive, but other than to note that it was an unfortunate note to end the meeting on, her remarks aren't worth responding to.

What is more troubling is that I understand that Daniel Boffo was allowed to wander the room somewhat anonymously, eavesdropping on conversations at various tables and, according to my spouse and my neighbour, inserting himself 'rather obnoxiously' into the conversation. My neighbour at one point asked who he was (his nametag identified him only as 'Daniel') and he said he was a local business owner, but didn't give any other information. While it's an open public meeting, and I have no objection to Mr. Boffo attending, it seemed that all of the residents were told to find a table to discuss a sub-area and that there would be an opportunity to change tables at a later point. Generally this is what most people did. It appears that Mr. Boffo simply wandered the room, inserting himself when it suited him and moving on before he had to engage with people more directly. With the proposed Boffo development as perhaps *the* most contentious issue in the neighbourhood, this is at best an odd way to run a public meeting on neighbourhood planning issues, and in a more formal setting it would be seen as an abuse of process. If nothing else, it creates the impression of an 'uneven playing field' with regards to the treatment of parties interested in the development. I'm not sure if it was the CA or the city staff who allowed this to occur, but it would have been much more appropriate to tell Mr. Boffo that if he was welcome to attend, but that he would have to engage in the process under the same parameters as everyone else.

Best Regards,  
Jim

Submission:

I attended the May 5 public meeting to discuss the Citizens' Assembly draft recommendations. Unfortunately, the discussions at the tables I chose to sit at meeting were mostly unproductive. Consequently, after further reflection on the meeting, I'm submitting my comments in writing.

Given the deadline for submissions, there simply isn't time to go into all of the recommendations in detail so I will focus on just a couple of sub-areas, and then add some broader comments.

My first comments centre on the Hastings sub-area. First let me start with the positive. I support the public realm and transportation recommendations, with the possible exception of 2.8, which I will include in my comments below. I also strongly support recommendation 2.17 – to support the expansion of key aboriginal services such as the Vancouver Aboriginal Friendship Centre and the Urban Native Youth Association. I will have a few more comments

about this recommendation below.

Recommendation 2.12 recommends a maximum allowable height of 4 stories, but then goes on to say that as demand for housing grows “...we are open to increase conditional height as follows:

- *NE corner of Hastings and Clarke – up to 20 stories;*
  - *Hastings, between Clarke and West of Commercial – up to 15 stories;*
  - *Hastings, Commercial to Kamloops up to 8 stories;*
- This is to ensure that the need for non-market social housing and much needed community services can be met...”*

The discussion with the CA member at the table clarified that the idea was that the higher heights were intended to capture CACs that could be directed to community amenities as suggested in the quote. In my submission, that is an entirely wrong basis for determining the built form for the Hastings corridor for the following reasons:

6. ‘Selling height’ to try to get CACs is a strategy that many communities in the City want discontinued because the process is so undemocratic and non-transparent.
7. It’s my understanding that CACs are negotiated with developers when an area is rezoned above what is allowed in the plan or zoning in effect at the time. If that is correct, then setting out these conditional heights in the recommendations effectively sets the starting point for negotiations at the conditional height not the initial height.
8. It’s also my understanding, from developers, planning experts and former planners with the city, that any CAC’s coming from an increase in height from 4 stories to eight would be negligible. So the conditional height addition between Commercial and Kamloops would generate little, if any additional benefits for the community, but would change the nature of a major shopping area to one overshadowed by much taller buildings and the loss of the characteristics that are making it a re-vitalized area (affordable rents, sunlight, a diversity of shops and restaurants, etc) and the loss sunlight on the north side of Hastings and the loss of views for those to the south of Hastings.

Recommendation 2.8 recommends wider sidewalks and street furniture to encourage public interaction and avoid tunneling. Buildings at 8 stories on busy street like Hastings is going to generate tunneling, whatever one does to the sidewalks. Similarly, there are studies that have shown that public interaction decreases as the height of residential buildings increases.

9. As an architect in the community recently wrote: “Building height should consider the width of the street, height of neighbours, street character, views, shadow and sunlight studies to name just a few determinants. It is not an opportunity to pick a number out of the air. I think it’s a pretty complicated matter and really hope whoever is making those decisions is very clear about what urban design principles they are following. It’s a question with asking every time building heights are discussed.”
10. The Aboriginal Friendship Centre and the Urban Native Youth Association own their properties and may want to develop those properties in the future to provide additional housing aimed at aboriginal residents. I support that idea, but it seems to me that limiting the height to 4 stories now, with the potential for increased height depending on negotiations with the city, can only complicate attempts to finance and develop those sites.

For the above reasons I would urge the CA to change recommendation 2.12 to a series of single allowable heights along Hastings. I would suggest that a ‘hard’ maximum of 4 or 5 stories be implemented for Hastings between Victoria and Kamloops. I think that heights can be increased between Victoria and Commercial, because the elevation falls as one travels

west on Hastings from Victoria, and because there is not a strong, pedestrian oriented shopping area there. This section I would suggest could perhaps allow as much as 8 stories on the East side of Commercial, especially on the North side of Hastings where the impact of shadowing, and on adjacent residential buildings would be less. West of Commercial, I have no specific section, although at the recommendation for up to 20 stories at the NE corner of Hastings and Clarke, is higher even than what, from my recollection of a Hastings sub-area public meeting, the developer was asking for.

Regarding the building form on either side of the Hastings corridor, I also support recommendation 2.14 that suggests the creation of transitional building forms North and South of Hastings. I especially see this as a possibility for the North side of Pender Street between Victoria and Nanaimo, (e.g. allowing row-housing) because of the width of Pender St and the fact that there is a fairly wide landscaped median down the centre of the street, which would create an effective 'buffer' between the more and less dense sides of the street.

I'll be more brief about the Nanaimo recommendations. The text and the map are not consistent so they should be modified to be so. The text allowing up to 4 stories is higher than what many people have expressed as desirable in workshops so I would recommend changing the text to read "to a maximum of 3 stories" to be consistent with the map statement "3 story mixed use (long-term vision)".

The text also doesn't mention the additional heights shown on the maps at the 'Nodes'. At the workshops I've attended there has been considerable opposition expressed about adding additional height at those areas, and it was not made clear to me in the May 5 public meeting that there was any compelling reason for additional height at the nodes, other than to say that the CA sub-committee working on the area wanted to avoid a monotonous streetscape with the same height all along it. That could be achieved in other ways than by allowing up to 6 stories in some areas, which in light of community concerns is far too high.

Recommendation 5.12 encourages the city "...to support a building typology that addresses livability with each unit having a quiet side." I think the recommendation should go further and direct the city to require a building typology that also interacts well with pedestrians on the Nanaimo side and with neighbouring buildings on the laneway side. This has been done reasonably well in buildings in the 2100 block of Hastings, and the Marquee building on Commercial at 7<sup>th</sup>, although there is probably room for improvement still. A counter-example is the building at Charles and Nanaimo (W. side) that presents a horrible blank concrete wall to its neighbours. Recommendation 5.13 perhaps is intended to cover this, but if so, it needs to be made more explicit.

Recommendation 5.2. strongly recommends the city increase speed limit monitoring and enforcement along Nanaimo. This is far less than what I understood city planners to be suggesting was possible at the public workshop on the Nanaimo sub-area - i.e. a median along the centre, bulges at the corners, or a separated bike lane. A key concern about Nanaimo is the difficulty with crossing it safely, and design elements to make that happen would do far more than suggesting more speed limit monitoring and enforcement.

Still on the issue of traffic, recommendation 5.6 ventures, oddly, outside of the sub-area, to recommend that adjacent streets to encourage the city to use traffic calming measures such as roundabouts and speed bumps rather than traffic barricades/diverters in streets adjacent to Nanaimo. After significant community concern about traffic counts and speed, the city placed traffic calming barricades and diverters into my sub-area many years ago. Subsequent traffic counts after the measures were put in place showed they reduced numbers overall and spread the remainder more evenly through the community. It took some work and experimentation to get the pattern of barriers/diverters right, and there was one significant redesign several years ago to address a flaw in the design. Although, I haven't

heard from everyone, I have only heard support for the measures since that time.

Nevertheless, this is a sub-sub-area issue and what is done in my neighbourhood (First to Adanac, Nanaimo to Victoria) has no impact on traffic South of First Avenue. Even the implementation of traffic calming measures North of Adanac (between there and Hastings) was done largely independently of the area South of Adanac because Templeton School and park largely separates the traffic flows.

Therefore, I would suggest that the recommendation should simply encourage the city to use traffic calming techniques to address neighbourhood concerns, and to consult with the affected neighbourhood as to whether they want barriers/diverters, roundabouts, speed bumps or abandoned cars in the middle of the road (it was suggested in my neighbourhood).

There are also broader issues with the draft CA recommendations, and I understand that these were conveyed to the CA through an earlier email so I won't repeat them here. I will suggest that it might be helpful if the CA could arrive at a few neighbourhood wide principles – at a higher level than the detailed draft neighbourhood wide recommendations. I would suggest, based on comments I've heard consistently over the course of all of the public workshops I've attended, that one such principle would be a neighbourhood plan based on flatter, gentler densification as opposed to higher, more concentrated development. That doesn't mean that there couldn't be specific instances where higher buildings might be allowed, but it would mean that the onus would be on the CA to explain itself in detail why it should be allowed in certain locations.

Finally, my sincere thanks to the CA members.

**Jim Fraser**  
**2257 Parker St.**

**Received May 8:**

**Neighbourhood-wide Recommendations that should be altered or changed. Suggested changes are italicized**

**2.3:** We recommend the City of Vancouver engage media and education to inform and reinforce safe road use for all modes of transportation.

*We agree! But this is NO substitute for improving and expanding the cycling network so that people of all ages and abilities feel safe and comfortable choosing cycling to get around the neighbourhood.*

**2.4:** We recommend the City of Vancouver expand the cycling network by proposing bike routes and then having a multistakeholder task force that reviews objective, transparent research to resolve locations of proposed cycling routes.

*The many economic, health, safety, and other benefits of bike routes are well supported by a wide body of research. This idea seems like a proposal to make the implementation of bike lanes more difficult. What "research" is necessary for this task force to review? Who would be on this task force?*

**2.5:** We recommend the City pursue improved bike access on high streets such as sufficient bike parking and signage, without affecting pedestrian safety and walkability.

*We support bike parking and signage but a key element of bike access is missing from this recommendation bike lane facilities that are separated from car traffic so that all people can*

*feel comfortable accessing the drive by bicycle.*

**2.9:** We instruct the City to encourage use of public transit through the creation of commuter parking and safe dropoff and pickup locations.

*A park n' ride lot would encourage people to drive their cars to commercial drive and would require a lot of space and public money. This is a very strange recommendation for a neighbourhood that is very close to the city centre with lots of proximity to sustainable transportation options.*

**7.1** We recommend that the City's social infrastructure division support nonprofit community health and social services such as community health clinics in their efforts to sustain, expand, and/or relocate in GW.

*This could also include a community bike shop, such as Kickstand, which allows people of all income levels to choose biking as a mode of transportation by providing them with an essential and inexpensive location where they can maintain their bike.*

**9.3:** We require that a long term city funded advocate be established to monitor the implementation of the recommendations of the Citizens' Assembly. We believe that Grandview Woodland Area Council (GWAC) is the community body to keep the GrandviewWoodland community informed of the implementation progress and to liaise with the advocate on a regular basis.

*GWAC is not a representative body of Grandview Woodland. It's membership is highly skewed toward older homeowners. Many community members would be underrepresented were GWAC chosen to represent the community at large.*

### **Two Important Omissions**

- The community wellbeing and health section makes no mention of urban planning provisions that encourage active transportation choices which are one of the best ways to ensure people to get their minimum recommended daily allowance of exercise. An addition could be:

We recommend that the City provide infrastructure, such as separated bike lanes, wide sidewalks, and many crosswalks, that encourage active transportation choices such as cycling and walking.

- The energy and climate change section makes no mention of urban planning provisions that encourage alternative modes of transportation. This is an essential addition as, car emissions are one of the biggest sources of carbon emissions in Vancouver. An addition could be:

We recommend that the City provide infrastructure, such as separated bike lanes, wide sidewalks, and efficient bus service, that enable environmentally sustainable transportation choices such as cycling and walking.

### **Points in Citizen's Assembly Draft Recommendations that are great and we support**

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

**2.2:** We recommend the enhancement of the public realm on neighbourhood shopping

streets, by widening sidewalks, allowing parklets, providing amenities, like street trees, furniture and buffers between pedestrians and moving traffic.

**3.12:** We demand that the City significantly widen sidewalks on Grandview-Woodland high streets to cultivate a lively streetscape and to accommodate new street furniture and greenery.

**Received May 8:**

Hi there, I have attended two of the meetings and found them always interesting, and at times reassuring and at times terrifying. Thanks for all your effort in putting them on.

My position on the area (and most of Metro Vancouver) can be summed up with "Get rid of single family home zoning entirely" and "regulate car density, not people density" I know these are politically and culturally problematic, but I don't see any other solution.

My position is rooted in a deep love of living in places of people, where I can walk to most destinations, see friends (and strangers) just by walking down the street. And I know of no force that destroys places like that more easily than higher volumes and speeds of car traffic.

It pains me that housing costs are being pinned on foreigners when we have vast tracts of land containing a fraction of densities that happily thrive in other areas of the city. (my GF and I actually walked the perimeter of the entire city two weeks ago, we saw plenty of space for new residents, there is only limited space for SFH and cars)

The 2nd meeting I attended was the one last week and I arrived too late to really participate but I was able to listen in on a number of conversations at the table. I was struck by two in particular:

1. Transition from multi-unit to SFH

A resident forcefully made the case that 6 storeys next to a single family home was simply too much and concluded that 6 stories should be pared to 4, perhaps with the upper floors tapered in some way to further reduce the difference.

Unfortunately, what was left unsaid was, "If the transition from SFH to 6 storeys is too much, why not get rid of SFH rather than trying to pare back the 6 storeys?" If my radical solution (no SFH) is too much, then transition from 6 to 5 to 4 over the length of the block.

2. Parking

Another resident decried people parking on his street and used this as an argument against allowing more people to join the neighborhood.

Again, what was unsaid was most revealing. If parking and car issues are the only concerns, then it would make sense to stop using parking to determine density and start just zoning for car capacity. I.e. rather than saying "this plot of land is zoned for this use/height/etc due to limited parking", then just start saying, "this plot of land is zoned for x many car owners. you can have as many ppl as you want but only x car registrations at this plot of land" or some such.

Another person talked glowingly of the parkade in Chinatown and suggested the area really needed something like that. I can't imagine a worse thing to happen to the area, or something that would send the area downhill faster.

Overall, it feels like a relatively small clutch of SFH owners are able to keep a lock on housing supply for the region, forcing others to suffer so they can maintain an illusion of 1950's suburbia for another few decades. I would urge you to do whatever you can to allow a new generation to join the beautiful city we have and to live they way people lived in cities before 1940 - at whatever level of density their budget and preferences allowed.

Thank you