

**Participant feedback for the members of the Citizens' Assembly**

**Public Roundtable Meetings:**

November 26, 2014

March 5, 2015

May 5, 2015

## **Public Roundtable #1:**

### **Participant feedback on the Citizens' Assembly's draft values for Grandview-Woodland**

**November 26, 2014**

Below are the notes collected at the **Citizens' Assembly's Public Roundtable #1**, on November 26, 2014. The focus of the roundtable was the Assembly's draft values to guide growth and change in Grandview-Woodland.

There were 130 community participants in attendance, as well as members of the Citizens' Assembly.

**AFFORDABILITY:**

We want a reasonable way for people of all socio-economic levels to live lives free from stress of an uncertain future in regards to their money, security, and ability to grow.

**LIKE**

- Ability to grow – love this idea, it seems out of reach right now!
- I like that it is a value
- There is a shortage of accessible housing for people in the city that can't afford the standard rental rates that have increased over the last 15+ years. There needs to be a balance and diversity of affordable housing types, both within the neighborhood and across the city as a whole. Making some areas of the city diverse and affordable and others not, does not solve the problem of affordability.

**QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS**

- How can we achieve this as land value increases? Is there an option to limit empty units in any buildings that are built? (not sure if it's a problem here, but it is in Coal Harbour.) In Vancouver, more supply of housing does not = less expensive housing; the planning process should take this into account. There need to be a diversity of housing options, not just single family and apartment buildings; options should keep residential feel and include duplexes, coops, row housing.
- Vague
- Is affordability a value? What are values and what do we have them for?
- I don't think "a reasonable way" is strong enough language in the face of big money development pressures. How about the city guaranteeing a percentage of affordable sites in exchange for upzoning land?
- City is too expensive, need density for kids and future generations to be able to afford to live in the neighborhood.
- This is missing a focus is this housing affordability, this can be assessed by "Stress" levels of residents.
- Vancouver is presenting itself as a "Green" City and densification is inevitable- how is affordability going to be addressed?
- Choosing to live here in a dense scenario – more communication is necessary to understand this density.
- What will happen to the current tenants of BC Housing?
- Single parent young families will not be able to afford to live in the area if they are trying to raise their children.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set up some sort of bylaw to “facelifts” of the designs and living developments in the neighborhood.</li> <li>• What reasonable way? Is too vague.</li> <li>• We need financial instruments coming from levels of government to create affordable houses.</li> <li>• How do we keep the “afford” in affordability with the rising cost of land?</li> <li>• What is meant by “ability to grow”? Not all citizens may want growth, but we should all have the ability to thrive.</li> <li>• Does this value capture affordability for small businesses to stay and thrive in our neighbourhood?</li> <li>• How is this really managed? Keep affordability by keeping suites</li> </ul>
MISSING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be better/more thoroughly defined. Reduce RS-1 zoning and replace it with gradual densification from main arterials. Allow for the opportunity for my kids to purchase something in the future besides single family or apartment.</li> <li>• Diversity - We should have mixed but affordable low cost housing</li> <li>• Economic opportunities - other ways to address affordability, keep local grocers, make it easier to start a business (accessible co-working)</li> <li>• Affordability may depend on Provincial and Federal \$\$</li> <li>• What is “reasonable”? – if developers can build whatever they want?</li> <li>• Are there plans to have free internet (WAN-wide area networks) for the community? There are many low-income families who can’t afford internet access</li> <li>• Not just for people/housing, but for small businesses as well</li> <li>• Acknowledgement of interconnection between values and affordability (they all contribute to affordability)</li> <li>• I want specifics about how the plan will define/understand affordable housing – ie. less than 30% of income</li> <li>• Also about to keep rents affordable for small neighbourhood businesses</li> <li>• Definition of what affordability is around housing – something more concrete</li> <li>• Need for deeper sense of what it means</li> <li>• Concern about changing rents</li> <li>• Affordability tied to change – for housing to be affordable, need different forms of housing</li> <li>• Is ‘free from the stress of an uncertain future...’ really achievable and realistic? Feels too idealistic.</li> <li>• Zoning</li> <li>• Land use</li> <li>• A mix of built forms</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gentrification</li> <li>• Industrial/residential mix</li> <li>• Make explicit: Rental: increase percentage; Subsidized: what is the need in the community, what is the percentage?; Price: limiting land value through supply and demand.</li> <li>• How does some one from the lowest socio-economic level live their lives free of stress? What is more stressful than not knowing where your next meal is coming from? Or where you sleep tonight</li> <li>• More should be about homelessness</li> <li>• We value co-op housing as affordable and community building.</li> <li>• Mentioning something specific about housing security.</li> <li>• Perhaps noting specifically housing, food, services, community centres</li> <li>• Maintain affordable housing not create affordable housing + encourage suites in areas not zoned for them</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Under “affordability,” there needs to be more explicit mention of social/affordable housing, accessible transportation, as well as retention and enhancement of character and form of neighbourhood.</li> <li>2) Under “affordability,” there should be some mention of the need to ensure that families have economic opportunities so that they can live in the area. Low-income housing and community amenities with public access seem important to achieving this goal.</li> <li>3) There needs to be a mention of transitional housing options to support homeless shelters in the area.</li> <li>4) Please add housing</li> <li>5) Is this even realistic—with lower storied buildings, which the community wants, but developers won’t build as it will be too costly</li> </ol>
--	---

<p><b>DIVERSITY:</b></p> <p>We commit to promoting and defending diversity of all forms. In planning for the future, Grandview-Woodland has a specific interest in the diversity of people, housing, public land use, and economic opportunities.</p>	
<p><b>LIKE</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quirky neighbourhood is important – comes from artists, performers, people of different social economic mix</li> <li>• Diversity is accepted</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diversity can be supported by promoting: affordability, diversity, well-being and health, safety</li> <li>• Accessibility to people of all ages – children, youth to aged; i.e. <u>affordable</u></li> <li>• Views – to mountains, to city and beautiful places such as parks</li> <li>• Diversity is one of the reasons I love this neighbourhood. It makes it unique among many other neighbourhoods in Vancouver (and other Canadian cities).</li> <li>• Diversity makes this neighbourhood vibrant and so great.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify diversity more clearly. Specifically I want to protect the <u>ethnic diversity</u> of small stores on Commercial Drive. This is connected with <u>Economic Diversity</u> – wherein we need to protect small and affordable commercial space.</li> <li>• Policy or practices to incentivize small new business and protect existing stores. Economic diversity.</li> <li>• Gentrification- if the neighborhood continues to be ‘built out’ with new houses and expensive condos, diversity will decrease</li> <li>• There is a very apparent lack of aboriginal families</li> <li>• I like opportunities for exchange of learning and other cultures</li> <li>• Missing- city neighborhood banners aboriginal art along Hastings, Grandview Woodlands</li> <li>• Engage native groups and individuals on their terms</li> <li>• I love the diversity of the community and the variety of different businesses and organizations here.</li> <li>• “Reasonable way” is too ambiguous – reasonable to who? The wording is confusing – feels like it could be simpler.</li> <li>• Make sure there is diversity in all 3 areas: 1) People: people and cultures, age, socioeconomic status, 2) Housing: types, sizes, 3) Land Use: mixed uses, live/work units, commercial, residential.</li> </ul>
<p><b>MISSING</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Diverse ways to densify (laneway, density bonus for single family dwellings) Diverse models for building for density, better modeled with neighbourhood character – co-housing for example.</li> <li>2) Include a definition of economic opportunities</li> <li>3) Maintaining businesses in the area including small manufacturing and warehouse space</li> <li>4) Limits to economic growth</li> <li>5) Need to focus on more than families: single people, seniors, low-income</li> <li>6) Arts and Culture</li> </ol>

	<p>7) What are other communities doing?</p> <p>8) An overview of a city-wide planning</p> <p>9) Introduction statement not a value. Word “appropriate is ambiguous”</p> <p>10) Capturing within the value the base line with which you start with. Existing demographic and social capital. Acknowledging the existing demographical conditions within the neighbourhood to be able to forecast the future needs of the current population.</p> <p>11) This should be # 1. Requires significant supply in all areas of the city.</p> <p>12) There is no mention of homeless youth in the emerging direction or in these values. It is not clear what diversity means.</p> <p>13) Maintaining diversity is really important to us</p> <p>14) By maintaining diversity we mean that we want to keep same proportion of every thing as we have now.</p> <p>15) We want a diverse active healthy model which is not like metro town</p> <p>16) Maintain diversity: density will happen but how will the area stay affordable is important to us.</p> <p>17) Right now there are not a lot of rich people in the area and its important that the area doesn’t become like yale town</p> <p>18) If there is a lot of money in the area, it will push the low income people out</p> <p>19) Wider range of light industrial and retail for existing zones.</p> <p>20) Defining patterns, what this term means and more structure</p> <p>21) Economic diversity as well, Land use diversity, Housing, Businesses, Ethics, Landscape, Transportation</p> <p>22) The values should be more descriptive of the definition of diversity</p> <p>23) 58 percent rental or 30 percent rental or 40 percent rental or whatever prescribes the diversity that the neighbourhood need</p> <p>24) Explicitly speak about supporting current and future small businesses.</p> <p>25) Diversity of all forms—more culturally sensitive.</p> <p>26) A commitment to reducing inequity not just promoting and defending diversity</p> <p>27) Under “diversity,” there should be recognition that planning for future land use should be both for public <i>and private</i> use.</p>
--	---

**JUST AND APPROPRIATE CHANGE:**

We understand that change is inevitable, but are concerned with the pace and type of

change occurring in our neighbourhood.

In order to embrace change, we seek to promote social and spatial changes that are integrated, gradual, sustainable, appropriately scaled and responsive to the needs of local residents and the City's residents more broadly. This is accomplished through extensive grassroots community engagement that is inclusive and democratic.

<b>LIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is good. Good second statement; should include maintain family-friendly feel.</li><li>• This is an over arching value, something that can guide all the values</li><li>• Recognition of change is healthy</li><li>• Like emphasis on gradual change</li><li>• I appreciate that the Assembly recognizes that the neighbourhood cannot be frozen in amber</li></ul>
<b>QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Appropriate change; agree but would add we have some responsibility to increase diversity in the context of a rapidly growing metro population</li><li>• The first half of this value seems to indicate certain change is inevitable – not all changes are inevitable (i.e. giant condo towers). It's hard to describe but the wording seems “off”.</li><li>• Second piece is good.</li><li>• the “needs of the city more broadly.” We are being forced to take more density etc than many areas. How about: we should be treated fairly by the city</li><li>• Who decides on “the gradual spatial change?”</li><li>• How can we accommodate a doubling of the population while maintaining the soul of the neighbourhood?</li><li>• Sustainable/gradual change</li><li>• Sustainable growth. Built form developments only in appropriately designated zones</li><li>• There are too many concepts overlapping with other values. e.g. here, it says we promote change that is sustainable (which is a separate value), appropriately scaled (which is also mentioned under sustainability). I'd suggest focusing this value on – we value change that is <u>responsive to the needs of local residents</u>. By focusing this value, it would be easier to work with.</li><li>• I'm not keen on the word appropriate. (ambiguous)</li><li>• How is “appropriately scaled” defined and by whom?</li></ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who defines what is “just”? What is just for one person may not be perceived as just by another. Suggestion of removing “just”.</li> <li>• What is the role of the real estate market in driving change?</li> <li>• What “appropriately scaled” means for me could be different for another person.</li> <li>• You ask: Appropriate change or Just &amp; Appropriate change. What is mean by “just” and appropriate? If this relates to affordability of housing, perhaps this should be discussed under affordability and you need to state something like not having to pay more than say 30% of your gross income on rent. Be specific.</li> <li>• What is appropriately scaled? When can we see the City’s data on population projections so we can discuss how this was arrived at and how should take these into consideration?</li> </ul>
MISSING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change as an opportunity; design aesthetic opportunities</li> <li>• Lots of citizen engagement – How? <u>Scale</u> My hope is that anything higher than 4 levels [is] <u>carefully</u> negotiated</li> <li>• Include: ‘development’ changes, ‘engagement and involvement’</li> <li>• Wording should include “respecting and encouraging families” or “family friendly development”</li> <li>• Framing the entire document with a family friendly lens</li> <li>• Zoning needs to be discussed EG. Under-used warehouses should be re-assessed - no need to get rid of all light industry</li> <li>• Density as a word/concept should be probably be addressed in the values</li> <li>• Should include small business, feels like it’s missing</li> <li>• Need a way to protect small, existing businesses from potential encroachment of chain stores. Keep rents affordable for these base small businesses (ie. produce stores)</li> <li>• Not sure the wording reflects the ‘justice’ value</li> <li>• Validity of the process</li> <li>• Do not reinvent the wheel</li> <li>• What are other communities doing?</li> <li>• An overview of a city-wide planning</li> <li>• “Appropriate Change or Just &amp; Appropriate Change” to “Respectfully managed change”.</li> <li>• Really need to define “appropriately scaled”. “Forms of density” are critical to define too.</li> <li>• Appropriate scale needs to be defined.</li> <li>• Growth as a goal. Growth is implied throughout this, but our goals</li> </ul>

	<p>around growth should be explicit and upfront.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much do we want residential and/or commercial growth?</li> <li>• Growth can be good for the neighbourhood economically and socially.</li> <li>• grassroots engagement that has impact and is seen to have impact</li> <li>• Focusing on upgrading the parts of the community that are under-utilized or underserved, rather than redeveloping the areas that already work.</li> <li>• Governance: continuing forms of democracy and shared decision making.</li> <li>• What types of businesses do we want and how do we want to invite economic growth at an optimal level?</li> <li>• Distribution of change within all neighbourhoods</li> <li>• Under the “appropriate change” value, it would be helpful to mentioning something about the need to convert single occupancy houses into suites, duplexes, laneway housing, and so on, in order to achieve the neighbourhood’s density goals. There should also be a commitment to develop only those areas already slated for development housing.</li> <li>• Emphasis on the value of current levels of light, views and vistas—many of which would be lost if pace of development and height of buildings allowed</li> <li>• Scale of the proposed buildings at parks (Adanac and East 2<sup>nd</sup>) will create a wall to keep community out or separated</li> <li>• Also: view of residents on south side of Venables</li> <li>• “Needs of the City’s residents more broadly” what does this mean?</li> <li>• Concerned about the process by which change happens, as well as the change itself. Important for community input to be valued</li> <li>• I want to see recognition that East 1<sup>st</sup>—while an arterial street—is actually part of the neighbour and if built up to too tall, buildings will create a divide in the neighbourhood</li> <li>• Recognition that East Hastings in G-W is an important, even crucial street for small businesses</li> </ul>
--	--

**CHARACTER AND HISTORY:**

We first acknowledge and value that we are on the unceded territories of the Coast

Salish peoples. This is not just history but an ongoing and living presence within Grandview-Woodland.

We value residential friendly change in line with the current character of built forms and streets. This neighbourhood character has been defined by its unique history and we want to continue to attract, welcome, and sustain diverse people, communities and buildings.

We value the character and history as it currently exists in Grandview-Woodland. We want to build upon that history and character while understanding that this can mean change or maintaining what is here.

LIKE

- Acknowledge that Coast Salish are the first peoples of this territory is important; why do we use the term unceded – is there a legal reason?
- Like protecting character!
- “change in line with current character” –good, but how is it enforceable?
- Heritage and Scale, History: Encourage – revere, educate what a gift the old sustainable building can be – also conversions to multi unit without losing character
- Vibrancy of the Drive
- Diversity, character, quirkiness
- Businesses, especially the coffee shops
- Preserving the vibrancy of neighbourhood
- GW is an Edwardian village
- Everything is within walking distance
- There are a lot of green, heritage buildings
- I like the values proposed for Character & History. Keep character, but open to shifting built environment.
- Respect what is existing! Character and history tell the story of a neighbourhood and a community.
- recognizes historic character of GW
- love the character and flare of our community
- very valued; authentic feel - Real architecture that is maintained (we need to preserve it)
- Like the emphasis on ‘friendly’ change I take this to mean that pace of development will be slow, orderly and allow public process to the

	<p>maximum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Current character of built forms and streets’ consistent with importance of introducing density without high-rises. Build to scale of existing character</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can you keep the feel and safety of life with high-rises?</li> <li>• Should we have straighter language about protecting heritage buildings - - or is that too specific?</li> <li>• How do we acknowledge the vast cultures in this community? How do we promote this? EG. Italian days? And others. Maybe a culture day every week in the summer?</li> <li>• How do you protect the built heritage? Current heritage rules often don’t work that well—too many houses being torn down</li> <li>• What does character mean in Grandview woodland?</li> <li>• Built forms need to be thought through thoroughly</li> <li>• Land use is key</li> <li>• Need a mix of types of housing that is inclusive of all</li> <li>• Does only keeping the outer face or façade of a building count as keeping its history? It does seem to be a common practice in the area. This seems to be happening a lot in downtown too (i.e. Gastown), where a building is totally demolished and changed on the inside, but the exterior is preserved. This does not really maintain the character of the neighborhood, especially because these changes are associated with changes in the community members that can afford to live there.</li> <li>• Densifying is not the only solution to increase housing availability and affordability. Densification might change the character of GW, both architecturally and in terms of the community members living there (too many people suddenly moving in).</li> <li>• What is meant and more importantly, the impact to our community as a whole by acknowledging and valuing that we are on unceded territories of the Coast Salish peoples?</li> <li>• What history and character will be kept</li> <li>• Low income housing for students and homeless teens</li> <li>• How much is the projected height and density of the area, and what is the expected growth</li> <li>• Tourism of the area: the look of the area, the cobblestone, trees and street light are important</li> <li>• What does it mean that the values take about “the needs of the residents”</li> <li>• Change should not be juxtaposed with maintaining what is here. We</li> </ul>

	<p>need to involve the residents to ensure we do not face false choices down the road</p>
<p>MISSING</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please include all the people who built the area, not just lip service to FN</li> <li>• Is it possible that real values are missing from the draft? The way they are presented seems long as paragraphs that contain seeming contradictions in expectations. Values might contradict but having them in the same line is confusing.</li> <li>• <u>Trees</u> are part of character not just buildings</li> <li>• There is character in each sub-area</li> <li>• Include a community definition for G-W character: Commercial drive, Commercial/residential mix, Inclusive, impassioned civic intentions, Walkability, Light industrial and Retain local businesses</li> <li>• Include - Diversity of building design</li> <li>• Define built form in specific heights of buildings</li> <li>• Wording needs to capture both built and natural environment</li> <li>• We need more visible representation of aboriginal/first nations in public places, recognizing the many urban and local communities and the rich history of First Nations.</li> <li>• “Change or maintaining what is here.” There are opposites so this statement means nothing.</li> <li>• “Residential friendly change” this is vague</li> <li>• Redefining the meaning of change.</li> <li>• Aboriginal history is important, however I’m not sure how it can or should affect planning.</li> <li>• Valuing existing built form too highly freezes an area of the city in place forever. Dead cities stay the same, vibrant cities change, even when it causes a change of character</li> <li>• “Residential friendly change” is very ambiguous – is this value specific to the architecture?</li> <li>• Be more clear about the character and history – style, layout, architecture, etc.</li> <li>• I like that this quality of the neighborhood (character and history) has been formed by the independent, blue-collar spirit of its residents.</li> <li>• ...want to continue to attract, welcome, and sustain diverse people, communities, buildings and businesses (eg. No chains or franchises).</li> <li>• Protection of visual history</li> <li>• Protection of types of people that make up the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Foster built forms that encourage social interaction.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We could use more spaces like the lovely cul de sac between Victoria and Commercial on E 8<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>• Add/explore planning relationships with First Nations in light of court decisions</li> <li>• The phrase “character and history” in the values is ambiguous. There needs to be stronger language about heritage as well as some recognition of the trade offs between preserving heritage and developing better spaces</li> <li>• Under “character and history,” insert “by recognizing and maintaining important heritage/character buildings and spaces” in the last sentence, just after “...build upon that history and character...”</li> <li>• Having high-rise towers would also mean losing character, which is predominantly the two or three level building form (especially in the area just north of Broadway).</li> <li>• Under the “character and history” value, it is important to emphasize that maintaining the unique character of the neighbourhood can itself be an economic draw. We should also look to ensure that newer construction conforms to the character of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Don’t focus too much on the character and history of buildings</li> <li>• Does not address the history and character of businesses and their independence</li> <li>• Small independent shops define character</li> <li>• Conflict between: increasing density and preserving character of the neighbourhood</li> <li>• Loosing height and views, need to preserve those elements</li> <li>• How much affordability are we willing to sacrifice for ‘character’ and ‘appropriate change’?</li> </ul>
--	--

**SAFETY:**

We value the ability to walk, ride and drive anywhere at anytime in a safe and reasonable manner. We also desire to protect and include all members of the community, whether it is inside the home or in the neighbourhood at large. Safety should be guaranteed for, among others: women, children, people no matter their ethnic/cultural background, those with addictions, disabilities, or mental health

problems, seniors, First Nations, and people of all sexual orientations.

We also want to encourage more collaboration between the community, law enforcement, community policing organizations, first responders, and harm reduction programs.

Finally, we value a neighbourhood that is family-friendly—safe, clean and encouraging of play for all ages.

<p><b>LIKE</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Love it. Would like to see law enforcement and community work closer (in a positive way)</li> <li>• Like it! Little vague, would like to see how it plays out</li> <li>• Family-friendly is very important and I would be happy to see it continually emphasized</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With increased densification will policing be increased?</li> </ul>
<p><b>MISSING</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be linked to better transportation. No safety for all should suffer, without calling out everyone but European descended males. Safety should be “guaranteed”... this statement is too concrete; safety cannot be guaranteed and it should not be stated as such. Safety is about trust between neighbors and community members; this is missing from the values statement.</li> <li>• Totally agree with the last statement (that safety cannot be guaranteed); could be stronger though; family friendly is paramount. Taking back the street for hockey, walking, cycling, and sitting and enjoying the gardens.</li> <li>• How do we get safer lighting on streets? EG. Victoria Drive (from Hastings to Broadway)</li> <li>• RE: Addictions – Why are we as a community not looking at the root causes of alcohol/drug use with our community members and looking at solutions?</li> <li>• Are you planning to have an earthquake preparedness plan? Community-wise plan</li> <li>• When creating a new building, include a library – it is a SAFE place for kids, for new neighbors to put (à la Jonathan Rose – Architect / USA)</li> <li>• Woodlands bike lane much better than commercial drive, leave parking on commercial drive.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better street lighting in streets off Hastings and Triumph</li> <li>• Better protection and safety for all women and girls, especially first nations women and girls.</li> <li>• Totally car free and pedestrian network</li> <li>• “Drive anywhere” is not a value to be emphasized. Driving not going anywhere but as least official use of scarce space, it must not be emphasized or ensured as a right.</li> <li>• “Safety should be <u>guaranteed</u>... This is admirable but not doable. A better word please.</li> <li>• value neighbourhood that is family friendly. Does that mean that non family people are not valued</li> <li>• Social services need to be supported and increased, also tailored to a diversity of support needs.</li> <li>• add spiritual as the speaker suggested</li> <li>• Under the “safety” value, instead of having “...walk, ride, and drive anywhere...” it might be simpler and more comprehensive to just put “transit.”</li> <li>• The language about “safety” use in the values seems to be missing the point: it’s not about “safety” (and here, you also don’t need to list different kinds of mobility options) it’s about accessibility.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY:</b>	
<p>We think environmental sustainability includes at least three dimensions:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities that are resilient, scalable, more complete, clean, vibrant, and have local economies.</li> <li>• Green spaces that promote ecological literacy, biodiversity, food security, physical activity and well-being for all.</li> <li>• Green infrastructure that is energy efficient and minimizes waste. It should also support people in reducing our collective emissions and resource use.</li> </ul>	
<b>LIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, parks, better green space, access and development. Maybe support distributed generation project.</li> <li>• Like: The idea of local economies</li> <li>• I enjoy resilient communities, green spaces, efficient infrastructure,</li> </ul>



	<p>etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green initiatives are going in the right direction</li> <li>• Maintain and expand green space for children and public enjoyment</li> <li>• If this value is implemented the community will be well prepared for the future.</li> <li>• More Green Space!</li> <li>• Like some emphasis on energy efficiency + like “reducing our collective emissions”</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can we be a leader in Vancouver in environmental sustainability; can we have demonstration projects so people can learn of the environment. Encouraging not having a car.</li> <li>• What about sharing economy (i.e. tool library)? Food security – more specifically orchards and edibles?</li> <li>• Be leaders in enviro-innovations</li> <li>• Missing “green planning” – or is that redundant? It seems general</li> <li>• Environmental sustainability 1. scalable?</li> <li>• Sustainability too in looking at the overall city and region’s needs; Some higher density in exchange for more green spaces?</li> <li>• What does “scalable” mean?</li> <li>• Expansion of #2, Green assets that are different than they are in the rest of the City. This would require the inclusion of natural areas especially for children and thinking about using roads as greenways.</li> <li>• Expansion of #3, Incentives to encourage people buy and renovate rather than tear down and put more construction materials in the landfill.</li> <li>• Need more green space</li> <li>• Not very safe for all modes of transportation</li> <li>• How does density address adequate public spaces for quality of life? If people are going to live in smaller spaces, there should be adequate public space provided</li> <li>• With increasing density how will the space and facilities support all these people happily and sufficiently? EG. Open spaces, diverse public space for different uses (dog parks, playgrounds, larger community centres, better gathering spaces)</li> <li>• With increasing density, public spaces also need to be safe, and quirky unique characters of the drive need to be supported and maintained</li> <li>• Point #1 feels lite it ought to fit into something more general.</li> <li>• We need to embrace sustainability in all areas: environmental,</li> </ul>

	<p>economic, social (make sure that the people that live here are able to stay here).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retrofitting of old buildings to improve energy efficiency (eg. Insulation, windows) is a way to preserve heritage values and maintain neighbourhood character in a “green” way.</li> <li>• Expand to include decrease in use of fossil fuels and reduction of Greenhouse gases+ develop/ encourage non-fossil fuel alternatives</li> </ul>
MISSING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to recognize that climate change is a reason we need to reduce GHG emissions; reduce environmental footprint; should be part of values; not enough mention of reducing our environmental footprint.</li> <li>• Greenest neighborhood in Vancouver. Make community street gardens in laneways to offset densification.</li> <li>• Encourage small, neighborhood shops that will reduce driving and spread entrepreneurialism and neighbor interaction</li> <li>• The creation of more green spaces</li> <li>• Sustainability should be expanded to include: social sustainability (festival), economic sustainability (diversity of businesses, economic base for local, regional, provincial and federal businesses) and environmental sustainability</li> <li>• Highlight activities and design to support social sustainability</li> <li>• Discussion that the other (non-environmental) values are part of social sustainability</li> <li>• Economic sustainability also relates to different sizes of industry</li> <li>• Green spaces</li> <li>• There are too many concepts here – distill to the choice</li> <li>• Planning jargon is not always clear</li> <li>• Missing any related to water streams, lakes, etc. (e.g. Daylighting stream)</li> <li>• Ecological conservation and restoration needs to be explicitly addressed as a core value that requires focused attention. It is not equivalent to the creation and protection of “green spaces”.</li> <li>• Should be “ecological integrity” not “literacy” (unclear about what that means)</li> <li>• Should say “communities that are <u>compact</u>, resilient...”</li> <li>• Adding a fourth point with an explicit statement about facilitating transportation; “green infrastructure that encourages sustainable transportation choices”.</li> <li>• Developing ‘walkable’ communities, less reliance on fossil fuels</li> <li>• Require new development to have a secondary sources of energy</li> </ul>

	supply
--	--------

<p><b>MOBILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY:</b></p> <p>We value a transportation system that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offers a well-integrated, sufficient, efficient and affordable mix of modes of transportation for all ages and abilities.</li> <li>2. Makes active transportation safe, convenient and delightful while managing traffic congestion.</li> <li>3. Allows the movement of goods and services that supports a thriving local economy and a major port, while reducing impacts and ensuring effective emergency response.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>LIKE</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkability, p.s. cars <u>last</u></li> <li>• All ages and abilities is key for supporting all members of the community being able to take part in the community. Empowerment through mobility.</li> <li>• Very important value. I believe most people don't shun private vehicles, but given the choice would rather walk, ride a bike or take transit – or also a car share program (eg. Car2Go).</li> <li>• This summarizes aspects of transportation and the community that are important to me: integrated, sufficient, safe, convenient, transportation.</li> <li>• Great! Let's have active transportation be the mode! 1) Walk, 2) bike, 3) transit.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seems out of scope; should this be a Translink issue?</li> <li>• More and better bike lanes.</li> <li>• I like a mix of modes of transportation</li> <li>• Accessible bldgs. parks and city infrastructure</li> <li>• I hesitate about the value of being able to DRIVE anywhere. I'd like us to barely be able to drive at all!</li> <li>• This value is missing the assurance that every street will not turn into a bike lane and the proper integration of transit with the rest of the city.</li> <li>• How can you legislate "delightful"?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “While reducing impacts” is quite vague. What impacts? On the environment? On the community?</li> <li>• Need to combine the different needs of internal “traffic” and transient daily flow-through “traffic”. Addressing the need to create strategies for managing these two types of traffic separately but in an integrated manner.</li> <li>• Does the Assembly support alternate transportation companies such as Uber (taxi services)? The City generally opposes this sort of service. While the Assembly might not have the power to decide on this, it might consider bringing the need for diverse modes of transportation to the City through the report. [Other participants’ comments in response to this comment: there are liability issues that might explain why the City opposes services such as Uber).</li> </ul>
MISSING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic Study of skytrain; air stinks from all the idling diesel busses.</li> <li>• Green spaces need to be enhanced/increased, not just maintained. More spaces for gardening and better accessibility.</li> <li>• Having connection to the street with low-rise buildings; nothing over 6 stories; greater than six stories creates disconnect with the neighborhood.</li> <li>• What is the plan to refurbish and reconstruct the Britannia recreational complex – this needs to accompany.</li> <li>• Would like to see issues like traffic, parking, green space, etc. as part of G-W plan, not as an afterthought. Safety is an issue; there are already too many accidents in Broadway corridor; what is the specific plan to deal with this?</li> <li>• Accessible housing options for mobility impaired need to be appropriately located (i.e. near rapid transit nodes)</li> <li>• Can we collaborate with Translink as to the growth that will inevitably happen in the next year? Assembly should be attending meetings, and should be included in the discussions where decisions are being made</li> <li>• Drive is currently very auto-centric in its design</li> <li>• Consideration of better parking requirements on new construction</li> <li>• How do we retain parking for businesses with a more diverse range of transportation options?</li> <li>• I have lived here for 8 years and it continues to get better every year.</li> <li>• I like communication on alternative transportation options</li> <li>• I want more people on bikes, change the provincial law on helmets.</li> <li>• Change the Helmet law</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sidewalks, need to be wider for seniors using scooters for example</li> <li>• Public spaces</li> <li>• Access for seniors</li> <li>• Traffic calming</li> <li>• Parks/parklets/pocket parks</li> <li>• Zoning and land-use</li> <li>• Seniors: need to provide living spaces and support that is adequate</li> <li>• Wider sidewalks</li> <li>• Emphasizing walkable and bikeable community and shifting away from cars. Like the term “delight”</li> <li>• Accessibility should encompass more than just transportation.</li> <li>• Under “mobility and accessibility,” it’d be good to put something about the need to encourage development built around transit, and vice versa. Translink also needs to be brought to the table, and higher rises should be encouraged (6 floors, plus) at the Main Street intersection.</li> <li>• Under “accessible transportation,” there should be some recognition that developing infrastructure for some modes of transportation (e.g., cars or buses) precludes other modes of transportation (e.g., bikes).</li> <li>• “Walkability” also needs to mean building sidewalks with enough width for at least two wheel chairs to pass by.</li> </ul>
--	--

<p><b>WELL-BEING AND HEALTH:</b></p> <p>We value maintaining green spaces and a quality of life that fosters mental, physical, and social health in the places we work, live and play.</p> <p>We view health in a way that recognizes peoples’ different social and economic histories and experiences. We also value walkability and encouraging active health.</p>	
<p><b>LIKE</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I like well-being and health</li> <li>• I like that this is the focus</li> <li>• Walkability! Green spaces!</li> <li>• I like the value of maintaining green spaces and a quality of life that fosters health.</li> <li>• The green spaces and pathways are part of what makes our community unique and should be maintained.</li> </ul>

<p><b>QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green spaces is essential to ward off high rises which would building community and health</li> <li>• Increased density can also mean increased green space (<u>reclaim space</u> near mid rises)</li> <li>• We value maintaining and increasing green spaces.</li> <li>• Britannia expansion great ☺ Will it be in my lifetime – next 15-20 years? ☹</li> <li>• Well-being and health, character and history, safety. The residential neighborhood at William and McLean sits next to a light industrial area it was reasonably quiet until the summer of 2013 when a berry business moved in and started making a lot of noise 24/7- business and owners of site not responsive to neighbors complaints</li> <li>• “Maintaining” green spaces – the use of the word “maintaining” suggests that no new green space is imagined.</li> <li>• Why is health viewed as relative to people’s social and economic histories? As humans, do we not all need the same basic health needs?</li> <li>• Part of walkability is having benches on which to rest (particularly important to the elderly). Drinking fountains were important to the British seniors group when the City consulted them.</li> </ul>
<p><b>MISSING</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This value should include specifics regarding the community amenity process: Transparency, Consultation, and Informed by city and community</li> <li>• Increase childcare space, also for disabled children</li> <li>• Safer biking streets</li> <li>• Unfortunately, the ongoing and living presence of the First Nations in G-W is on the sidewalk ☹</li> <li>• Affordable daycare and health services included into densification and provided by developers.</li> <li>• Problem is children living in poverty and better neighborhood schools.</li> <li>• Health Centres are missing</li> <li>• Affordable daycare is missing, must be included in development CAC’s.</li> <li>• Walkability means being able to walk amenities (retail, schools, jobs).</li> <li>• Arts and Culture</li> <li>• Wider sidewalks</li> <li>• More parks/parklets and pocket parks</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important to have various types of spaces (not just green) that <u>foster interaction</u> (note taker's note: emphasis in original). A big part of community building is the interactions with other community members. Spaces such as libraries, classrooms, corners, are fundamental in this regard. For instance, the plaza right by Britannia. Need to generate spaces for interaction near the skytrain station. Small community markets are an option.</li> <li>• Availability and access of green spaces and community amenities.</li> <li>• Specifically add cycling, and other modes of active transportation.</li> <li>• Increase green space (more than maintain). "Grandview Woodlands is one of the most undersubscribed neighbourhoods in terms of green space, "maintain" does not begin to characterize this inequality in access and availability to social amenities.</li> <li>• "Security and assurance" that as the community densifies, new green space and community amenities are provided commensurate to the new growth.</li> <li>• More accessible holistic community centres or meeting places.</li> <li>• Add in something re: creation of more public spaces for citizens to meet and collaborate</li> <li>• Add support for community-focused health services</li> <li>• Under "well-being and health," most residents also value the ability to live "car free" and to have accessible, effective transit options.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>OTHER CONSIDERATIONS or MISSING VALUES:</b>	
<b>LIKE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am grateful for the work the Citizens' Assembly is doing. The values have been well thought out. Thank you.</li> <li>• Positive; agree with intent and wording of all as presented Nov.26/14</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase density while maintaining connections to the street.</li> </ul>
<b>MISSING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Townhouses or row houses intact, being a strata like Tamito (?). Heritage preservation; we should restore all the buildings on the Drive like Nelson, BC.</li> <li>• Britannia Community Centre is the "rotting" heart of our community; it needs to be repaired, and that may help keep the safety, family oriented of our neighborhood.</li> <li>• More car coops to reduce cars.</li> <li>• Preserve our grand views; no high-rises/mid-rises.</li> <li>• Spaces for our littlest – no childcare centres for under 3 years old</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The needs, desires and interests of residents and the community take utter precedence over the needs of developers and those seeking to profit from “change”</li> <li>• Parking: transit upgrades will lag behind densification. How will the plan deal with the major parking headaches? (this is my best guess on this one)</li> <li>• The value of community</li> <li>• NEW VALUE: We value a community process that fosters ownership and agency and seeds organizational and community capacity in order for genuine democracy and engagement where the citizens of Grandview Woodlands feel like they have a voice that is listened to and acted upon.</li> <li>• Livability – but could be covered in other values</li> <li>• Cultural events/arts</li> <li>• Community Input and ongoing community input – needs to be reflective of ongoing changes that are occurring, iterative process</li> <li>• Community democracy</li> <li>• Something about the value of festivals and care free events</li> <li>• Want “scale” to be a value</li> <li>• Views are not blocked</li> <li>• How are we going to better engage aboriginal and first nations communities knowing that there is a large population here. Record is from previous work that actions were not followed though.</li> <li>• Diverse types, single family, townhouse, low rise</li> <li>• Jobs, incubator space for industrial jobs.</li> <li>• NEW VALUE: ARTS AND CULTURE: We need to identify and celebrate the artists in our midst, create more spaces for public art, i.e. in our parks. Public art should be visible</li> <li>• NEW VALUE BUILT FORMS AND LAND USE: Preserving the diversity of housing in the neighbourhood -» Zoning for diversity What built forms in the neighbourhood do we need to protect? How do we do that? What are the built forms that are missing in the neighbourhood? We need to include the creation and preservation of parks in the development of the neighbourhood. What maximum height? Housing should be inclusive of a diversity of people, including singles, senior and low-income people</li> <li>• Local economy. Look at Strathcona with its social enterprises.</li> <li>• Transparency. The public at large must be included in our process. Regarding the comment made by one of the community members at</li> </ul>
--	--



	<p>the beginning of the session about why the community values had not been made public in advance of the roundtable, that was not a deliberate decision. It is just that other things were prioritized. The Assembly needs to pay more attention to this, because lack of transparency was actually the catalyst for the creation of the Assembly. It is necessary to keep this in mind.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sense of community is not captured in the values. Community, friendliness, and being neighbourly is part of what makes East Van unique. We should capture this within the values.</li> <li>• There is nothing about arts and culture in the values</li> <li>• Adding a statement along the lines of: “We value the sense of belonging, being connected with other people in the community.”</li> <li>• There should be a value about economic sustainability. There are only small mentions in some areas but is not a value on its own. There should be something about valuing small independent local businesses, and the light industrial area, which should be a protected economic engine that requires proper planning; for example, in relation to tax policy.</li> <li>• Mentioning more welcoming / user friendly community facilities and spaces.</li> <li>• Values could be in conflict with one another as there is no ‘prioritizing’ lens (i.e. prioritizing small business, affordable housing).</li> <li>• What are the indicators for values? They’re too general/un-specific</li> <li>• Economic growth and development not included, should be explicit mention of supporting economic growth of small businesses</li> <li>• Will require concrete recommendations for actual change based on these values</li> <li>• Must propose a realistic option for increased density over the long term</li> <li>• Require commitment by staff to be accountable for accurately presenting findings to Council</li> </ul>
--	--

**Most common ‘Top Issues’ for community participants, in no particular order:**

- Scale and height of development
- Affordability
- Housing
- Support local businesses, create new commercial nodes
- Process: transparency and how to
- Walkability, sidewalks, accessibility
- Transportation and density
- Density (location, speed, form, infrastructure, affordability, etc.)
- Safety and traffic
- Parking

- ensure the process has an impact?
- Transparency of the City (in particular its relationship with developers)
  - Citizen involvement and participation in planning and implementation
  - Bikes
  - First Nations relationship with community
  - Greenspaces (more and better uses)
  - Public spaces and programs (increase)
  - Arts and culture
  - Neighbourhood character

## **Public Roundtable #2:**

### **Participant feedback on the Citizens' Assembly's draft neighbourhood-wide recommendations**

**March 5, 2015**

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

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

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

## HOUSING (5 Tables + Posted Comments)

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

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

- Support

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

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

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

- Support

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

- Loves attics / basements
- Look at variety of rental sizes very small – 2 / 3 bedroom
- Best practices: Tax empty condos and rent control
- Purpose built single room rental
- Use attic space
- Shared hybrid housing (separate bedroom and bath with shared kitchen, etc.)
- Introduces the concept of “non-market” that is confusing and should be defined clearly with examples. In general one table thought that the assembly should simplify the language and make sure that their recommendations are not too vague. Adding many examples was one of the suggestions from the table.
- Rent controls
- Need municipal rent controls
- Adopt best practices from other cities
- Actions that work to sustain/promote coops

- Tax empty condos, i.e. track by power consumption
- Use micro-houses

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

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

- The more \$ you extract from developers the more housing will cost

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

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

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

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

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

- Support for existing rent / own ratio
- One table was unclear regarding what the “balance” currently was, and feared that a recommendation about maintaining a specific balance was impossible to enforce

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

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

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

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

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

A. Love lock-offs

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

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

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

- **...within existing zoning height restrictions.**
- **...up to a maximum of 6 stories.**
- **...up to a maximum of 12 stories.**
- **...with height restrictions to be determined by each sub-area.**
- One table thought the answer is D with height restrictions to be determined by each sub-area.
- A second table thought that it was not useful to set general guidelines for the entire district given its diversity, and instead the guidelines should be street by street.
- A third table whose preference was D – to be determined by sub-areas. Some participants were flexible with height (would prefer to see some height rather than just more width)
- A fourth table largely preferred option A (existing zoning), with two exceptions: one who preferred option B, and one who preferred C might but only because of the Safeway site
- A fifth table preferred D, but there was also a preference for a 6 storey maximum
- Land assembly: Not # of lots = size of land assembled
- Zone for diversity -à \_current height (1910 heights) \* levels
- Infill, coach, laneways
- Within existing zoning only



- High density along Broadway
- Truth is density increases affordability
- Use what you have; city should be more flexible for owners to use infill opportunities for affordable housing
- House is more affordable with allowing multiple units, i.e. Duplex won't allow for laneway houses. It should.
- Zone for diversity, i.e. Duplex
- Let zoning allow suite in house
- People are unclear about how many more suites are needed – they're open to considering, but they need to know more about the needs
- Not so much an issue of to what height

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

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

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

- Recommendation 1.19 is good

## **MISSING ISSUES**

### Population Growth Expectations:

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

forms. The overall consensus is to achieve what one of the members describes as “gentle densification”.

- How are these expectations of population growth reflected in the recommendations?, and how do they address the preservation of the character of the neighbourhood?

Density:

- Orientation away from major arterials, and into the lanes – important to consider how to better utilize laneways near arterials
- This could create parking issues
- Also, where will the schools go? Added people means added families with children

Built Form:

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

Affordability:

- Affordability is not limited to more housing stock. Increasing density through development is not the ideal way to reach affordability. Allowing other forms of diversifying the accessibility to housing such as rental units, and apartments is a desirable solution.
- Counter argument - The inclusion of higher developments that provide communal amenities such as common public areas increase social vitality. Also, the investment on densification around transit nodes enables more users to access public transit, which in return is seen as a different form of affordability.
- No spot rezoning is desired. Equitable development with a maximum of 2 lot assembly is the ideal form.
- If more people want to live here we need to provide the zoning to accommodate them, we cannot choose how many people move here.
- What we need to allow more of it is all of the above. Condos, rentals, townhouses, basement suites, coach houses. Find a way it works with residents but not at the expense of the new ones.

- Focus on finding ways to make market rentals and ownership affordable (parking, increasing the very constrained supply)
- Maintain low cost rental housing by encouraging retention of rental buildings and creating financial incentives to owners to upgrade.
- Allow duplex to include basement suites.
- Encourage heritage home renovations and retention by using financial incentives to encourage homeowners to build a suite.
- Encourage rental buildings to be built by developers.
- All monies paid by developers to the city for project approval to be spent in the neighbourhood the building goes up in.
- The city is neither seen as a developer nor as having the responsibility to invest in housing. However, it can provide the tools to get developers to contribute to the community. CAC's are one such tool.
- From a renter's perspective there is a deficit in the availability of rental units within the neighbourhood. A mixture of condos and rental apartment units is desirable. Townhouses, duplexes with rental units are also viable options to increment the stock.
- There was interest in knowing who's buying, and whether buyers are actually living there – Issue related to price inflations. [Could recommend a study if one doesn't already exist].
- Basic finishes but good quality vs. appliances/finishes targeted at the investor market
- Micro-suites – good idea, but in balance with the rest of the neighbourhood would be best

Land Assembly:

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

**GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

- Concerned with radical change
- Love heritage and a worried about displacement
- Interested in land assembly
- Interested in subsidized housing
- People will build what is profitable
- Affordability is the result when you increase height; there are some places you could go and increase height without changing nature

- Co-buying a house is an option that should be approved by the City: VanCity accommodates mortgages for co-ownership – it increases sense of community. Is it legal?
- Zone for diversity: add basement or attic suite, let people solve their own problems, maximize creative potential, allow people to come with lots of ideas if neighbours approve
- Support increase density with creative bylaws
- Lower development will lower amenity payments that add to community services
- Amenity payments need to be negotiated instead of going into a “pot” and doesn’t go into community; let CACs stay in the community
- Keep an existing house exterior “as is”, but allow multiple suites within the house (attic suite; basement suite), single room rentals, while still allow laneway house.
- The City needs to be more flexible and bylaws need to be less restrictive in order to allow creative solutions to density be implemented by the community
- Interest in the shift to low cost and rental housing affordability.
- Not being overwhelmed by the scope of development and its effects on the character of the neighbourhood.
- Management of the neighbourhood as a whole and the distribution of density across its entire area.
- Supply of different types of housing to fulfill affordability needs and diversify the housing stock.
- Development of the city at large is seen as a menace to the character of the neighbourhood. The amount of development projects occurring in the City of Vancouver is discussed as the inevitable future for the GW neighbourhood.
- Potential to overdevelop the area. Possible unevenness of the distribution of development across the neighbourhood poses a risk to certain areas more than others, particularly those closer to transit nodes.
- Conserving the existing diversity and avoiding gentrification.
- Distribution of density around the neighbourhood is preferred as opposed to specific concentrations in height in tower form.
- Keeping a balance between the ideas proposed during these meetings and the financial sustainability of the proposals.
- Secrecy of the Citizens’ Assembly throughout the process and the lack of exposure of their work to the community at large. The disparity of power being held by the Citizens’ Assembly in finalizing the

recommendations is seen as a menace to the true representation of the community's opinions presented to City Council.

- The order of the recommendations should be in the order of public importance – not the order of Council priorities. -affordability –non-market rental housing – rental housing – variety of ownership forms. Homelessness is important but not the # 1 priority of the people. Homelessness as the first item on the Housing recommendations agenda is regarded as a City driven agenda. This politicized topic may be given priority and this poses a threat to other important issues that might be undermined such as housing stock diversity.
- Support for laneways and co-ops
- No more spot zoning should be allowed once the plan is in place; City should not be allowed to re-zone for, say, 10 years
- Support for more densification of housing like Kits: laneway, in-fill, strata, etc.; more in-fill will give us more units in RT zones, but they should be kept as rentals
- Concern over lack of transparency around targeted population
- People living in poverty/with disabilities should be better distributed city-wide
- Affordability: how can we provide housing for low- and middle-income residents?
- We need more options in between single-family houses and rentals
- Density: some supported more on First, and on Broadway; others worried that density on the arterials would put pressure on renters, decrease affordability, and lead to replacement by condos (“more density does not lead to more affordable housing”)
- Density in GW was/is already high
- There is no mention of seniors; we need supportive housing for them
- We need more co-op housing units
- Reward developers for rental development through an incentive program
- Regarding building height: if you impose a limit of 4 stories, the City will allow 6 – so say what you mean and don't give them latitude
- Limit amount of lot coverage to that currently existing; concern for adjacent lots
- One person said high-rises are not so bad; others disagreed
- Support for mixed-use buildings
- Street life is important
- It would be good to encourage more storage in new development

- Concern with City as developer: look at Olympic Village; lack of faith in bureaucrats (these ones at least); however, there was support for the City to develop parks
- Did the City give the CA density targets?
- “Rate of change” should be neighborhood-wide; strengthen this somehow

## TRANSPORTATION (2 Tables + Posted Comments)

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Concern that this should also include education around safe driving, since bad driving is one of the main causes of lack of safety for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Note that cycling infrastructure is a big issue in this regard, which has a significant impact on safe cycling (maybe more than public education).

- Concern that this recommendation is not specific to GW. While there is agreement that this should apply to the whole city, there is the risk that by making the recommendation too broad, GW might not get the benefits soon enough if the neighborhood is not prioritized due to budget limitations.
- Good-to-go with minor addition.
- Add: “and safe driving”.

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Support
- Good-to-go

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

- Support
- Good-to-go

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

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

**SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION:**

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

**MISSING ISSUES + GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

- Need for crosswalks at bus stops.
- Room for street furniture at bus stops.
- Introduce off-peak parking on 12th Avenue.
- Enforce speed limits in general.
- Pedestrian connections parallel to Commercial Drive.
- “Neighbourhood is a walking area but focus is on biking routes instead of walking routes; more people walk than bike.”
- **RESPONSIVE TRAFFIC SIGNALS:** Pedestrian controlled signals need to be coordinated to allow traffic flow on streets.

- “SCRAMBLE LIGHTS”: Consider scramble lights as a suggestion for congested pedestrian intersections. This means that pedestrians only move on the scramble light, therefore cars can turn right faster and the bus can move faster through the intersection.
- TENSIONS BETWEEN CYCLING AND PARKING: “Regarding adding bike lanes to Commercial Drive, parking meters are almost always full. If parking is removed will those drivers/customers continue frequenting the businesses? Residential parking is permit only so where do people with cars park?”
- DESIGNATION OF STREETS: “Make sure that traffic on streets is according to designation of streets (e.g., Victoria Drive has the traffic of a secondary arterial, but now it stands as a local collector.)
- NOISE REDUCTION: Need to look at ways to abate noise from traffic.
- REDUCE CARS: Reduce vehicular traffic and car ownership, increase parking requirements and impose parking maximums.
- TRANSIT: Consider the use of bus lanes (lanes with priority for public transit), using bus bulges, reducing the number of bus stops (as per Streets for Everyone proposal)
- Suggestion to have a bus route running on 1st Ave and connecting the West End with Burnaby; some disagreement about the dangers of noise that this will cause; suggestion to have instead a trolley bus.
- There should be mention of the plan to make Vancouver the greenest city.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**AND**

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

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

**3.9:** *Recognizing the different populations that the Templeton and Britannia pools currently serve, and the anticipated increase in population in Grandview Woodlands, we request that both of these facilities be retained and upgraded after direct consultation with the community (including feedback regarding programming).*

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

**GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

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

- The sidewalks on the Drive should be widened and more permanent outdoor seating space should be provided (similar to the West End)
- The current CA public realm recommendations are far too vague, and need to be more future-oriented.
- Most of the issues people have with the public realm in GW seem to come down to questions of stewardship – perhaps the City can support more initiatives for stewardship of existing parks so that this responsibility is not just foisted ad hoc onto grassroots community organizations.
- Finds it interesting that current park space in the neighbourhood is being under used, this suggests that the real problem is the quality of existing park spaces, and not just the acquisition of new park spaces – parks need to do a better job of attracting more people.
- On the question of pools, many people don't want to use the local pools (and go to Hillcrest) because of the chemicals that are used – lower levels of chemicals might increase pool usage.
- We are somewhat park deficient in the neighbourhood, but the bigger problem is that current park space is not well maintained and offers no attractions. For example, some parks only have a few benches for people to sit on and not much else. We need to address people's usage of parks.
- There should be more input from the CA into the capital plan development project for Britannia.
- What people are looking for are outdoor "living rooms" where there are tables, places to sit, read, play games, etc. in parks and on the sidewalks.
- The pools and community centres also need to offer new and better programming for residents.
- There is no information about the infrastructure needed to accommodate more density in the neighbourhood,
- We need to do a better job of using and developing the parks and park space already in the neighbourhood.
- Templeton programming (and all community centres) needs to be drastically improved.
- Need to incorporate more of the feedback from the sub-area workshops into these recommendations (at present there is very little).
- Maintain the expansion of adequate community centres
- Get rid of sandwich boards along commercial drive to widen the space on the sidewalks – hang signage instead.

- There needs to be much stronger language in the recommendations for public realm – less “we request” and “we recommend” and more “we urge,” “we instruct,” as in other areas, such as Transportation and Housing.
- There should be no cars allowed to park between Broadway and Venables



## HERITAGE (1 Table + Posted Comments)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**4.4:** *We, the Citizens Assembly, recognize that there are varying and competing aesthetic tastes (e.g., what constitutes good or bad design, whether “faux” heritage is appropriate, whether modernism is poorly badly executed, and so on) that inform on-going debates on the acceptability of development in our community.*

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

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

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

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

- There was an additional proposal that there could be an overarching statement recognizing the indigenous land that predates “heritage.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**5.6:** *Recognizing the current shortage of hotel space in Grandview Woodlands, and other accommodation barriers to cultural visitors to the neighbourhood (e.g., artists, musicians, attendees), we urge the City to provide support for developing visitor*

*accommodation within walking distance of Grandview-Woodland's performance venues (e.g., the Cultch, York Theatre, live music venues). We hope that this will result in a wide range of accommodation options of varying affordability, suitable for hosting a diverse range of visitors*

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

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

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

commercial along Commercial between Venables and Hastings may be beneficial.

- There was a note of a forming brewery district.
- Finally, some wanted to provide a rent subsidy to non-profit performing groups for the more expensive theatres.

## LOCAL ECONOMY (1 Table + Posted Comments)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



- Re: language of recommendations, what is the difference between “require” and “encourage”? What does this difference say about the authority of the CA?
- Venables should be reconceptualised as a ‘high street’ and developed in an original manner.
- In general the ‘emerging directions’ are pretty good and should accompany the recommendations for local economy as they do for the other topics.
- Emerging directions should not explicitly protect or maintain current manufacturing/industrial zones.

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

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

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

- Remove specific reference to REACH

### GENERAL DISCUSSION/MISSING ISSUES:

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

#### Youth:

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

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

- An issue was raised in regards to noise: for people who are living near second and Commercial Drive, there is a lot of noise every night with the skytrain. Perhaps there can be a recommendation that requires a study that looks at

harmful acoustic levels. There should be a study looking at how noise can affect health. They're considering a new skytrain design. Should they consider potentially an igloo?

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

#### Parks:

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

#### Emergencies:

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

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

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

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

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

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

AND

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- GOOD TO GO

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

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

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

- GOOD TO GO – just add a concrete example

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

- GOOD TO GO

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

- GOOD TO GO, provide a concrete example

#### **GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

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

- Encourage the City to offer incentives to keep housing stock, using retrofits and repurposing, instead of rebuilding. Reduce construction waste.

## **WILD CARD (1 Table + Posted Comments)**

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

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

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

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

- Revisit and clarify the first sentence. What are the issues and opportunities? Define and have solutions. City and community should have a role in education?
- Real problem: how can we improve the level of education / funding?
- CA members should define what the specific problem is in the recommendation on public school and propose solutions for it. The recommendation is still quite unclear and needs to be more specific.
- Is it possible to include the language of artists and community to mentor the youth?

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

- Needs clarification

**GENERAL DISCUSSION:**

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



## ALL OF THE ABOVE (2 Tables)

### GENERAL DISCUSSION:

#### Housing + Growth:

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

- Co-ops/ affordability important
- Foreign investor tax?
- Maintain existing stock
- Extend duplex zoning east (gentle densification)
- Promote laneways
- Promote basement suites
- More consultation on each project (e.g., large development)
- Use language of gentle densification (specific recommendation)
- Not too much density around parks
- These concerns are particularly with respect to Garden Park. The residents in the area do not like the ‘fingers’ that extend from the Nanaimo Area. There is strong opposition to ‘eyes on the park’.
- How much more density is needed? What’s the plan? What’s the plan across all neighbourhoods?
- Diversity/co-operative living
- Promote micro forms of cooperative housing

Local economy:

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

Transportation:

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

Parks:

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

Process:

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

## **Public Roundtable #3:**

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

**May 5, 2015**

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

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

## 1.0 CEDAR COVE

### DRAFT PREAMBLE

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

(Other ideas to include:

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

### Public realm & transportation

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

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

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

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

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

- Likes that smell of chicken plant is identified

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

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

### **Housing & built form**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Local economy**

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

### **Additional issues/recommendation:**

- Recommendation to protect existing Single Room Occupancy hotel

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

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

**General feedback from Cedar Cove tables:**

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

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



## 2.0 HASTINGS

### DRAFT Preamble:

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

(To include (?):

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

### Public realm & transportation

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

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

- **We want less dangerous traffic - make it or keep it safer**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Housing & built form**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

to artists.

### **Local economy**

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

See also: **2.10, 2.11**

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

### **Services, amenities and other planning themes**

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

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

- We need to put more in the Waldorf

### **Remaining issues/recommendations:**

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

### General feedback from Hastings Tables

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

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

### 3.0 BRITANNIA-WOODLAND

#### DRAFT Preamble:

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

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

#### Public realm & transportation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Support for bike improvements (expressed by many)

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

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

### **Housing & built form**

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



- Support for this expressed

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Support for this expressed

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

- Design guidelines need more specificity

### **Services, amenities and other planning themes**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**General feedback from Britannia-Woodland tables:**

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

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

## 4.0 GRANDVIEW

### Draft Preamble:

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

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

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

### Public realm & transportation

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

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

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

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

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

- LIKE: Increase biodiversity in existing park.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Housing & built form**

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Encouraging strata ownership reduces the rental pool



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

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

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

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

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

### **Local economy**

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

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

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

### General feedback from Grandview tables:

#### **Public realm & transportation**

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

#### **Housing & built form**

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

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

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

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

## Process

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

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

## 5.0 NANAIMO

### **Draft Preamble:**

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

### **Public realm & transportation**

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Housing & built form**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Local economy**

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

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

### **Services, amenities and other planning themes**

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

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

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

#### General Feedback from Nanaimo tables:

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

#### Development around the Parks

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

#### Laneways

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

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

### Zoning

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

### Increasing Density

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



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

### Process

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

## 6.0: COMMERCIAL DRIVE

### **Draft Preamble:**

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

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

### **Public realm & transportation**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Housing & built form**

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

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

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

- Support in general.

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

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

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

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

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

- General support for this idea.

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

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

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

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

**“6.7 Commercial Frontage Widths and Active Frontages:**

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

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

### **Local economy**

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

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

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

### **Services, amenities and other planning themes**

#### **Pending recommendation for Venables/Commercial Drive site:**

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

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

*There was consensus among most of the members regarding:*

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

*There was significant disagreement regarding:*

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

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



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

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

#### General feedback from Commercial Drive tables

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

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

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

## 7.0 BROADWAY & COMMERCIAL

### **Draft Preamble:**

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

### **Public realm & transportation**

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

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

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

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

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

We also expect co-op housing to be maintained.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Support for this

See also: **7.21**

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

### **Housing & built form**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 1) Commercial and 12<sup>th</sup>
- 2) Broadway and Clark

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

- Concern about mixed-use



- Support for focusing density at intersections
- Concern about height at 12<sup>th</sup> and at Clark

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Support for this recommendation
- Support for this idea

**7.19:** We recommend all new buildings have green roofs.

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

See also: **7.1, 7.21.**

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

## **Local economy**

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

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

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

## **Services, amenities and other planning themes**

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

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

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

**Remaining issues/recommendations:**

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

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

**General feedback from Broadway & Commercial tables:**

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

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

**General feedback from 'Other' table:**

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

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

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