

Open House # 2 - Public Input Comments
Date: October 15 and 20th
Location: Oakridge Auditorium

Table of Contents

Mixed Use Comments	2
Built Form, Height & Views Comments	2
Retail in Oakridge Centre	6
Housing Comments	8
Housing Towers and Location	9
Ground Oriented Housing & Location Comments	9
Community Facilities Comments	10
Comments on parks / Green space / Open Space	12
Specific Park Features Summary	12
Transit Ridership through Mix of Uses & Design	14
RAV Station / Café Comments	15
RAV Station Entrance / Oakridge Signage Comments	15
Comments to Improve Linkages to the RAV Station & Nearby Bus Connections	15
Comments on the RAV Station and the 24 Hour Pathway	18
Comments to Improve Existing / New Pedestrian Linkages through the Site	19
Comments on Expanding the Tunnel on W 41st Avenue	20
Comments on 45th Avenue Site Access & Other Suggestions to Better Manage Vehicle Access	21
General Traffic Comments	23
Parking Comments	24
Other Comments	25
General Concept Comments	26
Open House/ Public Input Comments	30

Mix of Uses Comments

- Cambie Street needs revitalization. The community needs a shopping hub with a village type feel.
- Mix is ok, but everything should be divided by 10. This is going to look like Metrotown West.
- It looks like Metrotown; it looks like trouble in the making.
- Like the mall the way it is.
- Great mix and easy access to all amenities without starting a car
- The unique character of the Oakridge mall as the “Oakridge Village” should be maintained.
- It is simply too much.
- No further residential development to current status. Additional localize office buildings to current stock is OK (By current I mean actually existing now)
- Mix use but should be safe and secure places putting into existing neighbourhood and catering to existing population. This is not a new village. People already live in this area for long time.
- mixed village concept
- Unless policing problems are resolutely resolved this mix of transit station & housing and business could cause serious problems for the area.
- Impossible for me to know the correct “mix” for this development i.e. Office vs. retail etc. I only know that guideline must be in place to steer this growth to a “people” - “Kitsilano” feeling.
- Parks also are useful but mixed use parks/activity based/are of most interest to me. How to engage the residents & community in activities & healthy choices. Static parks as buffer zones are less appealing to me.

Built Form, Height & Views Comments

- Lower density
- 21 storey buildings are the beginning of the destruction of the neighbourhood character. Suggest no higher than 8 stories.
- Height of towers should be no higher than 10 stories.
- The City should also look at increasing the zoning along Cambie & 41st streets on the East side of Cambie and the North side of 41st. This would allow for a better transition from the higher towers being considered
- The area still needs to maintain a community feel
- Economics may mean higher buildings.
- Some times building right to the street line can feel overcrowding. There needs to be adequate landscaping at the street level.
- The building should not be too high, try to reduce the high-rise buildings
- The four towers are too high! Should be 6 stories or less.
- On Cambie perpendicular to the mountains, blocks less view. Almost like the existing thru co-op and one rental apartment buildings behind the mall along Tisdall. Due to the sloping topology towards Marine Drive, the four proposed locations of the 21-storey storeys will block the view of a lot of residences south of the shopping centre.
- The four 21-storey towers are significantly too high!

Built Form, Height & Views Comments

- You do not want to turn Oakridge into another Metrotown. If you let Ivanhoe-Cambridge build so many towers within 20 years, they will build them in 5 years instead. They do not need to acquire land. So it's very profitable to build them much sooner! Shaughnessy, Kerrisdale and Oakridge were and are the best neighbourhood to live in Vancouver. With too big a development in Oakridge, it will have significant negative impacts.
- We do not want the beauty of Vancouver covered up by high density apartment development. We do not have any views our mountains and waters, unless one is fortunate enough to live in one of the downtown ocean front high rises.
- Increase density and height of all new towers to at least 45 storeys. Think of all great view this would bring for residents to enjoy! This area of city already has many huge parks. We need more high-rise condo and rental towers, not more parks.
- Buildings should conform with the surrounding area. To high a height in the towers. The density will be too high it will almost be as big as the whole of the surrounding area
- Housing density will make a "West End" of Oakridge. How much of this added density will be bought by off shore and American purchasers? Thereby making nonsense of increased density supposedly for local residents.
- I don't think this works (i.e. Fairchild Court). "The Conservatory" is admirable, but I've rarely seen "eyes on the street".
- Believe the site will be a zoo with additional density. Oakridge is a great asset. I don't want another Metrotown.
- No high-rise buildings. If at all possible stick with 6 stories.
- Buildings could be made more attractive. No shoe boxes please.
- My major concern is the drastic increase in high-rises. We need more housing but the proposed density is too high.
- I think the towers are much too high. But only mid-rise not high-rise.
- I feel that 10 stories are enough - but its valuable property and I like the idea of a shopping area that has everything.
- This should be a regional shopping centre and residential neighbourhood and not downtown. Metrotown justifies so many high-rises since it is downtown Burnaby.
- I am totally against high density residential area at Oakridge Centre.
- Given that residential density has (+ is continuing to) increase. In the area over the last 10 years the notion of "upping" the square footage for housing on this site from 50,400 to 1,314,000 is too much. It is obvious that there will be increased density on west (and way before of East) 41st and north + south on Cambie in the coming years.
- Density too high. Height of new building should be mid size only
- Agree that high rises should be located near centre of Oakridge
- Not more 4 mid-rise condominiums should be allowed in the site, all clustered together. This will ensure a high quality living/shopping in the area, giving viability at not so distant future

Built Form, Height & Views Comments

- The two proposed high rise towers in the north east area of the site obstruct the mountains view for the conservatory, Hemmingway and others. These should be shifted to the two proposed high rise tower areas on the West side of the site, to make an efficient cluster of high rises at the same place, thus obstructing a minimum of mountain view overall. This will also maintain the basic "Oakridge Village" feeling over most of the developed site, the relatively small high rise area being the most "upscale" and most out of place in the Oakridge area.
- I don't like the idea of more towers at Oakridge
- Not in favour of any high rises in this area. Prefer 5-9 levels. At present the residents of Tisdall enjoy beautiful views of all the mountains, and Q.E. Park, to the north and Mt Baker to the south, if all this construction takes place, we will see nothing but buildings.
- I am completely against to the project - too big, far too many buildings especially high rises.
- Don't want any residential towers, complete loss of view occurs
- 21 stories for towers are too high for location. Lower profile would better.
- I think 21 (twenty one) story towers are too high for this area. A maximum height of 10-11 stories is sufficient. These buildings may be a better look for the area, also a one up-man ship in the height to get a better view.
- Future development should fit into existing neighbourhood buildings not over power and become an eye sore proposed design is out of place.
- The proposed height of towers not compatible for south Vancouver development. There is not building at present of A 20 + storey height, not in public or neighbourhood interest - too much given to developer.
- density & heights of building too much, does not fit into neighbourhood
- To accommodate city growth, areas of high density are needed so that a) affordable housing is available and b) we can retain single family areas. With the proximity of this to RAV and being on a major e-w route this location make sense.
- appreciate the variety offered
- No buildings higher than the existing buildings in the area
- Built forms: different types that will fit into the site and aesthetic. 2). Density: not more than can handle the present volume. 3). Height: different appropriate levels. 4). Views: the complex will become a welcome landmark to surrounding areas & not sacrificing the mutual views of each other.
- Daring designs
- no glass towers, they have glare & reflection problems
- Needs taller residential buildings - nicely spaced for views.
- Will make it a more vibrant community
- The designing of facilities that are visually appealing (modern) are extremely important. The usual: scale/form/function issues, but with a world class vision (paying for good design).

Built Form, Height & Views Comments

- Our area already has a character. High-rises are more appropriate to the character of Hong Kong, not Oakridge. Buildings over 7 stories do not add “eyes on the street” because it’s too hard to see people from that high up.
- Buildings should be set back farther from Cambie and from 41st to allow preservation of existing trees or planting of a double row of new trees.
- Some of the buildings are too tall-will cause shadowing.
- Prefer higher buildings, but less of them.
- Prefer less low-rises and same towers but higher!
- The typical downtown “glass and metal façade” high-rise is ugly. The Yaletown type tower will not be well received. Texture and colour should be required.
- Too much additional density re housing. To high an impact on neighbourhood re congestion - Traffic to access site.
- The increase to residential is just too huge (like 2600%) and totally out of context to the neighbourhood - presently mainly single family - too drastic a change the retail and office increases are not as drastically out of line- they seem more reasonable.
- The towers are just “too much” - too tall. We don’t want to live in a neighbourhood resembling Metrotown or the Downtown core or Yaletown. Will there be no middle class single family areas, safe from such large increases to density?
- This was part of my opposition to RAV - I spoke to a city planner at the time of those public consults and was told there were no plans for rezoning. Densification in the neighbourhoods surrounding RAV stations. My fears are that once a massive Development such as this takes place, it’s only a matter of time before surrounding single family residential is rezoned for condos and apartments.
- Very opposed to 10-21 storey high-rises, totally our of context to existing neighbourhood. Keep it to low rises - 5-9 stories.
- appreciate the variety offered
- Lower height buildings I believe are best around the park areas.

Retail in Oakridge Centre

- Don't think that more stores along Cambie etc are necessary.
- Good office supplies store, computer store, printing, stationary,
- photo reproduction, camera & photo
- Large format shopping e.g. Costco, Staples, Wal-Mart, Superstore
- Fitness centre
- An alternative supermarket to Safeway and another competitor to The Bay
- Make sure there is a wide variety of retail, not just expensive fashion as it is now. If the area is to be a community it needs a wide range of retail at a variety of affordability levels; Sears, Old Navy, Winners
- Our centre is expensive, especially lady & men's clothing stores. Can't we have a few modestly priced stores? Lower priced clothes, more inexpensive ladies shops, more low end clothing
- Better choice of restaurants, 1st class restaurant, high end restaurants
- I like nice restaurants, but also would like some other quieter than the food fair. The food fair is ok.
- The new centre should just satisfy neighbourhood shopping. Big shopping centres are already close by within 15-20 minutes drive (e.g., downtown, Metrotown & Richmond malls). Regional markets are well served by such retailers as Metrotown and Richmond Centre.
- More selection & choices
- More entertainment / theatres
- How about 500-room hotel with casino of at least 1500 slot machines, as every city in Australia has. Should have 3 more theatres and 200,000 sq. ft. entertainment area.
- Oakridge Centre, as it stands, is far too expensive for people living in affordable housing (excluding Zellers).
- Would like to see street retail like Kin's Green grocery, Murchie's coffee spot, expansion or complementary uses to Kins and Fish Market.
- Capers, Choices, organic food, farmers market, other retail that complement Kins & the Fish Market, organic bakery, more organic food in general, Galloways, whole foods, Large Fresh Market
- More ethnic food facilities
- dollar store
- art store
- Hardware, home reno stores, decorating supplies, house supplies, paint, home improvement, (1- stop) store, electrical, mini Home Depot
- fabric stores, craft a place to buy notions for clothing repairs and alterations
- electronic store i.e. future shop, radio shack
- If focusing local shopping nearer to Safeway's end of mall, this makes sense. Certainly, this is where I part most of the time.
- Drug Store, London Drugs, Shoppers
- Retail should be unique
- M.E.C. , sporting goods, bike shop
- pet food store
- Men's shoe repair, more men's clothing
- At grade should be solely retail. But problem would be set back from the busy road
- More selection of affordable retail. Some good changes have been made to the mix at Oakridge.

Retail in Oakridge Centre

- Furniture stores
- Video rental store
- Gas station
- MacDonald's
- Bowling lanes
- indoor locations, e.g. the post office is in a bad location
- More retail that shown
- Retail should be Perhaps clustered in 2 main areas - Along Cambie & High St through the Oakridge site
- repair car needs
- Post Offices in public areas -Two large avenue level Post Offices - or one central and large Post Office, with a branch on both sides of the complex. To have the Post Office in the Bay basement (as it is now) is dumb. Does not really help the public.
- Areas where one can pick up and drop off shopping carts
- The retail increase are not enough from my point of view. One new anchor retailer could absorb 80,000 sq. ft., and from a convenience point of view this/with transit are the positives to redevelopment of this area.

Housing Comments

- I believe there should be a mix in all areas, if possible, so as not to ghettoize any particular group
- We need affordable housing with unit sizes large enough for families with kids.
- We really need affordable housing!
- Young couples starting out need affordable housing, and this neighbourhood needs a mix of age groups, otherwise it will no longer have vitality.
- Housing should be a good mix of all groups or we get “ghettoized”. Housing should be affordable. Some of it should be strata title for a stronger sense of “ownership” in the community.
- There needs to be balance for all sectors of the community
- Does “all types” of housing include affordable housing for low income families?? Will they REALLY be affordable?. I am delighted to see SOME affordable housing will be included and sincerely hope those on low-income and fixed income will be taken into consideration
- I prefer a mix of ages/demographics in a residential area
- Single family dwelling are more appropriate for families with children
- A variety for all - cost will be the issue. There is a lot of new immigrant families flooding the Oakridge market and keeping prices too high for people like me to afford
- What about the “coach house” idea - such that seniors can move out of their large home onto the same property into a one story home??
- If there is low income housing, who will be accepted - singles, seniors, families. Who will see that it is maintained as well as the existing area - no clothes etc on patios - bikes etc on balconies - etc. Seniors and families don’t always mix well, sound level, running down halls, strollers, shopping cars, ball bouncing. etc. Can low income families afford to live in this area?
- Some need for non-market housing -seniors, families on low income
- A good balance of the different kinds of householders should be arrived at.
- All these categories will need housing. The concept presented is just too, too crowded. Nearly all of the above categories will have a cars (maybe 2)
- Oakridge, located at the center of the city, should have housing to meet needs of all of above- singles, seems to like west end Yaletown.
- The housing should be developed for the mix use, not for one group of people where others are excluded. Community should be mixed like a village where all ages and social groups are included
- Is affordable/social housing area going to create a Ghetto/low income area?
- more affordable housing
- No row buildings please - it is cheap ugly & diminishes the quality of Oakridge homes.
- how about more types of non-market, such as co-ops, transition houses, group homes, etc
- I am surprised the housing centre of total square footage so high based on 1000 sq ft that means 1300 more homes and 1300 more parking spots, I assumed the RAV would make it a destination mall and expected to see more retail and office and less housing.
- The size of the development will allow a mix of unit sizes and family units. The high value potential of the upper floors will support the provision. Non market housing and other positive features.

Housing Comments

- Oakridge should prevent itself as a community and attempt to encourage all of the above. Key would be affordability we as a Vancouver community) need to encourage a fall mix of residents and especially young people. (This includes children and young adults) I would consider redevelopment of Oakridge to be a failure if it only catered to high end occupants.
- Affordable housing necessary for seniors to be near their established network of services
- Housing should be universally accessible
- Support for coach houses
- No, the area is over saturated with housing
- I would say all. I am a senior, in our building, we are 99% seniors, the other 3, 9 -10 storey apart building could easily be mostly seniors. I feel for a viable community, we'd need as wide variety of ages as shown in the list.
- While seniors housing is important there is presently a large percent of residents in this category living in the area. With the new RAV line; couples, singles, etc., will consider this a convenient area to live & commute to Vancouver City. Younger people create more diversity & are interested in actively participating with; daily shopping, eating out, purchasing memberships, etc. etc.
-

Housing Towers and Location

- Residential Tower location - Do you mean the north-east side, new street runs north to south-east
- housing; increasing to 2.6 x - would depend on density of apartments and were they are to be located
- I'd switch the housing density to the back area of the development where the parks now show on the plan.
- Tower locations - Perpendicular to Cambie blocks less views. The sloping topology towards Marine Dr, the four proposed locations of the 21 storey towers will block the views of a lot of residences south of the shopping centre; South West side of Safeway; near the centre of the site; west side of Oakridge, near the towers that already exist; need to be remote from arterials

Ground Oriented Housing & Location Comments

- Build 'ground oriented' housing on top of retail on north-east side of street.
- No more residential at street for security reasons
- Not enough ground oriented - if allowed on Cambie St.
- On 45th Ave
- Near the parks
- Setback distance from the busy road
- Anywhere at grade is good
- No ground oriented housing
- Residential breaks up the street retail.

Community Facilities Comments

- In this community I think there could be more activities that youth can benefit from. There could be more clubs and classes that the youth could be involved in. Example cooking classes; dodge ball, basketball, the additional could become a gym for many purposes.
- We need a sports facility - parks to let our children join sports club, basketball volleyball courts
- For families living in Vancouver discount or free services be provided i.e. outside "Maple Grove" pool or Family pass for a summer each year be sent to all families with children as swimming is a life skill. Three of my children and I took lessons to level 2, however with all of community service. Changes it makes very difficult to retain the skills. Ice skating rink Kerrisdale needs to be available for more hours.
- More facilities availability for the senior and families with children
- More facilities for family needs
- A community centre with programs and facilities for all ages is needed
- If the housing area is to be increased 26 times, is twice the community facilities going to be sufficient?
- As a senior who uses the Sr. Centre, I feel we are fortunate that Cambridge give it to us at no cost. Will this continue?? We use the gym twice a week - no cost - will this continue. Will our centre be enlarged - last week we used it for gym - knitting club - learning bridge and snacks. It's a bit crowded in one room although the gym class is usually in the auditorium.
- No drug addiction facilities
- Need place for teenagers; need youth space
- more community facilities and parks in relation to increased housing
- More youth facilities are required to accommodate the substantial increase in housing proposed by this development i.e. gym, youth centre, swimming pool, etc.
- Neighbourhood policing station
- Safe drug injection site
- Although here we offer community "centres" this development would justify its own dedicated community facility. (Providing it is available to the community at large)
- Policing Station / Community Policing Centre / Reporting Centre
- Functions room facility, nice space for rental for dances, prom etc.
- indoor swimming pool or wave pool
- Washrooms should be right off these avenues with wide entry openings. (saw a splendid public bathroom off the Dockside Restaurant at the River Rock Casino-they had constructed a wide entry opening not have doors to push - lots of room for wheelchairs and walkers & even room for shopping carts when people have to use them for body support to shop, oh & baby buggies. I hope the bathrooms are enough and not seemingly 1 block away from the main mall halls (the present arrangement is just plain dumb). We all know the population is getting older, people have to toilet more often down the road.
- Oh - for heaven sakes, put the library off one of the main avenues, not stuck away in the basement, as it is now. People like to read books, there could be a double door entry into a new and larger library - creating a quiet area, thus a quiet library. Have you thought of a meditation alcove for anyone who wants a few moments of peace (interdenominational of course).

- The senior centre would need to be larger even with its own smaller washroom. Oh yes - a really roomy Post Office where the present Post Office is situated is really unbelievable - at the back of the Bay basement, whomever thought of that??
- I hope the Library will be much larger, very central and right off the main concourse. Central - not in a basement, also it need several large meeting rooms & more bathrooms. Also, public washrooms - also not off the 3 main avenues so one doesn't have to walk ½ a block to get to a toilet. The public is getting older and older people have to toilet more often: more public toilets, also more public phones and permanent rest benches.

Comments on parks / Green space / Open Space

- Green spaces should be greater on the street side and towers should be in the back side of the development. We are in danger of making our thoroughfares into tunnels. Keep the green at street level.
- I think the parks should be spread over the street side of the development so that the streetscape is more aesthetic and enjoyable by all citizens & visitors, not just by shoppers and residential.
- I am delighted there will be a play area for children and park space.
- There can never be too many parks in a city.
- Keep them low maintenance and encourage community flower garden area.
- There's plenty of park space & Queen E. etc.
- Smaller space and a few plants and a bench - put the park on the roof.
- Playground on south park the larger park usable for children, close to daycare and schools and church pre-school near 45th Avenue
- Parks not required - better use of land
- The park space and green roofs are great. Could there be public access to the green roofs?
- Enough parks within 5 - 10 minute walk
- Public park area should be at ground level off the main road with a easy access for public
- park area should be one area large enough to be useful to public
- park should be more accessible to residence and public
- need restrooms near by
- quite areas for seniors, trails, need some visually & physically restful space, keep tennis courts and sports areas out
- Active uses, sports, kids play areas, tennis / basket ball courts, baseball diamonds & stands, play ground, running/walking track, swimming pool
- landscaping and flowers, trees, lots of greenery
- Are the parks providing space for youth sports i.e. soccer and skateboards? Sport fields if area is short i.e. if there is a demand
- Green roofs - can these be made people friendly useable - it's not a lot of empty space if it's not going to be used by and for people. Will the green roofs be accessible? To whom?
- I am very supportive of using rooftop spaces as green spaces instead of parking
- Provide parks for people in existing towers as well as new towers. Less important for daily shopping.

- care must be taken to have reasons for the parks and green roofs to be active areas e.g. have a community centre or daycare beside rooftop above Safeway so it's used and doesn't become a no man's area
- No, There is Queen Elizabeth around and some other parks in the vicinity
- With 2 parks they are both too small for any meaningful activity. One park of adequate size to include some amenities for both children & seniors (i.e. playground & seating with some covered).
- The current locations of the parks are such that they are private parks for the residents & not a community park.
- But should be bigger
- Should be more parks, especially along the west edge, retaining existing trees. The parks are too rectangular - should have more "edges"
- Many trees, flower beds, tennis court, many benches, paths, even a fountain.
- Lunch areas similar to service available in London - England parks.

Comments on parks / Green space / Open Space

- The parks should be for less active uses such as walking trails, flower gardens or pet shops, Children's uses. Not active as team sports.
- In general I feel it is necessary to have as much green space i.e. landscape area as possible. As far as large park areas - Jamieson and Tisdale Park is closed as is Columbia Park. So more important to keep the area with grassy areas and trees not a concrete jungle.
- See any photos of original Oakridge - lovely landscaping around perimeter - loads of Rhodos - recent landscaping improvements are good and appreciated plaza needs lots of improvement its ugly.
- open space that is safe and secure
- relocate current play area from Safeway to another location
- gathering space
- It comes at the expense of creating a high density area
- Configurations should be safe, well lit with less bushes
- make it a combined area at ground level
- The parks should be larger & a green belt should link them
- The current location of the parks are such that they are private parks for the residents and not a community park

Specific Park Features Summary

- seating, benches, picnic tables, with & without shade, seating with some cover
- community gardens
- Washrooms, rest rooms, bathrooms,
- BBQ pits
- Play ground, , play area for kids, small play ground,
- sports related, tennis courts, basketball court
- landscaping, more flower beds and trees, lots of trees, lot of greenery
- Water falls. spring, water fountain, small pond, water garden
- keep them low maintenance and encourage community flower garden area
- tennis courts (away from Safeway)
- Sports should be kept out, keep tennis courts & sport areas out.
- space for youth sports (soccer/skateboard)

- need some visually and physically restful space
- Pathways, quiet for senior strolls, no bikes/skateboard, roller blades etc.
- baseball diamond, stands
- BBQ pits
- community garden, dog park
- dog park, fenced, with benches, doggy areas, doggy daycare, trails, Dog park with trails
- running, walking track
- The parks should be for less active users such as walking trails, flower gardens, team sports
- swimming pool
- fitness centre
- paths even a fountain/ many trees/flower beds.

Transit Ridership Through Mix of Uses & Design

- No matter what - there will never be the projected rider ship on the RAV project.
- It is sad to think the high density is necessary to make RAV profitable, and comes after the decision to develop the RAV line!
- When the City approved the RAV line the planers should not have taken for granted that they can increase rider ship or the RAV by hoping for a substantial increase in the population density at the Oakridge Centre. The residence in this neighbourhood would never agree to it.
- provide physical barriers between station of RAV and other areas like turn stiles
- not many people can afford to live in the area given the recent cost of housing many people in the area are car dependant
- Integration of RAV station and a nearby market baker, take out deli (home from work pickup shopping because the proposed grocery @ 45th is too far away (4 blocks) compare sky train
- the more activity, the better at any RAV station
- Active / mixture of uses e.g. Coffee shops, sports stores, public toilets, convenient stores close by RAV, pizza house, pub, shops, recreational centre, restaurants, beauty salon, laundry store, shoe repair, bank machines, toilets, magazine shops, etc.
- Bike parking (secure) and end-of-trip facilities. Washrooms, baths/showers, cafeteria, bike stands (see train stations in Italy).
- Bank machines, toilets, magazine shops, coffee shops, pay phones
- But it probably will depending on mix of "destination stores" that will be at Oakridge Centre
- Need a safe area to wait
- Ensure safety - close proximity to police station, community policing office, reporting station, security station, telephones, first aid office
- plenty of open space
- No matter what happens, there will never be the projected ridership on the RAV project
- Yes when many more people will be living here.
- I would like to see 1 or 2 restaurants, shopping carts/pick up at RAV station area if one is going to shop for food or library books etc. then go on to eat out-even see a film, shop-even get food. Go thru the avenue, picking up things they needs, even take home food & stop for coffee café etc.
- Safety at the RAV station is a concern. A community police station could be established to help control drug dealers.
- Any buildings that help promote tourist information for international visitors arriving from the airport via RAV.

RAV Station / Café Comments

- The café should say open long hours for safety.
- Not only a Café but other boutique style shops like the Granville Station (under the Bay) or at Sinclair Centre.
- Bright well lit not so small café will be good for all
- shop and RAV station should have link only for public safety
- Definitely - good idea for transition between "travel" and shopping.
- Why only a small café? Why not 2 or 3 & a bakery.
- The more activity, the better at any RAV station.
- To all three-A Chapters and care combined it could become an amazing meeting place
 - Especially if the Library is near by. (The Library in Williams Lake has a funky café /internet cafe attached)
- Any research re Skytrain on this- would it become a "hang out' for undesirables. No convenience store!!! They become magnets for undesirable behaviours.
- No, it would it become a hang out for undesirables. No convenience stores.
- good ideas for transition between 'travel' and shopping
- This will make a hang out place for drug dealers, the same problem they have a Metrotown
- buskers, new stands
- Concern to create an area that is not secure
- Provided that it doesn't provide a hangout place for the undesired types
- Also a kiosk or small shop with bus/RAV tickets, newspapers etc.
- Absolutely - even an area where people can pick up high, but small (than Safeway Carts) carts in order to go along the high streets and shop with more comfort - then these carts at cart depots near ones apart areas. With this type of cart, people will use them more and buy more and not have to struggle with a multitude of bags.
- I believe business/office staff who may request a busy, well respected café, etc. may help with keeping the crime element out of this area.

RAV Station Entrance / Oakridge Signage Comments

- We should take a lesson from the Burrard St Station that is full of cherry blossoms in spring and looks like a park, while still serving functional requirements or from Paris with their beautiful Art Deco entrances. Please preserve the streetscape aesthetics.
- I think more than one entrance to the RAV line is required
- Large CLEAR signs are extremely important! They avoid confusion and aid an atmosphere of comfort
- This would be an advantage to Oakridge Centre, which should be paid for by some kind of trade-off.
- Provided the sign continues to be informative i.e. running text.
- keep separate for public safety
- But keep the TransLink SkyTrain look to ensure people realize it is a station at a glance.
- It would be easy to find RAV station
- Integrate RAV into the mall so it is not obtrusive on the streetscape.
- Depending on what form (Design) it would take, i.e. tasteful not tacky looking.

- Mixed feelings, better integration of RAV with the overall public realm like at Burrard Station. Improve the streetscape esthetics.
- Needs good identification
- Yes, could be an advantage to Oakridge
- keep them separate for public security
- I think more than one entrance to the RAV line is required
- Signage should be done in a very creative way. The sign should also advertising shops and have temperature reporter & a clock

Comments to Improve Linkages to the RAV Station and Nearby Bus Connections

- More frequent bus service during rush hour. Some seniors afraid to use after 3pm when school gets out. 41st bus can be so crowded they can't get to exit when they want to get off
- Close to the RAV station and bus stop, better access to bus
- A bus loop in Oakridge.
- Under ground access across the 41st/Cambie intersections to connect with buses and other retail in the area.
- Tunnels to the other sides of the 41st to Cambie Streets
- There should be a glass covered walk-way connecting the station and the mall entrance so we do not get wet because of rain and now. It would be even better if we can access the mall from underground. This may mean converting some underground residence parking into a walkway with small shops or food stands along the walkway.
- There should be a second RAV station at the North-east corner of 41st and Cambie. This will provide easy access to UBC.
- Covered ways and adequate shelter at bus stops. (Current new shelters aesthetically pleasing but no protection against, sun, wind, rain or snow!).
- We will need frequent shuttle buses to get from the RAV stations to stop near where we are going/live
- Enough covered areas due to rain; covered walkways and adequate shelter at bus stops
- Eventually, there should be Mall-RAV outlet to all corners of the 41st/Cambie to ease the traffic and pedestrian congestion at the crossing.
- Improve the bus service on 41st, 49th etc, (if RAV runs every 3 minutes as was told at a RAV meeting.)
- Bus station could be part of the enclosed RAV station so that transfer does not require transfer ticket, similar to Toronto's subway and bus system.
- Underground passage ways for connection to the bus stops so current city view is not affected.
- There could be a more accessible transit system and more accommodations for people, shops etc.
- tunnel under a bridge over 41st Ave & Cambie for people to cross streets
- provide tunnel or bridges to cross main roads
- have a mini bus terminal also
- A connecting bus/coach terminal to the RAV, A terminal for buses/coaches going to universities, sight seeing spots, train stations, ferries, sky-trains, etc.
- Covered access to bus stops (out of the rain, from RAV station. Express buses should be on same side of Cambie as Oakridge. All retail shops/spaces on the "transit square" should have window/doors and access only to the square, not to the interior mall. Prefer that these shops include several restaurants, etc.
- A well designed transit node will accommodate both RAV and bus. As consumers we would expect the new Oakridge to plan for this integration.
- We are of the opinion that multiple buses to the centre be provided but to reduce the number of traffic light intersections or the intervals.
- keeping bus stops as close as possible to RAV Station although this could create some congestion if rider ship were very high - need good flow of "people traffic"
- RAV should link to Skytrain, it will bring ridership without a question

Comments on the RAV Station and the 24 Hour Pathway

- Depends on security
- With security enhancements
- Very important “weather-protected” 24 hour exterior pedestrian pathway.
- Safety is a big concern walking from RAV station, through the parks at night to homes South and West of the shopping centre. Please make sure the paths are well lit with fewer bushes.
- Transit finished @ 1 a.m.? Suggest 6 a.m. to 1:15 a.m., opening 24 hours may ring nuisance pedestrians, sleeping hoboos, etc.
- Security/gangs hanging out
- Provided it doesn't become a hangout for undesired types
- No, will affect Oakridge's high class images if the expansion looks like that of Broadway & Commercial Street. Well lit underground pathway costs more but it is worth it
- Connect it underground to the mall and Safeway
- protective & safe pathway will improve the use of RAV
- as long safety or the public is considered
- This makes it sound safe and secure!
- Security issues would have to be considered - how would stores be protective from break-ins and loitering of undesirables in a protective area could occur.
- Depends where you are planning to put this "weather protection/24 hour" pathway.... Great place for drug dealers
- That would certainly be most helpful
- A skywalk like the one in Pacific Centre across Dunsmuir would be desirable connection to the second storey protective and safe pathway will improve the use of RAV
- Make it safe & secure
- Seems like a good idea, but security issues would have to be considered
- Oh yes - this would be wonderful, like a European Boulevard - so when people come out of the film theatres, others are around, cafes are open.

Comments to Improve Existing / New Pedestrian Linkages Through the Site

- Need more bike racks-scattered around all the different entrances
- Yes, make it safer for children and pedestrians and bikes
- I hope there will be a ramp and walking from TISDALL to the mall - as there is now.
- A skywalk (similar to the one in Pacific Centre across Dunsmuir) would be desirable connecting the second floor of the mall to the second floor or the new Safeway at the corner of Cambie & 45th Ave., across the new street.
- It should be safe and secure, no mugging
- Will there be a covered area from Safeway to the Mall
- 45th and Cambie intersection and 41st/ west side shall have overpass to separate pedestrians from vehicles.
- Large wide open pathways required for people to feel comfortable.
- a walkway around the perimeter of the site
- Keep as many trees - existing on West boundary and elsewhere, direct pedestrian access to Mall RAV and grocery esp. from the west side of property (existing residential) Highly visible security esp. after dark.
- Pathways, quiet, benches for seniors, strolls, no bicycles, skateboard, rollerblades etc.
- Needs to be better pedestrian access through the site east-west, the service streets should be put underground and surface streets, pedestrian/bike only, open as long as transit is running, or else 24hrs./day.
- The concept is not clear. There needs to be a definite plan through the site, especially connecting to Heather, and connecting the new street (ped.) to the sidewalks to the west.
- Yes make a wider sidewalk/bike way. Also retain the existing sidewalk/trees along the west plaza
- No, I like the accessibility of it in the design
- Not necessary
- Most of the walks within the property will be in the shade of the buildings all the time, so most of the year it will be cold & damp
- More pedestrian access needed from the west side of the property line
- Make Cambie more pedestrian friendly.
- Covered secure bike parking
- Bike or pedestrian only streets.
- We have to grow or we'll just wither away. I see the main central concourse like a wide European Avenue - wide, trees + shrubs on raised boxes, benches (many) people can even dedicate benches to loved ones, even open café on this avenue, lots of lights, flower boxes, little cafes with tables & chairs on the avenue, a people place, lots of shops, plus a walk-thru place from the tube station. Now the other 2 avenues could also be similar, maybe as grand. Any plan that will get the residents out & about. The more people are invited to come out, the more safe everyone feels, the more sales are made, the more social the community would be - and vibrant. Are these 3 avenues to be covered by high curved glass ceiling as are now in the galleries? If so - super planning. Are they all going to be wide, really wide then e.g. at Christmas time, 3 school choirs can come and sing to the people.
- As long as there is lots of lighting so people feel safe and secure.
- Where will the bikes be store/parked in & around the mall? Do people shop & ride bikes home with their purchases? Are bike routes used as much as planners hope they are?

Comments on Expanding the Tunnel on W 41st Avenue

- Easier access and exit from Oakridge Centre
- The main idea is to improve the traffic flow
- Speed up traffic
- Okay if it would not make 41st Avenue too narrow for ordinary car traffic.
- All you are doing is using existing entrances, some of which are nearing satisfaction at the present time
- I like the improve access off 41st (tunnel) and off Cambie
- Should be decrease car access - this will promote more cars.
- Very busy on 41st very unlikely to work safely!
- Good idea, but access to Oakridge from East bound traffic can be as is now
- I like this as it harder to enter the N end of the mall if travelling W on 41st
- I like this idea that will reduce congestion of ground level traffic
- Can't see the need for 2-way tunnel
- I think the present tunnel affects me as a motorist - it feels unsafe/confusing, however, if this is a truck exit, o.k., but the trucks should stay underground on-site, to give priority to public pedestrian access.
- Inbound would be excellent it wouldn't affect me
- Would be much busier- I'm not that keen on mixing of cars and huge trucks in an underground tunnel situation (Exhaust fumes, noises from trucks etc)
- No impacts to the transit user.
- Supportive / positive, a good idea
- It will provide easier access and exits from Oakridge Center
- Sounds good would maybe prevent so many drivers causing a bottle neck at 45th Ave
- Having traffic underground is progressive I suppose. However accidents in tunnels do happen frequently
- Good idea, but access to Oakridge from east bound traffic can be as it now.
- too disruptive for other road traffic
- Would be much busier. Not that keen on mixing cars & huge trucks in an underground tunnel situation.
- Safety is the first priority
- There must be infrastructure need if the retail area is increasing.

Comments on 45th Avenue Site Access & Other Suggestions to Better Manage Vehicle Access

- Because W. 45th Avenue is very small. I think it should access from Cambie St., or 41st Avenue
- Better remove truck servicing from 45th Ave
- The cars should access the Oakridge Centre through Cambie Street or 41st Street because both streets are bigger than 45th avenue.
- Fine - as long as it doesn't impact pedestrians in a negative way
- 45th Avenue is already too busy. Wherever possible, please reduce traffic going through the Oakridge neighbourhood
- We want to separate the mall traffic from the residential traffic. We should convert 45th Ave. back to residential traffic for the Oakridge district. Please use the existing underground access (convert to 2-way) immediately north of the Safeway parking lot for underground access.
- Access for vehicles should be restricted to Cambie and 41st Avenue. More pedestrian access openings from west property line.
- From the Seniors' residence to 45/Cambie is already a mad-house, - so NO (Ash Street also runs into this melee.)
- Do a cut and fill for 45th crossing Cambie Street
- 45th Avenue as is now is problematic so do not permit cars to enter from Cambie into 45th Avenue.
- The 45th St. access is a pedestrian hazard
- One way system
- Entrance only in - no exit onto 45th
- Traffic lights at 45th/Cambie are too slow to change and too short when they turn green
- Not a good idea
- No access for cars from 45th Ave. Many are impatient with pedestrians crossing from Ash etc.
- Improve and make more safe access to site from Cambie Street
- Change the proliferation of buildings to a more manageable level
- Mall to Cambie & 45th south bound could be underground tunnel
- 2 accesses are necessary 2 to Safeway 1 to Oakridge otherwise traffic congestion is foreseeable.
- access at ground level the car go underground
- entry at ground level should be considered
- large truck entry can be considered after shopping hours only
- more entries and exits
- Provided that 45th is not the only access way to the underground parkade. 45th Avenue is not good enough for too heavy traffic at the same hour.
- Leave truck access on 45th Avenue. No car access for parking on 45th avenue. But right-in-right out only. No shopping traffic through the residential area/park. (Leave the median intact at 44th)
- unless there is a full median on Cambie blocking all 45th Ave. east bound traffic to/from the mall.
- Only one vehicle access on 41st and one on Cambie. (is that what the plan shows?). No access to 45th. Trucks could remain underground after accessing the tunnel on 41st.
- Need traffic access to and from 45th avenue

Comments on 45th Avenue Site Access & Other Suggestions to Better Manage Vehicle Access

- I don't have a problem with it but may affect residents on West 45th.
- Entering the site from 45th at Cambie is ok. Driving through the residential area east of Cambie does NOT work for me. I live there!!
- As long as the approaching cars aren't coming West from 45th and Main.
- 41st Avenue & Cambie St. are the arteries, make them do the work and keep the shortcut driver out of our residential areas
- Must use main arteries, stay out of neighbourhoods.
- Any such street should be so designed as to not impact surrounding residential with additional vehicular traffic! Local residents must protect from shoppers cutting through the neighbourhood to access mall. Our huge concern is existing volume on 45th avenue east of Cambie. Perhaps right in right out - on east side of 45th avenue at 45th and Cambie intersection. That intersection is a nightmare.
- We do not want to create a new road through the neighborhood or in the E/W direction.
- but right in - right out only. No shopping traffic through the residential area / park. Leave the median intact at 44th)
- This would mean extra traffic lights on Cambie and may be a disaster.
- Keep the entrances on Cambie, where they are now.
- Biggest concern is increase in traffic on 45th. Removing trucks from 45th is good. Current access on 45th is a real mess. Crossing between 44 - 43rd is very bad. Changes proposed would be a big improvement
- Fine to permit some cars as long as it doesn't impact pedestrians in a negative way.
- The cars should access Oakridge Centre through Cambie Street or 41st because both streets are bigger than 45th.
- A good idea
- No, we want to separate mall traffic and resident traffic. We should convert 45th Ave back to residential traffic. Convert existing underground access to 2-ways immediately north of Safeway
- 45th Ave is now problematic. Do not permit cars to enter from Cambie into 45th.
- Entrance only in, no exit onto 45th
- not a good idea
- that might be satisfactory - especially during heavy traffic times like Christmas Shopping
- 2 accesses are necessary (1 to Safeway and 1 to Oakridge.)
- Service truck access should be a designated truck entrance from Cambie
- access at ground level to underground parking
- Provided that 45th Ave is not the only access way to the underground parkade. 45th Ave is not good enough for too heavy traffic at the same hour
- Leave truck access on 45th Ave. No car access for parking on 45th Ave
- There should be one access in and out on Cambie and once access in and out on 41st. Anything more is confusing for drivers and terrifying for pedestrians
- No. Unless there is a full median on Cambie blocking all 45th Ave eastbound traffic to & from the mall.
- Multiple entries need to be provided to the centre to reduce the number of traffic light intersections on the arterials

Comments on 45th Avenue Site Access & Other Suggestions to Better Manage Vehicle Access

- It appears that Cambie need to be a 6 lane road & 45th probably should become a 4 lane route from Cambie St. west.
- Need separate lanes on Cambie and 45th Avenue.
- more entries & exits; have more access ways into the new complex
- I agree with removing truck access from 45th. Car access from 45th is useful.

General Traffic Comments

- The traffic to the current mall is bad enough; any increase in size of the mall will make traffic on 41st Ave & Cambie in this neighbourhood a nightmare, no matter what the development would be.
- Don't create more traffic
- The residences should not be disturbed by heavy truck circulation
- What effect will MORE cars have on an already busy traffic?
- Every effort should be made to reduce the shoppers' traffic going through the Oakridge neighbourhood which areas used to be quiet before
- traffic is around the centre 24 hours all due daytime
- we do not want to create a main road through the Neighbourhood in the east/west direction
- reduce density to reduce cars etc use
- keep mall traffic out from entering residential areas
- The residences should not be disturbed by heavy truck circulation
- As I have alluded to in earlier responses, my chief concern is that the area bordered by 49th, Cambie, 41st and Main will become a beehive of commuters (and construction equipment). It is bad enough now with the present Oakridge and Langara Campus.
- We support this concept we understand the traffic arrangement plan will be commissioned as part of the development process. Clearly will be a need for improved traffic circulation.
- Any expansion will bring added traffic - isn't that the whole purpose for the developers to embark on such a project. The local residents should not be subjected to constant traffic on side streets - we need to be protected from increases in traffic volumes. There will be added congestion on the main streets no matter what.
- Pedestrian light needed between 43rd and 44th on Cambie is extremely Dangerous
- Cars run the red light constantly need safety upgrade - Additional flashing crosswalk lights and cameras to catch offenders.
- I believe the estimates for the # of cars projects are far too low.
- Two islands on 45th, that's a disaster.
- Reduce the daily truck traffic on Cambie > send them to Knight St. Make Cambie more pedestrian friendly.
- Large truck entry can be considered after shopping house only.
- Security and limited access of the commuters to the Tisdall Street/45th street, & Ash Street residents I believe is important.

Parking Comments

- If there is more improved parking, underground then more people can come and enjoy this facility, most time when we come to Oakridge there is limited parking.
- More underground parking
- Underground parking is fine as long as there will be surveillance of the area & cars parked there
- Perhaps more underground parking although I know this is not going to happen without development which I oppose
- I am very much concerned about crime etc. with underground parking I speak from experience etc. Security is a must, cameras and security guards.
- When people start using transit, then the need for underground parking space will markedly decrease if you provide lot of parking space why take transit, cycle, and walk?
- Charge for vehicle parking with not rebate, rebate transit fare tickets. Promote people moving on foot or on a bike with prizes etc.
- There is the issue of minimum development required to pay for the investment. For all the proposed residential housing would obviously require substantially more parking for cars including massive under ground parking which is very expensive to build. If the development would consist only of mall expansion and some additional office space additional parking requirement would in my judgement, not require additional underground parking; only some new above ground parking would be required. This would lower the cost substantially.
- All underground parking is costly, more unsafe and not essentially needed. Some elevated parking would be more sensible!
- As a woman I don't use underground parking Downtown. I park at the Bay Parkade and walk a 4 block radius to shop. Consider one of the towers be above ground "open" Parking.
- Too much parking, needs better pedestrian access through the site east/west. The service streets should be put underground and above ground areas should be for pedestrian/bike only. The mall should be open as long as transit is running. (or 24 hours a day)
- change the access of the parking/traffic to be more manageable
- Decrease parking, so that more people are walking, biking or using transit
- At the meeting - I heard that there was going to be 3 levels of parking underground. I imagine many enhanced exits will have to be worked out.

Other Comments

- I hope aisles, toilets, products, will be easily accessed by wheel chair patients and/or by those with walkers.
- Existing Mall sky-lights must be saved as they are "Oakridge"!
- Hope some consideration will be given to people in the neighborhood in regards to when construction takes place
- The fares are too expensive and schedules are too restrictive right now
- No, who is going to lug their suitcases and baggage from the airport to a downtown hotel on the RAV line. I would take a taxi!
- Not many people can afford to live in the area given the present cost of housing. Many people in the area are car dependent
- I hope some consideration will be given to people in the neighbourhood who will have to put with all the heavy equipment, trucks, dirt and limitations, of access while the reconstruction takes place.
- More large entrance opening wall to toilet areas. Why are public large toilets hidden away.
- Would there be a number of security on bikes - out and about.
- We have to grow and move on or else we won't become a true village of many, many productive contributing people that Vancouver needs. We need to consider how all this will impact the near by schools, Jamieson Elementary and Van Horne Elementary.
- Higher volumes of people, and easy access from drug dealers, etc. is a concern. Turn-styles on RAV lines enforce everyone to pay for their transport (fares need to be enforced). Extra revenue from turn-styles should pay off the added cost of the facilities over time.
- I believe enforcing new world (sustainability) standards is a bit too heavy handed in this case.
- We have had a number of auto break-ins as is from easy access by criminals through our alley. I am concerned that the additional population on by the RAV will create a problem in the future.
- Another idea - what about small, high shopping carts for mall shopping, people could carry all their bags with ease. Yes the food shopping carts are necessary - but once people get of the tube and take the avenues to flow apart, they really need the help or assistance of a small, hi cart - hi handles, so people don't have to bend over - no-one likes to walk bending over. People will shop more when they don't have to carry all their bags, and coats. Wide avenues could be beautiful, the hi-glass ceilings covered avenues could be temperature controlled: a pleasure to be inside, to shop, to stroll, to window shop, to buy flowers, ice cream, to meet friends for a café meeting & lunch, to go to the Library etc.
- Oh, another idea - what about naming these three avenues, name one - The Terry Fox Avenue or Boulevard, another - the Smokey Smith Avenue or Boulevard, third boulevard - name for a BC woman of note:
 - someone even from our BC History
 - a woman that had given much to BC maybe our first judge or one of our great contributors to creating a better world for all BC citizens.
 - have a newspaper contest for naming the avenues.
- Another idea: - what a nuisance to go all the way along one avenue, - turn right or left to get to the next long avenue: have mid-cross avenues.

General Concept Comments

- Beauty of Vancouver's views, green space, parks and trees. Once we lose that, we've lost it forever. Definitely opposed to more high rises in this area.
- I think the draft concept is a good idea and the more improvements will lead more people to want to live in this area.
- I think more improvements could be made to make this facility more useable and want consumers to keep coming to Oakridge and make a good use at the time in the community center linked with all the activities, youth, elders, and children like to do.
- I am concerned about the aesthetics of our city and of this neighbourhood in particular. I believe we need to keep our entry routes to the city as garden-like as they have been in the past, with set backs substantially proved for so that evergreen landscaping can be provided for Citizens travelling by. It is critical that we do not develop strip mall aspects within our city and that we preserve our mountain vistas for all.
- The revitalization of Oakridge and surrounding area would create another vital hub for our growing city and would definitely help with increased population in our area. We need to bring higher density to this area to help current and future retailers. I support the whole Cambie and Oakridge Village concept.
- The improvement of the existing mall facilities
- The proposal appears to be a win-win for the developer and the users (above users/city). The redevelopment (densification) is always subject to parking and accessibility. It appears to have been dealt with. The economics will also be a big factor
- For the community to go "green", density is the only solution along a transit system.
- architects/city/developer have done a good conceptual lay out
- What a huge challenge you are about to undertake!! For the past two decades, the neighbourhood is deteriorating. Please keep more existing good areas in Vancouver, and still maintain Vancouver as the best place in the world to live.
- We do not understand why it requires 20 years to just add an addition to existing small mall. It is really no big deal. Why not 6-8 years from today OR even better soon after RAV line opens, NOT 15 years after RAV line opens.
- I like the model: (draft concept plan), would like to see lower high-rises (let's not be greedy!) and more parkland. Like street access through shopping centre and exterior retail, also as requested by others, more restaurants.
- Supportive - but too much density.
- Don't want development at all.
- Lansdowne Richmond promised everything and delivered nothing. Oakridge has delivered nothing in regards to green space and will not unless we agree to their development. I like Oakridge the way it is even without any green space or at the cost of my vote allowing increased density.
- I think there is too much density for the available space. I would like the high-rises reduced to mid-rises. It's time for change and change for the good. Affordability of housing would be important. I have worked on 45th Avenue for 14 years and would love to be able to afford a house in the area.
- I live on 45th - so whatever is erected will interfere with my view - but I do like the concept and I won't live forever

General Concept Comments

- I like the plan - nothing can be perfect. The RAV line disturbs me, as more crime will happen, so I guess it means more security will need to be, more money for them - high prices for us.
- Good job on the conceptual layout
- Supportive of the improvements to the mall, reduce high rise buildings, more facilities for family needs
- Looking forward to seeing the new development
- This whole model reflects the greed of developers and Owners. These condensed units will not be for people earning average wages. I don't think more stores along Cambie etc. are necessary. At present there is quite a large turnover of stores in the shopping mall.
- The local residence did not ask for this plan, but now have to put up with future noise, confusion, crime, inconvenience and so on!
- I realize these changes will take 20 years to complete but I do feel overwhelmed by it all.
- This proposed project will totally change the feel and look of this peaceful area. There is simply no need for such a large eyesore. If someone wants to shop they can go to Metrotown, Pacific Centre, Richmond centre, and many more shopping areas - this proposed meta-mall is simply not needed!
- The plan is totally inappropriate for the area always be residential the propose density is an intrusion forced on surrounding neighbours so many people in so little space will increase crime.
- This proposed project will take a beautiful residential area, and morph it into an unpleasant commercial zone. We do not need a new Metrotown!
- With more population density, crime rate will increase. We need a police station in a major transit centre like this.
- Glad to see options from the 1st open house are incorporated in this plan.
- Hopefully, the input from local residence here will this survey will convince the planners to change some of the policies as noted above, especially with regard to intense residential development proposal. This magnitude of development is totally unacceptable. Everybody I talked to in this neighbourhood deems the current population density here as acceptable. Just because planners created a transit state does not translate into approval of higher population density by local residents
- I am afraid of the increase of crime with this project because when an area becomes over-populated crime follows. This project does not conform to the "identity" of this area.
- My vision of the improved Oakridge shopping centre is a doubling of the current size and maybe a small park and an additional current site office bldg. No further residential development, higher residential development would reduce the quality of life in this neighbourhood, because of residential developments over the past few years the population density has markedly increased to the point where enough is enough. When I moved here in 1991 I expected some further housing development but not anything on the scale proposed here. Except for the expansion of the shopping mall, I do not approve of the development plan.
- Density too much, buildings height excessive, do not conform to any development in the south Vancouver. Not enough thoughts to traffic not enough thoughts give to public safety overall not in the interest of neighbourhood too many concession to the developer

General Concept Comments

- Tower too high impact of traffic & density on the neighbourhood too pricey
- Proposal is not looking after eh local interests too much is being given to the developers.
- build to mimic Whistler Village, i.e. retail with apartments on top Cobblestone streets, covered walkways wooden sidewalks etc or build pyramid type high rise buildings up to 6 stories
- It looks as if a lot of consideration has gone into the development of the concept and I appreciated being able to view the large scale model and to hear explanations as to how the various areas fitted in and complimented each other on that basis I would be pleased to say - about right.
- It is a great opportunity to plan for the future and I was excited by the innovative planning that was evidenced by the model and the explanations that went with it.
- Go Oakridge!
- It's hard to visualize the outcome from the draft concept plan because I am not expert in complex construction. However, improvement is always better than no improvement.
- If it's "unviable", then why not build residential on the parking lot, with underground parking (and lower parking ratios) and implement the low-rise plan, but leave the mall as is for now, gradually removing rooftop parking in favour of a green roof. Also fix the public square for RAV access w/coffee shops, out-door seating, etc.
- Plan is heading in the right direction. I'd like to know what standards will be followed, e.g. % of green roof, which existing trees to be retained, etc. Also a pro-forma. I don't believe they have to have 21 storey buildings or the plan is "unviable". Need a traffic analysis of impact on neighbourhood. I still think 45th should be a greenway.
- I support the Concept, I like Oakridge, just remember please that I live there. I grew up in Fraserview and have been shopping at Oakridge since the mid sixties. I look forward to an exciting future for the centre.
- The draft concept seems well thought out and looks as through there is as fair balance of uses. I would support more commercial and residential density providing more community space is provided.
- The COV and the community should not miss the opportunity to develop an Oakridge Community. The significant size of the property will allow a master planned project that will permit appropriate densification of a part of Vancouver. Successfully developed in Concord Pacific and other Vancouver neighbourhoods. The scale of the development would allow Master Planning for the buildings, public relations & public art etc. etc.
- The redevelopment of Oakridge, offers a unique opportunity for a planned community. That will benefit all of Vancouver. The property and the redevelopment process will allow the developers (by virtue of the economic budget) to complete a superior project. For these reasons the developer should be allowed advantageous density and zoning.
- I realize some redevelopment is inevitable but a concrete jungle (with green roofs) does not make it liveable
- Great opportunity to plan for the future and U was excited by the innovative planning that was evidenced by the model and the explanations that went with it

General Concept Comments

- General Comment - Its rather exciting to see another transportation of the sites as I was raised in the area in the early 1950's and on. I particularly like the proposal to build a second level of shops, etc. I do think we need a greater choice of good restaurants - even one more upscale establishment! Also, I'm very much in favour of altering the seemingly wasted "plaza" (brick tiles) area and the corner of 41st and Cambie. It has a cold feel to it in its present form.
- density is too much, building heights are excessive, proposed development does not conform to any development in the area, not enough thought to green area or public safety, not in the interest of the neighbourhood, too many bias to the developer
- It is important to have the RAV line used therefore increased density within walking distance is important.
- This is a huge change from what exists today and no doubt will have a fair share of opposition from the existing community - but this a necessary change in order to satisfy the needs of the generations to come. This will allow them the opportunity to live in the city and in a self-sustaining community - where there is access to everything
- I envision 3 wide boulevards or avenues fanning out from the tube station. I see the new Oakridge project surrounded by apartment buildings and thousands of people. Are the boulevards going to be covered over as the galleries (east 7 west are now?). Will these avenues be wide enough so the public can stroll any time, for day shopping and evening strolling as families do on concentrated European avenues with:
 - many bends and flower beds
 - raised boxes for trees, even benches around the hi-boxes that hold trees.
 - a number of colourful cafes with tables and chairs right out onto the avenues, even bright umbrellas (with perhaps fences)
- I see whole families, single peoples, older couples and families with young children and baby buggies coming out evenings for strolling along these avenues. If new residences can be coaxed out for evening strolling, you would have achieved something miraculous in the "mall world". Coaxing, for want of a better word, people to get out evenings and walk along the boulevard could help/assist in creating a community feeling - thus the Oakridge Village is formed. People from the whole area could come to this new centre for evening walks. Any walking seen on streets now is to shop or returning home from shopping. Of course people will come to shop day time & evening - but, evening walking will get thousands more to café stops, window shops and even evening shopping, plus library visits etc.
- I like the plan. We have to move forward

Open House/ Public Input Comments

- Happy & supportive of the public consultation process. Excellent job!
- The planners, architects, etc. are to be congratulated on the liaisons with the public. I should include the owners and managers of the Oakridge Mall. You have done an EXCELLENT job!!!
- Survey needs refining - not easy to read and questions are leading (occasionally) and confusing.
- With people in Oakridge/Cambie area. Oakridge centre as the Centre with amended by-laws along the RAV corridor faces wonderful opportunities to become an example of private/public planned development -successfully.
- This questionnaire is too long. One loses interest about page 5.
- Great community consultation! Lots of staff was present to answer questions. Presentation boards and model are very helpful in understanding the plan. Also I would like to thank for coffee and cookies/muffins. Perfect timing for a snack after work reception table is important in making people feel comfortable.
- Thanks for all your work and for setting up these meetings.
- Make consultations to similar projects in other big cities in other part of the world
- Not enough public input by Mall owners.
- I would think the plan would need to draw in every one in this area (as far as possible).