

Cambie Corridor Planning Program
Notes and Comments from King Edward Walkabout and Workshop
June 26, 2010

The following are key comments from the King Edward Walkabout and Workshop on June 26th, 2010. The comments were taken from the notes pages and drawings produced at the workshop at the Chown Memorial Church. They have been sorted into themes and synthesized on a map of the area. The comments will be considered in the further development of the Cambie Corridor Plan.

Housing

- Family oriented housing is important.
- Housing needs to be geared to families wanting 2-3 bedroom units
- Affordability of housing in the area is important - not everyone can afford single family housing
- Developers and City need to address housing affordability

Property Value

- Impact of people's property value is important
- Taxes have doubled with property value increase
- Concerns regarding property values being diminished by development
- People want price options in the neighbourhood
- Concern about impact of property value for single family area next to multi-storey buildings
- Concern that developers have already bought land in this community to develop
- The plan should be less upsetting to local homeowners regarding property values to make it viable

Character and Identity

- Residential character and identity of neighbourhood is important
- Some houses have beautiful character, and this would be destroyed
- Privacy in private homes and yards is important
- Cambie Village and its retail shops, are important to the community, including the feel and character of the street
- Will lose small town charm of Cambie Village if development is permitted
- Existing character, forms and neighbourhood feel should be maintained
- There are plenty of heritage houses that would be displaced
- Single family character housing is very important
- Privacy considerations need to be taken into account

Built Form

- Concerns about height of proposed buildings
- Consider enlarging the development areas to include whole blocks off of Cambie and King Edward (no just to lane)
- Pace of development and rate of change in the neighbourhood should be considered
- Develop along Cambie Street first
- Retain RS1 zoning
- No building along residential areas
- Orphaning parcels - would say no to leave out a house - minimum lots 11,000 sq ft.

- Rental properties along Cambie should be re-developed
- Suggestion: changing zoning on 24th (west of cambie) so other residents can profit rather than lose potential value
- Maintain Cambie Apartments
- Lower heights to 2 and half storeys to maintain views
- Redevelop rental housing on Cambie - city make requirement 30% rental covenant
- Be mindful of context and location when increasing density
- Both sides of the block should be considered - some on 24th do not want to move - others want zoning to change to be able to increase property value and sell
- No development south of King Edward. Row houses and townhouse should be considered
- No orphaning lots
- Restrict development to 2 and half storeys along King Edward
- Concern with buildings over 2 and half stories on Cambie south of King Edward
- Some people say 'ok' to some density along Cambie (not East-West on King Edward) including retail
- Do not propose retail anywhere else other than where it already exists
- Some people 'ok' with density around Canada Line Station
- City has goal of density around transit stations
- Need to consider privacy, dumpsters, blending, and character when thinking about transitions
- Setbacks from lane would allow for greenery along King Ed, but will that leave enough depth for development?
- Do not put setbacks along Cambie or in the lanes
- Concern with height of buildings over 2-3 storeys
- Strong support for duplex/4plex
- Concern for tunnel effect on Cambie Corridor
- Lot depth along King Ed doesn't allow for transitioning/privacy for houses on 24th and 26th
- Request for greenery around densification, between buildings and on paths to retain the open quality of single family area
- 19th-23rd already zoned for high rise, why not increase density there?
- Concerns about protecting renters over homeowners and changing zoning near single family dwelling but not in 19th-23rd
- Concern for appearances on King Ed with increased density - use 2/4plex which is more aesthetic for neighbourhood
- King Edward expected to be lowest density station along the Line
- Most people in favour of keeping existing density
- There are height differences/topography/shadows along King Ed (North and South) between Ash and Cambie that will have impact on existing houses
- General desire for 'low height' development (2 story or less)
- Suggestion of developing 'higher' rises along Cambie (19th -21st) up to 10 storeys
- Important to keep mixed use buildings
- Terrace the buildings in commercial zones to residential zones
- Support for maintaining the 3 storey buildings between 19-23rd as current rental units - use as a model for the new developments
- Keep new development to 2-3 storeys

- 2 blocks east-west of Cambie seems too far for new development (people are investing in family homes there)

Traffic and Parking

- Mitigate impacts from parking on adjacent streets due to the Canada Line and proposed new development
- Higher density will cause more cars to be on the road
- 25th and Ash street is already very busy (because of bicycle junction at Heather)
- There should be more parking on 25th on east and west bound sides of the street - now it is limited.
- There are concerns about traffic speeding along 25th
- Free up parking on King Edward on North side of the street, between Cambie and Heather.
- There will be no available parking if highrises are built
- There is already traffic in lanes, and security, busyness, and parking challenges will only increase with development
- Traffic studies need to be conducted
- Parking issues for local families need to be addressed
- Current parking regulations are not being enforced - it takes too long
- Concerns of parking overflow and using side streets to take Canada Line with new developments
- Can the community tolerate a large increase in density in terms of additional cars coming into the area from increase in density?
- Parking for residents is a big concern

Transit and transportation

- Improve transit to UBC
- There are considerable issues of buses being full on 25th Ave
- A biking neighbourhood does not necessarily mean a high density neighbourhood
- There should be a bike lane on King Edward - east/west - remove part of a car lane
- Concern that transit is at capacity already, so why do we need more density?
- Concern that capacity on Canada Line increases before more people come to community
- Walking on Cambie - we must ensure it continues to be attractive and sustain a higher rate of foot traffic

Safety and Crime

- There are concerns with increase in crime in neighbourhood
- There will be an increase of security and safety issues with new development

Public Realm

- Views to the North Shore Mountains and to Queen Elizabeth Park are important
- Sunlight and shadows should be considered
- Green and open spaces should be increased and enhanced
- View corridors - City does not look at private property value?
- Elevation concerns that need to be addressed in new development
- North of KE - shadows will occur
- Views to the North need to be considered

- Views of the park are important (looking south from 19th), as well as looking west and north from the park
- The loss of public views as well as private are a concern
- Preservation of nature as well as views are important
- Suggestion for greening/activating lanes with trees, gardening, green space (conflict with laneway housing?)
- Access, look, safety in alleys are a concern
- There are different consideration with regard to sun and shading with buildings aligned North/South vs. East/West
- There is concern that public view of QE Park seen from Cambie looking south could be obscured by buildings

Amenities

- As density increases community amenities (library, community centre, daycare, etc.) should increase
- There will be pressure on amenities in the neighbourhood
- We need amenities
- Lost Mt Pleasant Community Centre - why? You say you want more density - so that should equal more amenities
- Concerns regarding the loss of green space
- Desire to see increased facilities in the area - rec centres, schools, parks, daycare, community centres (small pocket)
- Will there be a school added somewhere?

Process

- Concern that some residents were not informed by the City about the proposed plan
- The plan should stick to RPSC Vision
- There should be an Impact and Planning study
- The RPSC plan is already a complete picture of what the community wants, you're just shooting holes in it
- Circle approach around station with low rise buildings - is that an option?
- Stage/phase the planning of the area
- Important for community to have voice
- Must have an entire vision and not just 'phase in'
- There should be greater communication regarding phases - there is too much uncertainty for residents
- There should be no variances to policies once agreed to (adopted)- policy should be clear
- Inform residents of development plans - transparency is important for residents
- Council can override policies, so residents need forum to make their opinions known
- When individual proposals come forward it is very important that neighbourhood is informed and has a chance to respond
- To better represent communities, planning of the area should be circular around the station, not linear along the 2 main roads
- Concern that planning department is trying to alter RPSC Plan
- Concern that RPSC community vision height restrictions is not being honoured
- There is concern about dividing the area up in phases. Planning should be done in radius 'nodes' around transit stations in the same planning phase

- When builders submit a building permit, Planning should notify them that there is change coming to neighbourhood
- There is a lot of misunderstanding and miscommunication on the proposals
- Need certainty about phase 3 - need to incorporate a larger area in phase 2 to give certainty to residents

Other

- Basement suites are most affordable housing options, don't want to lose that
- Laneway housing is a good density option, but may not be an affordable option
- Laneway housing is too big (tall) for neighbourhoods
- Why do we need density in this area anyways?
- How does community have voice about 2 story laneway housing - a big problem for privacy - this wasn't part of the original agreement of a maximum 1 and half storeys.
- What is the plan for the major sites in the area? Major residential development without adding amenities in these areas would be a big mistake
- Rezone Safeway plaza at 25th and Oak