

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments	
1	QE	1.) Scale of Oakridge Centre together with the high buildings on the corners 41st and Cambie and will transform this area and give it an appearance similar to stations on the Centennial Line in Burnaby-High and ill-placed within the community. The current plan has the potential to become one of the most egregious examples of city planning decision making with regard increasing density while respecting local residents. 2.) Use of term "Corridor" speaks volumes of the lack of appreciation of the physical and social community along Cambie St. The massing of buildings along Cambie at the heights recommended will reinforce perception of a lined corridor along one of Vancouver's loveliest streets.	1) Built forms along Cambie in my area are too high—especially in proximity to QE Park. Structures from 27-39th should be no more than four stories as per the Riley Park Community Vision on building heights. Queen Elizabeth Park will soon be overwhelmed with dense structural massing along its perimeter. This will have a negative impact on tourism and on the park's character. 2) Built forms at 41st are again much too high—twelve stories at 41st will tower over the community. I feel sorry for those who live in the Cambie 41st vicinity when they must come face to face with this scale of building. I have spoken with local residents on West 40th between Alberta and Cambie and they are distraught over the proposed changes. The City is showing a callous level of disrespect for the local residents by placing eight story buildings in those residents' backyards and then wrapping it with a green label. 3) Lay-out (placement) of structures along Cambie is too rigid. Structures should be oriented variously north-south and east-west in order to break up the pattern of buildings facing the street. In addition there	1) Existing public amenities such as child-care, park space and community facilities including those for seniors that are needed to accommodate many thousands of new residents will be inadequate. Already, Vancouver's concept of a seniors centre (such as Oakridge) is inadequate and out of date by 21st century standards. The Riley Park South Cambie area will need an additional community centre type facility just for its additional population. Additional population pressures will come will other large site developments on the arterials and at Little Mountain; there will also be increased density located on what are now SFR properties in the corridor. This total picture of growth must be planned for. 2) City needs a new amenity policy and an accompanying plan that lay out how to deal with extreme redevelopment pressures. We will not be able to maintain the current level of amenities in the face of a growing population that will reach into many thousands.	1)The City should keep in mind that this is one of the better areas in Vancouver with regard to space, light, air flow and greenery such as trees, shrubs, etc. Your challenge is to protect these elements while attempting to place more people in the area. The Corridor Plan is NOT respectful of Queen Elizabeth Park and the Cambie boulevard region. 2)The notion that our area will be a net recipient of benefits through small plazas, lane modifications and additional public space is a spurious notion. We have already wonderful access to public space at the parks, and the boulevard along Cambie provides a stunning visual element from 25th to 41st and beyond. Already, we walk and bicycle with ease. The Planning Department's descriptions of new benefits are a form of "spin" that has no place in serious urban planning.	5 (a lot)	2,3,4,5	I suggest that the City consider adopting the "Seattle Green Factor" planning tool. It comes from Europe and provides a way of measuring the scale and scope of features that increase biomass on multi-unit housing sites and commercial buildings. Cambie Corridor will need to increase dramatically the scale and extent of plants, shrubs and trees around and on its buildings if it expects to mitigate the downsides of the corridor on the local environment.	
2	OTC	Problem to publish a policy indicating "future" rezoning effectively freezes neighbourhood improvements - potentially for decades. People don't want to rebuild homes in case they will later be replaced by condos. Better to remain silent until just before development occurs	The neighbourhood is being steadily redeveloped with multi-million dollar homes. It lacks "character" (coffee shops, bakeries delis etc)	1) The city should actively work with citizens to bury the electrical wires. It is absurd in such a beautiful landscape to see poles and wire everywhere. Even if the city cannot pay for this, they can put pressure on BC Hydro to make it easier.	2) The city should install sound barrier walls along major streets - as for example in Calgary. W 41 between Manitoba and Ontario is an obvious example.3) When rezoning occurs, those negatively affected (e.g. those in shadows, those losing views) should be compensated by those making profits	4	4		
3	OTC	High densities could mean a whole new outlook on existing amenities.	Don't like all the proposed concrete in what is currently a lovely quiet residential area.	1. The library is currently inadequate for the community. With the proposed increased density there should be resources set aside to upgrade and expand the library. 2. There is no adequate drug store e.g. a London Drugs, Shoppers, etc. in Oakridge		3		Under the "a complete community" it mentions creating "subsidized housing". It would be prudent to explain whether this means housing which will be for the "difficult to house" population. This should be clearly stated so there's no ambiguity so this is an issue that has implications for our community. The high density high rises are bad enough, but including subsidized housing for the difficult to house population could be disastrous in the long run.	
4	CV	I totally oppose the form and character proposed for the King Edward portion of the Cambie Village Area plan. The plans put forward by the City's planning staff is completely out of scale and character to the existing RS-1 zoned neighbourhood, in particular along the King Edward corridor. Increased Density in the form of building height should only be considered at the commercial core of the Cambie Village, along Cambie from 16th to 19th Avenue. Mass building blocks appear to encourage mass big box retail or the potential for it. I oppose big box retail in this corridor. The City must do everything to encourage local neighbourhood scaled businesses to succeed.	I totally oppose the proposed 4-6 storey built form and character endorsed by the City Planning Department. Increased density at this scale of up to 3,000-4,000 new residents will increase traffic on neighbourhood streets, especially where residents are furthest away from the commercial core of Cambie Village. There have been no independent traffic impact studies provided by the Planning Department to the area residents which is shocking considering the work undertaken to date. I support the original 2005 RPSC approved housing types only. No 4 storey or higher development along the King Edward corridor whatsoever.	A community park within the boundaries of Cambie (west), King Edward (south), Ontario Street (east), and West 16th Ave (north) is needed. Improved street crossings are essential and should be added at Yukon and Columbia Streets.	I do not support proposed density of 4 storey buildings along the King Edward corridor due to the massive impact of vehicle traffic that will be introduced to the interior streets and lanes. There should be no access to below grade parking from laneways. There has been no information given relating to building setbacks from property lines, especially at lanes, which is a crucial piece of information not provided by City Planners.		1	1	I do not support the current proposed plan put forward by the City's planning department, as presented at the recent open houses. 2005 RPSC approved housing types only. An independent 3rd party traffic impact study with explicit terms of reference must be completed and published for public record prior to Council's review of any proposed land use policy changes for these areas. A transit study comparing existing Canada Line capacity and use at peak hours today, 2010, and at maximum density build-out must be completed. The residents need to know that the premise to add density because of transit will be supported by the current transit infrastructure because the City of Vancouver does not control the funding for the expansion of the existing Canada Line. Otherwise the City is adding congestion through increased car travel. As a voting resident, I am extremely concerned in manner in which this planning process has taken place, largely behind closed doors and without a more comprehensive and detailed public consultation process. It is outright disappointing the lack of regard the City has shown the residents of this
5	QE	I think that the increase in density along the 41st corridor to Yukong street would completely change out neighborhood for the worse.	It is a low rise, single family area.	A sidewalk around Midlothian Way to completely go around Queen Elizabeth Park					
6	CV	General positive however density could be higher given that one is less than 10 minutes from CBD/is from YVR. The higher dependence on rapid transit will help reduce vehicular traffic.	The urban image recognizes the located close to the center of the city. Gable or hip (?) roofs are archaic and reduce the amount of usable surfaces for decks, overviews, ...	A small library close to the station would be positive, maybe a workshop available to the apartment/local residents.	Green lanes extending between grouped driveways will encourage pedestrian activity in the lanes. Consider retracting bollards to limit lane use to residents, service vehicles, firetrucks, ...	4	2, 3, 5		
7	CV	Six to eight storey pattern is a good one to use for development from Cambie between King Edward and Main Street. Include commercial facilities will help tax revenues and promote development.	Along Cambie Street and east of it to Main Street and north of King Edward to 16th Avenue, all should be changed to mixed use with lots that could be consolidated to promote development which could be as tall as 10-storey buildings. Such approach could also become a new model for neighbourhood development in Vancouver.	According to where I live, zoning needs to be changed to allow more development. This is to make progress for Vancouver in the next 10 years and so this is public benefit and good for the residents and also good for the government in terms of creating revenue for city's general operational funds.	Basically, facilities are quite efficient and worked out well. Unless there are creative ideas, I am quite satisfied.	5	1,5	I hope to receive from the City what have been displayed at the Open House.	
8	CV	The planning department has not listened to area residents on building heights and character of neighborhood. The tee approach and not circular around (?) Canada Line Stations is most concerning (?).	The building heights at corners of 25th and Cambie and heights along King Edward are still not in character of neighborhood. After much input from area residents the planning department has fallen short in listening skills.	After all the proposed benefits proposed from glances there have been no additional benefits planned for 25th and King Edward that are not already in place.	Again the policy falls short with town home sites being 2 feet from laneway. No concrete plans on how to beautify the neighborhood unless you count concrete and people watching.	3	2, 3	If you are not going to adjust density and building heights that include a circular approach around Canada Line stations then you give an unfair advantage to home owners on 25th Ave while the potential devaluation of properties below or above. Please listen to residents that live in the area, if you can not then follow the approach of Riley Park version that states there were no more than 3 storeys.	
9	LA	Today the neighbourhood is well developed as a SINGLE FAMILY area with convenient shopping senior citizens DO NOT want to have the disruption and the density proposed having lived in the neighbourhood for 40+ years. If the city wants to increase density, keep it located immediately around transit centers (i.e. 200 ft. within) and not the entire corridor	Again more interested in maintain the single family feel along this part of the corridor vs. the increase density proposed.	Already have greenspace (Jamieson/Tisdall Park) Langara Golf Course, YMCA, Green space at 54th & Cambie. Potentially add community policing station	n/a	1	2,3,4	"IF" approved don't allow single family homes/lots to be left stranded sandwiched in between two multi-story buildings. Enforce the "orphan" rule and have minimum frontages and lot sized increased. Otherwise, neighbourhood will suffer aesthetically and livability - wise	

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
10	LA	This is a great opportunity to bring the people back to Vancouver, those that left Vancouver over the past 20 years because of high cost of real estate.	If the density can be higher would make more sense for the future image of Vancouver. This can be done by increasing the FSR from the proposed 1.5-2.0 to 2.5/3.0 or by increasing the height.	An ice rink added to the Marpole Community Center would be nice. With more population, come increase tax revenue base, more public services can be added.		1	1	We need to plan for the next 30+ years rather than just the 10-15 years. If Vancouver plans to be an international city the 6 stories on a main corridor is very low. Once it's built changes will be very difficult. It's highly unlikely that development along the Langara section will happen in the next 5 years so the vision should be for at least 30 years into the future than hav another rezong/replanning done 10 years from today.
11	CV	Very good - support density along the entire corridor. Current drawing look too homogenous - should have a wider variety of housing forms. i.e. apt blocks (6-8 storey's) with central courtyards for residents (playground, gardens, bike storage etc) row housing in surrounding areas.	I would like to see extension for the Cambie village shopping district to 25th Ave., Why are the old rental appt between 20 -24th not included for increased density? In residential only areas I would like to see a wider variety of forms	Another E - W bike corridor between 10th and 37th 22nd would be a good choice	Wider sidewalks from 16th - 20th are needed. Pedestrian access at midblock is a nice	3	2,3	Why does planning zone not extend to Olympic Ville Station? I'd like to see a commercial/retail/entertainment complex at 2nd Ave beside the station. Use the amenity \$ to finance the downtown streetcar
12	OTC	I saw the proposed Cambie Corridor for Marine Drive and love it!! The neighbouring is much more pictured to be welcoming and neighbourhood friendly. Regarding the Cambie and 49th Ave storey building, I think the buildings should be higher. The city will make more money attracting residents to come shop local to Oakridge and building more units would require selling them making more money for the city.	I live near the Langara Station - Cambie and 49th ave and it would be lovely to have higher storey buildings.	As a youth, I would like to see more "Broadway" type restaurants - Cactus, Earls, etc. either one the Marine Drice site or in Cambie Village to attract a younger generation. I know that with the younger generation the city would fear increased crime, however restaurants can be enjoyed by all groups to eat at.	Wider streets	4	2	More food!! Love the Marine proposed plan.
13	LA		buildings should be more beautiful enough with the glass, this style is tired and boring	beautiful buildings	wild spaces, not just grass indigenous species please	4	2	
14	OTC	Being livable with more density and additional shops in a safe environment is desirable for people from all racial background. It is important for Mayor to listen to the residents and it is the responsibility of the City (since we paid taxes) to introduce proposed changed with clarity.	Mix used buildings should be as tall as possible with commercial at grade. Housing and amenities to shop and buy groceries for seniors should be an important element to consider in future development.	Benefits should be catering to all people with different cultural and racial background. Something beneficial for the elders and the youth.	Policing centre/station, safety services, parks, sports, and places for learning are amenities for a healthy community. Create opportunities for residents to serve the community. It is important that we first learn to give way before we take.			
15	QE	I agree that it makes sense to have a cluster of apartment buildings immediately surrounding the stations, although I do not like the change to my neighborhood. I really do not like to see apartment buildings all along Cambie and especially near Q.E. Park. The train was put underground to preserve the beauty of Cambie which is unique in Van with its majestic median and tree lined boulevards.	I truly hope that the apartment buildings at the King Ed station will not exceed 4 floors. Anything higher would ruin the view from the park. Apartment buildings between 37th and 26th would change the parklike nature of the neighborhood too much. This area should be maintained as one or two storey residences set back from the street with front gardens to maintain the parklike environment.	Better walking access to Q.E. Park and better walking paths in the park will be a great improvement and I agree with including affordable market and rental housing in the development plan. Increased child care and increased facilities for seniors would be welcome additions.	I totally oppose any plan to develop land belonging to Queen Elizabeth Park at any time in the future. Public spaces with trees and gardens should be planned wherever possible. Walking, cycling and using public transit should be encouraged.	1	1	The graphs were not easily understood without taking some time to figure them out.
16	CV	I am not in favor of you ____ storey densification program from the station. If you want to densify then you need to offer ____ to those people whose properties are affected by this process as a buffer.	I am in favor of townhouse development branching out from the skytrain station to blend in with the community of heritage houses in the area. I am not in favor of large buildings obscuring the site lines to the city.	Businesses in community, need adequate parking. I do not trust the planning process that wants densificationat any costs.	I have as a single family (extended) have much in common with pokey apartment developers who do not share my daily concerns. I spoke with a real estate agent who felt that the uncertainty about densification adversely affects the value of my house.	2	2	Graphs are too busy, too much jargon. "upzoning". Proposed visions are polyanna... since when does apartment living produce a community? Pokey little apartments only produce convenient touch down pads for people to sleep.
17	QE	rental/strata mixture accessible to everyone 6 storeys along 25th between Cambie & Yukon	mixture of allow for all levels of keep privacy for folks behind 25th	Cambie & 25th convenience store, small grocery store, post office rental/strata mixture - if the market allows possible Translink community bus to Hillcrest Park/Library	Provide green space small parks, play areas in the 25th/Cambie area lanes - make them habitable, blended sloping and centralized driveways			consider front door backdoor small gardens with work space for small projects for those who downsize but still like to keep busy. Apartment living & changes lifestyles volunteering doesn't replace my garden or my husband's work space
18	CV	I like the attempt to balance existing character of my neighbourhood with the need for more housing	Existing 4 story bldgs on Cambie N. or 19th provide an important focus/cone for future development in this area - please 4-6 stories_really_works	Cambie Village shopping area - low rise - human scale is what attracted me.			1	A good process - thank you
19	OTC	I like it.	I like it.	Canada line station at 41st & Cambie, ___ single ___ to multi-entry, at least on east side of Cambie st to add	In general, I like it very much. It does an excellend job of "balance".	5	2,5	Good job, thank you.
20	CV	Needs more density and transit stations. No point in having high end homes/condos in such close proximity to station.	Woodframe (multi-plex), family oriented neighborhood	Community center nearby, parks, bike route, grocery/shopping etc., no added benefits needed.		3	5	Current FSR is too low. Currently at 1.0/1.5 will achieve very little for this area. For developments to proceed the FSR needs to range 2 1/4-3. Need to increase density, create more to help pay for transit.
21	CV	Overall plan = very well thought out. Needs higher density around current and future skytrain stations to increase long term sustainability.		Current proposed greenspace, bike routes, and walking paths = great for locations. Need to utilize new skytrain to increase walkways/less vehicles.				Density needs to be increased around skytrain in order to become a fully sustainable and affordable neighborhood. Current FSR and height proposed near Cambie and King Edward = short term outlook.
22	OTC	The zoning changes are for the benefit of developers at the expense of existing residents. I would not like the see a 6-8 storey building across a narrow lane from our house which has been zoned single family. Must restrict zoning changes to Cambie St. only.	Any zoning changes will likely affect the density of the neighborhood. The increased density does not fit with the current neighborhood of single family dwellings. I have lived in this neighborhood for over 60 years and have enjoyed the views, the neighbors, and the overall natural beauty of the surrounding lanscape! Why would I want it changed?	Currently fine - why would I want to pay higher taxes when it already is too high?	Currently fine - do not wish it to be changed.	3	5	Deeply concerned how quickly the proposal for the Cambie Corridor Plan has evolved in such a short time span. Surely the motivation is not for the current residents living in this neighborhood. The building forms in the Cambie Corridor Proposal do not reflect the neighborhood and would certainly be rejected if local residents were allowed their input.
23	CV	4 stories east of Cambie on King Edward still may be too high overall on lots with depth of 124 ft. concern with privacy & shadowing	Single family homes small shops (ma and pa type)	daycare, commercial/retail		2	1	Phase 3 and 4 should be combined since both are long term planning goals
24	CV		Denser housing is all along busy, loud roads, - would prefer some density in Second blocks - more livable blocks - in exchange or some blocks along Cambie left low - especially to protect views	Do not see any information of housing affordability - will new townhouses be affordable compared to replacements of older houses with rental secondary suites & rental laneway houses? Have the demographics re income been studied?		3	2,3,4	

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
25	Other	I support the overall changes and increased densification, but I imagine neighborhood residents might be resistant for fear of too much change, too quickly. Improved communications with the public to illustrate that the proposed changes may take decades would alleviate those fears.	I applaud the well-planned transitioning from the Cambie Corridor to neighboring single-family houses. This is key to alleviating false fears of giant towers with long-casting shadows or "threats" to privacy to people in their backyards.	Expanded libraries, more green space, more childcare spaces, better assurances for affordable housing so that current/future residents are not forced out due to increased prices, planning for percentage of rental units guaranteed.	More public art, architecture standards/design guidelines so that new towers/buildings along Cambie don't look like every other boring generic glass tower in Vancouver, patios and streetside seating wherever possible, green roofs!	1	1	The visuals were excellent ("How it Might Look") in helping people to understand how their neighborhood might look like at build-out. Marine Gateway area still feels removed/disconnected from the Fraser. I know it's mostly an industrial area but it would be great to have at least some public greenspace right on the waterfront. A future Canada Line station at Cambie and 16th is needed, even more than 33rd or 57th ave. The Cambie Village retail area is too far to walk from Broadway to King Edward.
26	OTC	A sustainable liveable walkable community serving the needs of a broad demographic with optimum green space maximizing public transportation cycling & walking	Mid density - no high rises which I feel depersonalizes a community. Access as much as possible to the ground directly, gardens community garden plots to maintain mid density and personal connection to the land and environment.	Family oriented neighbourhood with supportive housing for people who need extra help, that would allow them to stay in the community.	See (2)	4	2	As a homeowner in the corridor, we have been under pressure from commercial realtors to sell our home, most likely for speculative purposes. I would like to ask the city for assistance in how to deal with this aspect of the development process. (I've spoken to you about this & feel this is being addressed so it's not a complaint but I want to formally make this suggestion today at the open house)
27	Other	I think increased density is great - it will add to the vibrancy, as long as they're not in "towers in the park".	Mid rise is great as is mixed use along the corridor.	Finish the bike lane on Cambie (ie where it's implied but not drawn on, south of King Edward.		4	2 (I think they are neat)	
28	OTC	The idea of having Cambie corridor to shape Cambie area to inform land use and change for future development may sound like a good idea, but with new buildings which will bring huge increase in density, traffic noise, and pollution.		For the Oakridge area we have enough public benefits therefore I do not think enhancement is needed for us.	Green space would be good it helps with the current environment to reduce the carbon dioxide	3		Oakridge area is already a good place to live in anymore developments and construction will bring pollution traffic and noise to the neighbors in the area
29	OTC	High rise should be considered for the whole Cambie Corridor including Ash Street and Yukon Street. This would create the characteristics for the whole corridor.	We agree with the proposed building forms however the back lanes of Ash are connected with Cambie. Ash should have the same proposed height as that of Cambie. If not, then we will face negative shadow impacts and spatial issues and this is not right! If you do not agree with proposing land use/height changes for Ash between 39th and 49th, we will disagree with land use proposal on Cambie Street.	Further planning for bus stations and skytrain station entrances. It was too busy with people and safety aspect is worrisome.	The fence of parking lot near Cambie Street & 41st between Liquor Store and TD Canada Trust can't be opened for vehicle access and this has created an unsafe situation for 5668 Ash Street and the backlane. I hope the City can look into this problem for us. There have been several unsafe incidents.		5	Sincerely asking the City to consider our ideas - please include changes to Ash Street like Cambie Street within this proposal and consider allowing Ash Street to be redeveloped to 12 storey building
30	OTC	God idea - I hope city doesn't waste too much time on bringing in the changes.	I look forward to having options to build multi-family housing on my lot. I live on Yukon St. Cambie St is going to have high rises which is ok with me. Please give neighbours behind highrises to have four stories - something like Ash St. Thank you.	Get rid of people pushing drugs on train stations and neighbourhood. Columbia Park area.	More traffic on 46th Ave and 48th Ave lately.	2	1	Give people the option of having multi-family zoning on streets adjacent to Cambie St. in consideration of having high rises on their back-yard. (no privacy) Thank you
31	OTC	I think the Cambie Corridor will be a vibrant, comfortable, convenient and accommodating community with people from different walks living and working side by side.	With amenities like the Canada Line and Oakridge Mall, the main traffic arteries like 41st Ave and Cambie Street, and the 12 stories commercial building only across a back alley, 3 storey condo is totally inadequate. We should at least have the same height, if not higher, than the commercial buildings line up the main road. So we can have some living spaces with sunshine all year round. The increase building height will be able to accommodate more residents who can take advantage of the public transit system and the nearby business and commercial facilities. Also with increased living space close by the main arteries, we can afford more green space behind all the high rises. Decent sized parks with green space away from the noise of the main road traffic. 3 storey condos will take more space, making it crowded and less green spaces. Most importantly we will all be living under the shadow of the tall commercial buildings.	High density residential builds around the corner of Cambie and 41st Ave would provide accommodations for people of different income levels. Upper levels with sunshine for the well off; lower shady levels for the more economic dwellers. The all have the benefit of convenience in commuting, working, shopping and entertainment.			5	
32	ML	The overall Cambie corridor (as depicted) reflects a consistent architectural aesthetic and similar principles re: density and connection to transit, open space and retail. It is unfortunate in my opinion that there is little apparent retention of anything that is already here especially if it could be meaningfully integrated into the vision. Wouldn't it be interesting to see the new development reflect the neighborhoods behind in a diverse & creative way!	The plans show only built form and character along Cambie. There appears to be a pretty crisp discretion between new development and the existing residential immediately east and west of the Corridor. In reality that rarely happens since there are pressures from the redeveloped lands that influence what happens beyond them. The build form and character of my neighbourhood is not reflected in the architectural form being proposed along Cambie.	I appreciate the new sidewalks being build (unfilled) in the vicinity of Marine Station. I would like to see a program to infill street trees in this area, and to begin planning to replace a lot of the plums and cherries that were planted when Marpole was developed in the 1950's and that are now beginning to declined & die. Any place for community gardens in this neighbourhood?	Lots of glamorous plazas and parks but I would like to have seen some quality of integrating habitat and green space in left over areas - such as perimeters of alleyways. This community needs some precedents to show people that there are new creative ways to live that don't require 100% replacement of small with big, old with new.	1	1	The plan needs to consider how it can "create complete communities" by supporting heritage conservation of what is already here including the people who already are here, many of whom have lived here their whole lives. There should be policy support to encourage conservation and renovation whenever possible (housing stock) rather than just envision a COMPLETE REPLACEMENT of everything that exists today. This is NOT sustainability - this is just jumping on the development -oriented vision that is rejected by all culturally rich cities, including Seattle, Portland Montreal & Toronto

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
33	CV	In my area there is no emerging identity on the Cambie corridor. There is no proposed development on Cambie south of King Ed, but the development is proposed along King Ed. I am very much against the identity proposed along King Ed and would very much like to see a renewed and improved identity along Cambie between King Ed and 19th.	I am very much against the built form and character proposed for my area. East and west from Cambie along King Ed should remain single family and or duplex zoned for the foreseeable future. Development should be concentrated along Cambie.	I do not particularly want or need any new "public" benefits in my neighbourhood other than any required to deal with increased density, regardless of how that density is incorporated. What would benefit my neighbourhood would be the encouragement of development that enhances and encourages my "community". Encouraging retail and commercial development along Cambie (between King Ed and 22nd) would help further develop the community and would provide more opportunities for people who live in the community to work, shop, and obtain their entertainment in the community. (Providing opportunities for people to stop using their cars, supposedly a stated goal of this whole exercise.)	There do not appear to be many if any public realm elements planned for my neighbourhood and that is fine with me. Cambie from 16th to 19th is urban in character as it is from 24th to King Ed. Between 19th and 24th it is almost suburban. This stretch of Cambie wants to be and needs to be far denser and more "urban".			I do not understand this over-riding need to provide new density along King Edward. The Canada Line is already beyond capacity at the King Ed station in rush hours. The new people being introduced into the area will be using cars to commute as there is limited opportunity to work/shop in the area and they will not be able to get on a train. Much as many would like to see it happen, these new residents will not all be riding bicycles, and if they were they would have no need to locate near to a subway station. Development along King Edward, regardless of the height will start the inevitable destruction of an existing neighbourhood. East/west development at 4 or 6 stories will destroy views and access to sunlight, lowering the intrinsic if not the actual value of adjacent properties. The character of the existing neighbourhood that those of us who live here have come to love will disappear, as development will surely continue to the north and the south of what is currently contemplated. As I noted above develop along Cambie itself to 4, 6, 8 or even 10 stories in select locations as long as the development is mixed use and provides the opportunity for Please....enhance, don't destroy.
34	QE	I am against 6-floor high rises on Cambie street from 25th to 33rd. This area has always been single family dwelling area. Instead of developing the North of 25th on Cambie which is already commercial, City took a dramatic step to affect hundreds of our neighbors living space.	I would support gradual step taken - as maximum 3 storey buildings on Cambie between 25th to 33rd.	I don't think public will benefit from these 6-floor buildings except developers to make tons of money from our properties. We will have to lose our privacy and peaceful single residential environment which we have pair our life savings.	The Queen Elizabeth corridor is the green environment and new constructions should meet the highest standard for green building.			
35	ML	The corridor as a transportation corridor makes no sense. The major transport mode is underground for most of Cambie St. So that is BS. The growth and buildings should be more organic around the stations: this way (the way it is presented) it looks like a developer's heaven.	Far too high buildings - they do not fit into the neighbourhood - no other community (outside of downtown perhaps) has such high buildings right on the main street. It should not happen here.	I don't see any benefits. This plan will intervere with Granville becoming a "high street". It does nothing for Oak. Main Street will suffer, too.	The new proposals for developments do not actually improve my neighbourhood. Bring the buildings down to human scale, no higher than 8 storeys.	1 (I feel greenwashed and hoodwinked - the graphs were not useful to me. There was not enough information about them)		I believe the tax impact on the surrounding neighbours will also change the nature of who can actually live ther/here and the industry it might attract. At present it feels like the growth industry is property speculation!
36	OTC	I am concerned one height of buildings on Cambie East side north of 41st. This height will put houses East of Cambie from 41st N to 37th in a lot of shade with _____ privacy	Our area will essentially remain unchanged residential I am OK with that	I like idea of more bicycle corridors & enhanced public space put cycle corridors in residential areas NOT downtown!	no comment	4	4	None
37	QE	Keep the view and the beauty of the house characters.	although 4 storeys building has been placed the style of house should be continuity and blend in with the neighbourhood. EG. No big block condo style.	I love the way it is now		3	2 (with help only)	
38	CV	Endeavour to retain as much of the character of Cambie as possible. Arriving from the airport by taxi, visitors always comment on how beautiful and open Cambie is. Even with development, maintaining trees and green spaces will help. Cambie, at present, is one of the "prettiest" streets in Vancouver, making the city what it is - construction must not create a "wall" effect along the street.	On Cambie, the apartment buildings are 3-4 storeys (19th-24th) with mostly single family houses (with front and back yards) along the side streets. The neighbourhood is quiet and stable.	I moved into this neighbourhood 24 years ago precisely because of the the access to public transportation (then, #15,25 buses; now #33 and Canada Line, too) (I do not have a car), to local stores, to parks (Douglas and QE), and to Oakridge and King Edward Malls (Later, City Square, too). (Also closeness of hospitals now more important). Better bus service needed to coincide with increased ridership resulting from people using Canada Line. Small green spaces are appreciated.	Maintenance of, and increase in, trees and small green spaces. The greenery 'softens' the street scene. The mature trees that border Cambie should be kept, as it is one of the most gracious aspects of the street, enjoyable throughout the seasons.			I nejoy living (24 years!) in an area in which I have walking access to public transportation, shopping, etc. (see answer to #4). I think that my neighbourhood already exemplifies the goals of this program. The rental housing blocks (19th - 24th along Cambie) have very stable tenancy, many tenants being single professional women.
39	OTC	If the impetus of development is to protect the quality of life which increasing density the future of transportation is the important factor. You street plans do not indicate a direction to diminish use of the automobile. Without some overt effort to diminish auto traffic, pollution, energy use, and basic safety considerations will be detrimentally affected.	Not sure how you decide what the rate of density change will be. Is it better to move from single family dwellings to 4-6 storey to 12 storey or to go directly to 30 storeys? It is likely that youre plans will be obsolete shortly after they are implemented.	I notice that your plans wipe out religious institutions along the corridor. Is this intentional? Is meditation space less important than green space? How about public interspiritual spaces?	There is already conflict between pedestrian, cycling, and automobile space. Crossings are already unsafe. I think you will be forced into separation of spaces if you don't want to further decrease safety.	1	1	
40	QE	Totally inappropriate for the area. The destruction of Cambi Boulevard will go down as the worst mistake the city has ever made.	The elimination of front yard setbacks on cambie will destroy what makes this street great.	I see no public benefit to a now great area!	Retain street character - utilize low rise developments on Cambie not mid rise. 2 1/2 storeys is the max that should be considered. Every neighborhood in this city doesn't need to look like W 4th ave. Some creativity on the planning would be nice.	1	2	In regards to UBC Partnership question: General assumptions were made that are either incorrect or unresearched. In general, the design and development work for this area has been extremely poor. It shows a true lack of respect for a great area, lack of vision and little concern for those who are most affected by it. Enforcing a poorly conceived concept on a neighborhood is disgusting.
41	ML	I think the overall planning looks good on paper - the details will outline whether or not the residents like the plans how the plan is going to affect things such as character on properties, reduce site lines, increase traffic, noise	The proposed built forms for Marine Drive Landing area are too dense a smaller form similar to Langara Gardens would be more salable in this area as 30 + stories is too large. Bringing huge density increases traffic to the corner of Marine & Cambie	I would like to see better pedestrian x-walks, more access to the river, a nice water walk	If proposed development can keep the trees that exist on the property or incorporate them into the development that would be great	3	2	
42	QE	Density TOO LOW! Once 24th Ave plan is approved some of the current issues will be resolved. We have an aging population - they need access to transit and facilities, to have facilities you need density.	I have looked all over the city at high rises next to houses we need to take advantage of the train stations - higher density is required - you will regret it - everyone will if we build too low to start with. You need to think LONG TERM - isn't that why the train was put in?!	I would like to see condos with exercise facility pool and common area - this requires density. I need to live close to a train station for transportation - I need the facilities, I am not the only one.	Green spaces can be added to tops of high rises. I love street cafes. I am outraged that we made an investment into the Canada Line and DO NOT want to take advantage of it. You are wasting ALL taxpayers money!	5	2, 3, 4	You reduced the density on King Edward - this is OUTRAGEOUS! What a waste of tax payers money, putting in a train station at King Edward and not making use of it. The density is TOO LOW it should be a high rise to take advantage of the location - to take advantage of the train station. If this plan is approved I hope you don't waste more taxpayers money on the 16th and 33rd Stations. I can't believe what you did!

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
43	QE	I agree with increasing the density.	Density could be higher	If mid-rise cost housing was more available in the form of high rises, many people would benefit. Affordable housing would provide students going to UBC a place to live and people working downtown and easy and convenient commute.	4100 block of Cambie and part of 500 block W King Edward Ave (an L shape) including the lane could accommodate a high rise of two, and allow view corridors.			I agree with the change. It is possible for single family homes and higher density to coexist in harmony. It seems to me that the building at Clark and Kingsway would be suitable (slightly smaller scale) at the N/W corner of Cambie (4100 block) including part of 500 block W King Edward and including the lane just west of the Cambie Corridor that poses a danger as cars travelling west on King Edward hit a red light at Cambie and turn up the alley at a very high rate of speed, very dangerous.
44	CV	Well I'm not happy with the idea that higher density is better for us. Its NOT! If we wanted to live in New York or Toronto we would. Also, the Fraser valley is nearly tapped out for sustainable agriculture is this smart?	Keep it low! It ruins our skyline	I'm happy with what we have. Better bike lanes etc (or routes) is good, I cycle to work and sometimes downtown. Its better than it was 10 years ago.	The idea put forward here of small public spaces green & not so seems good.	4	2,3,4,5	I feel the planners have presented & put together a pretty good plan, if you accept the idea that growth is inevitable & good. However, I think there are enough people here already. This is not just a city issue, so not easy for city to deal with directly.
45	OTC	The height of building on Cambie Street should not have impact on the residences on Ash Street. This is why changes should be considered for Ash Street.	Please allow changes to Ash Street (5514 - 5676) to be compatible to the proposal for Cambie Street (39th to 49th), i.e. the same building height to 12 storey.	Improve traffic near the exit/entrance to Canada Line station at Cambie and 41st.	blank			We hope the City will listen to our concerns and would not allow us to live under the shadow of tall buildings. This would impact on the character and greening of our street.
46	OTC	Limiting my remarks to Oakridge Town Center. Appalled at the idea of proliferating "12 storeys". In 1993 we were warned by Frank Ducote about "water shortage". Now we have had to accommodate 100,000's of people and more of the same. There are more cars than ever filling our streets.	I'm pretty well insulated from carriage houses etc. etc.until they decide to tear down the 2 storey apartments that provide housing for families. (I live opposite, situated on Tisdale & 45th ave)	Interested in the District Energy facilities - would like to know how it works as far as billing goes. (I live in a 9 storey high rise with extensive, very desirable landscaping)		3, 4	4	Re: Marine Landing - I am 100% in favour of banks in Fraser River being reserved for industrial/shipping purposes. Almost all great cities built on rivers.
47	CV	I hope you can restrict the height of the buildings along Cambie even further; 4 storeys would be preferable. Please ensure there are setbacks both at street level and at the top to reduce the shadows and to ensure architectural interest. Keep the sidewalks WIDE.		Is there a way to REDUCE liquor stores? These stores bring unsavory characters to the neighborhood and reduce public benefit.	I like the idea of fixing up Tupper St.	4	2, 3, 4, 5	Please ensure that transit can keep up with this planned density. The Canada Line is already at capacity. This plan really depends on transit.
48	QE	The area is mostly residential with some small independent retail stores along Cambie street. Oakridge center has become a high end shopping destination for Vancouver Westside.	Currently its all detached single family homes with little or close to no commercial buildings with the exception of NE corner of King Edward and Cambie.	It's a close-knit neighborhood with lower turnover. QE park is one of the major benefits I can identify, the upgraded tennis courts and the scenery the park has to offer. The nearby Jewish Community Center is also a place where people of any nationality can enjoy their services and facilities. The Canada Line is a great addition to the area.	QE park is one of the best green spaces in town. Please keep the park the same way to let people enjoy nature to its best.			Would like to maintain the current density of the Cambie Corridor. Along the Cambie Corridor there is not too many community center to service the community. I personally have to use the Riley Park facility which I don't know if this is part of my community or Kerrisdale. Since a couple of years ago the BC Liquor Store has extended their hours to midnight, I found there are more homeless people in the area.
49	QE	We do not want high rises in this area at all, and especially as 12 storey high rises on 41st and Cambie or along 41st Ave and especially along Cambie between 39 and King Edward.	It is already high density as it is. We do not want any additional density.	Keep the Riley Park Community Center as it is and do not close the Percy Norman Pool.	More traffic lights to cross Cambie, especially at 39th Ave.	4	4	I am very concerned about all the subsidized housing being brought into this area. This will bring more crime and vandalism and lower the value of our homes. Since we are the ones paying the very high taxes, it will drive us out of the area and decrease the livability of the area. What do we have to do to be heard? We are the one paying for everything and we are being completely ignored and marginalized. We have very legitimate concerns and we want to keep this pleasant neighborhood that it is now.
50	CV	Good		Library at 16th and Cambie now equidistant from 3-4 libraries. Open spaces, walkways, pass-throughs...	Lots more being put by King Edward Station although 16th Ave will have higher final population density. Hopefully will be wide sidewalks.	4	2, 3 (somewhat)	1. Please don't build "HQPRF" narrow sidewalks with so many "high quality public realm features" that are unpassable - eg. As now between 16th & 19th. It was great with the new sidewalks after Canada Line construction until so much stuff was put in. Especially if lots of new people added in six storey apts. 2. More amenities at north end of study area to go with added people. Meaning not "HQPRF" such as bus shelters and bike racks, but pathways open spaces, day cares and indoor services. PS-> with the trees in the middle of the sidewalk between 16th & 17th, and all the year round barricades outside restaurants for tables use 4 months/year it's even worse.
51	OTC	We fine the proposed identity as getting too dense, too fast, hence increase in pollution, noise and crime. The transportation benefit of Canada line is good however, it already took toll on our neighbourhood, and we believe that the proposed identity will totally eliminate the character and make this area unlivable for families and elderly people.	Our neighbourhood is all made up of detached and bungalow style homes, which are mostly occupied by families with small children and elderly. To bring high density housing to our backyards will not only take away our privacy but also take away sun from our backyards (where kids play). Drug gangs already operating in the area, thanks to liquor store and Canada line...new developments will give them a greater market to operate in.	Living steps away from Queen Elizabeth park was one of the reasons we called this neighbourhood our home. However, we would like to see more sidewalks, perhaps a pedestrian crossing on Alberta crossing 41st Avenue	We are 100% against having condominiums across from our backyard (area: south side of 41st Ave, east of Cambie) Town homes like the ones on 43rd are good model to follow. If we were to have mid-rise condos across from our backyard, this will cause us major shading, no privacy, potential break-ins, more reasons for gangs to operate and conduct transactions behind our yards.			Ultimately we would like to preserve the character family feel of our neighbourhood. Adding high density condominiums will take away all that we have and add pollution more parking issues on 40th Ave/ East of Cambie, increase crime, close our backyards to the sun, intrude our privacy.
52	CV	I like what has been starting to develop but we still need a more comprehensive plan for encouraging density around the main roads and transit hubs.	Would like to see higher end developments in the neighborhood along main arterials only, higher end materials could be "paid" for by additional density.	Looking forward to new ice rink and library opening. Would like to see better maintenance or existing infrastructure. Haven't had a chance to visit the pool yet.	Not a fan of the concrete barriers erected throughout the neighborhood.	4	4	Would like to see more of a density mix towers and townhomes, not just 4 storey residential/commercial mix.
53	OTC	Good	High density (first block) around the stations are good on major streets.	Lower density two blocks away from stations (ie reduced from current proposals). This would avoid too many units rezoned and flood the real estate market. Too many rezonable units would give developers no incentive to build. (see also section 6)	More green space, proportional to the population growth in the area.	2	1	(continued from #4) The most important planning focus is to put the highest density around the stations, which encourages foot traffic. Bicycles then cars are next in order. 1. The highest density, outside the Oakridge Mall development, should be right behind the Oakridge Mall, the area bounded by 41st and 45th and Cambie & Oak (foot traffic). If the City justified four highrises on Tisdale 45 years ago, it would certainly justify more highrises westbound today! This concept is similar to developments behind the Metrotown Shopping Centre. 2. Higher density described in 1. above would complement the high density future development of the previous bus depot north of 41st ave.
54	LA		I think around the station is underbuilt with your proposal. More highrise should be incorporated to make use of the land surrounding the station.	Marpole community centre is too old and too small. Have you plan a new community centre in this area?				

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
55	LA	I don't mind the proposals at the Cambie Village but the buildings at Oakridge & Marine Gateway are too reminiscent of the West End & Downtown in character. The height & scale of the Marine & Cambie buildings are inappropriate for this single family neighbourhood.	I think that the PCI development and the other buildings at Cambie & Marine is a bad attempt to bring a "downtown" to Marpole. The buildings are way too high.	Marpole needs a new community centre to accommodate the additional people coming into the neighbourhood	I like the idea of green space and the greening of streets & lanes, but how can you plant trees in lanes without disrupting traffic flow?	3	1	Marpole needs a neighbourhood plan
56	CV	Two story max for residential units in Cambie Village to include a maximum of a six foot green area around these units Max residences on one lot = 4 i.e. single detached, duplex, triplex or fourplex	Our neighbourhood is just fine as it currently stands	Max round about in lieu of stop signs as our City Council is ____ to be bicycle friendly while neither providing safety for cyclist most of whom ignore the stop signs in our neighbourhood or peace of mind for motorists and pedestrians in our areas who must be every wary of the unpredictability of cyclists.	We need more green space not less	3,4	2,3	To what extent do these planning goals reflect the desires of the residents of the areas concerned with this. The visions of City Council & its planning department?
57	ML	It would enhance the character of the area but at the same time would impact the identity of the neighbourhood. I would suggest that development should be consider in a slower pace and not to loss site of the original character of the area.	Our neighborhood is famous for its green and open spaces and the silent atmosphere of the area	More amenities for seniors and the youth parks for children and green space develop the south side of the Fraser River to become a vibrant neighborhood. Connect an easy access in the Cambie corridor to the other side of the river	Public plazas are essential if you are building a community, green spaces, walk ways, bike paths etc.	3	2,5	Public consultation is very relevant to any future development Forums like this would help a lot in understanding how progress can be gained at a particular area. Presentation like this would enable the public understand the process
58	OTC	Need for more mom & pop concern re transit where will they all work. Ensure enough daycare	?	more areas for rest or ____ (smaller than parks)	trees in alleys I be flexible is it wide enough type of trees			
59	LA	Like what I see. Consider mandating more "family" suites instead of primarily one and two-bedroom suites. "Immediate choice of use/mixed use opportunities" will usually mean residential. I would like to see more mixed use (retail and commercial use) as they provide more transit ridership than residential.	Planning department should work with developers to bring forward architecturally pleasing developmetn.	More bike lanes. More green spaces.	Provide plenty of greenery and TREES! Implement visibly sustainable features like bioswales so public can be educated.	4	2,3,4	Despite the loud vocal criticism against density, I like what I see and am supportive of development along the corridor. I would like to see more family oriented units (ie 2+ bedroom units). I am concerned about density = no children. Families are moving to the suburbs. Vancouver needs to encourage families, but I still want to see more density at the same time.
60	CV	We like the overall ideas you have presented. We are particularly keen to see greater density along arterials, especially nearest the transit stations.	Off the arterials, we'd like to see the general form of the neighbourhood evolve incrementally. Phase 3 will be useful in this regard. As between multi-story condos and lower-rise townhouses, we'd probably choose the latter. Similarly, as between the form of the neighbourhood around 14th and Willow (primarily condos) and that around 14th and Columbia (more single family but increasing numbers of duplexes / triplexes), we prefer the latter. However, we also favour increased affordability, mixed uses, and active communities focused on walking, cycling and transit.	More bike racks in commercial areas, especially covered racks, would encourage more cycling. Wider sidewalks in Cambie Village would encourage more walking (and would also make more space for bike parking). Bus stops could "bulge" into the street like on Main St.	Better connections into Queen Elizabeth Park from 29th, Midlothian, Yukon and other streets north of the park.			Generally, I like what I see. I thought the density / transit use graphs were quite interesting and helpful, in particular in relating our potential neighbourhood density to the existing density in other places around the city.
61	QE	Generally pleased with direction BUT there is little information on the massing and heights of the 6-8 storey buildings being contemplated at 25th and Cambie.	Would reserve judgement until Phase 3 - need more information.	More commercial at 25th and Cambie? Walkable amenities.	Maybe put more effort in the street and less on the lane. Lane density is too expensive for the return - leave it to develop in a more incremental way.	2	1	FSR ratios are in line with proposed heights.
62	Other	It is a very good plan for the public and development community	very nice	more community centers and parks		5	3,4,5	Please consider impact on local schools. With the projected growth in the area are there enough schools to handle the growth or will new schools have to be built!
63	QE	Too big for this neighborhood. Not more than 2.5 storey on King Edward.	Too big, too much traffic. No parking. The road stay same.	More crime, more traffic.	Maximum fourplex on King Edward. Every single family home can change to fourplex without change the shape of the street, street front, and side and back yard.	1	1, 2	I hope that City cancels/regrets this proposal or make it much smaller. Not more than 2.5 storeys on King Edward.
64	CV	Great! I think this is long overdue - we need higher density for more affordable housing.		More focus around RAV stations; more pre-school locations		5	4	
65	OTC	Too much density - TOO high. It will change the safety and social consequences - already it has changed to be more unsafe and crowded.	Vancouver's density should be spread out - increase density on Granville - Oak - Main - Fraser - Victoria	More green space even if on apartments. More trees, keep view - openness	Seems like Hong Kong.			
66	QE	Character --> okay but still too dense --> take 2 storeys off each. Remain disappointed that a more comprehensive approach to the overall neighborhood isn't being taken. Planning the edges along main street is very limiting. Impacts neighborhoods with no shared density.	Townhouses/four storeys better than 6	More greenspace! Or at least maintenance of current ratios. Additional commercial near stations.		3 - Number of dwellings/hectare not as relevant as number of people --> these neighborhoods house families with kids therefore density is higher. Future targets seem very high. How were these established? What is the goal?		Don't feel that concerns of previous open houses were reflected. Density and number of floors barely altered! Existing parks and community centers are pretty full and serve a much larger area - how is assumption that there is capacity to double population? Cambie street along Queen Elizabeth - what happens when front yards eliminated/reduced - the street will not be the same.
67	LA	Good	Presently it's single family. Like to see multi-family zoning. Houses behind Cambie St. should be allowed to have higher height restrictions (four stories). Re-zone to multi-family.	More police present in train stations.	none	3	2	Speed up the process - keep expenses down.
68	CV	Please continue to keep max building heights low (4 storeys or less)		More recreational facilities (parks, pools, rinks). Retail also ok!		4	2, 3, 4	
69	LA	I support the project. Vancouver has to densify for people to use transit more and cars less. Also Oakridge mall should be allowed to grow down the road.	Would rental units be provided for the langara students?	More retail/shops at street level along Cambie and 49th Ave. The whole project looks great!		5	2	

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
70	QE	I am in favour of the higher densities proposed but very concerned about the transitions to single family homes. I would like to see density extended beyond just the busy streets.	There needs to be consistency between density of Cambie & the Heather lands. Single family homes sandwiched between 6 storey developments is not desirable. I would encourage Ash St between 37th & 33rd be rezoned consistent with either Cambie or Heather St.	More schools (elementary) and small parks	I like the idea of active landscapes. Small parks are preferred to large open spaces mature trees need to be protected	3	1	Single family homes on large lots is a relic of the past. I would like to see them replaced with higher densities applied liberally. Let entire neighborhoods rather than patchwork quilt of densities spread thin on busy streets
71	CV	It appears there is a lot of emphasis on adding housing near the skytrain. Although this is all important I am concerned that there should be an effort to increase transit flow perpendicular to the skytrain to avoid saturation of current transit lines, this should occur prior to increasing housing.	Again a lot of emphasis on housing, I think this neighbourhood would benefit from increased community resources as well. This seems to be a poorly utilized area - could benefit from a major transit or B line.	More transit		4	3	Loved the bar visualization graphs. Keep in mind balance between density and traffic flow busses are over packed will not deal well with increased urban density.
72	CV	No supportive of the building heights along King Edward		Need better amenities (Douglas Park Community Center is too small), no pool or rink, need lights for fields.	Bulge outs on Cambie. Heather street needs repaving to be a real bike route.	4	2	Artist drawing of Cambie/King Edward changes was very helpful in visualizing the impacts.
73	ML	Did the Langara/Marine divide change recently? The line should be at 49th Avenue or maybe even 57th Avenue	Future suggestions for phase 3 seems so out of character with the surround phase 2 proposals. Your density (people & jobs) estimates aren't clear, is this phase 2 only or at build out of phase III don't concentrate everyone on the corridor.	Need more parks & open space everywhere for active community space & buildings: consider extending Winnona Park all the way to Cambie, the city already owns a good portion of the land (lane & Yukon St), so the cost will be reasonable for the impact.	Produce a plan that show new sidewalks, boulevards, trees. Several streets still lack the essentials.	2	5	
74	OTC	No identifiable changes for res. Area (39th and Ash) other than large scale seniors center - off 41st and Ash. Proposed enhancement of Oakridge Senior Center/Library most welcome.	Surrounding areas - 41st and Cambie - 42 look promising.	Need small retail outlets outside of Oakridge, e.g. bakery, convenience store	Totally support enhanced crossing at 39th and Cambie (a current death trap). Would like to see access to Oakridge Mall west of traffic lights at 41st. Have grid crossing now, drivers are not compliant.	4	2, 4, 5	Interested in enhancement of "dog park" located at 37th between 33-37 adjacent to Eric Hamber. No night lights and not enough garbage cans - 2 located at entrance. This IS a designated dog park.
75	LA	I support public consultation process and density need to retain mixed neighborhoods & increase density in remaining single family residential areas with laneway housing - then improve laneway (this will decrease current criminal activity/drug deals and theft in dark/dead land space & protect environment/Fraser River fish habitat by permeable space vs. current toxic washout into storm drain)	Current mixed; predominantly single residential, cultural mix++ economic mix (lots of rental & home stays students); destination points (YMCA, Langara college, Langara Canada line stations Punjabi Market @ 49th & Main) *Traffic grid lock on 49th due to drop-off @ Canada line stations (parley because the 49th Ave bus serve is under capacity 30-50 waiting for bus & 1/2 hr serve @ night when college still open) college/Y/Punjabi Market traffic ++neighbourhood bypass traffic due to lights on Cambie St (49th to 41st & gridlock on 49th)	Need to 1. develop/improve plaza @ N/E corner of Oakridge & make it green!! 2) safer pedestrian & bike routes (too much by-passing car traffic 3) retail @ Canada in. stations on Cambie (e.g. corner grocery coffee shop etc) 4. safer bike rout' access f room Can Ln Bridge over Fraser River to north. 5) more green ways within neighbourhood NOTE: leave walk around Langara Golf course as a nature walk? It is highly used neighbourhood asset refuge from urban noise, trees on Cambie St edge form sound barrier	Current lack of integrated public realm IDEA: "greenway" on 51st Ave. Sunset Comm. Cntr/Main St Bus Stops/Height pedestrian traffic to Langara College/connect activities between Sunset comm. Cntr including lent between 51 & 52 Punjabi market/Langara College/Langara Park/YMCA/Oakridge Provide publish signage/education about environ't. habitat on gold course & perimeter pathway; underground streams & drainage to Fraser River/fish habitat. Langara Golf Course & College grounds have amazing habitat and wildlife & birds	5	2,5	1) please hold separate precinct public mtgs and expand east/west boundaries. Our lived neighbourhood crosses the neighbourhood/corridor boundary lines and the development issues are inter connected e.g. people use Oakridge as neighbourhood shopping, because 49th Mall is a cultural area not a neighbourhood shop area & Punjabi market 2) re-think Marine Dr. just 4-6 stories along Cambie & like proposal @ 45h/Cambie. Do not shadow the single family homes. this plan is out of place. This is SO different from all other Can. Ln. Stations plans e.g. Broadway & Cambie, Olympic Village)
76	OTC	The bldg/high rises should take into consideration the "look" of the neighbourhood to provide more open space & greenery & not go beyond 6 storey's high as it affects the shadowing of the nearby residential bld. - townhouses will be most ideal	The Oakridge & nearby bldgs are a bit tired looking. I realized they're due for a face lift but was hoping not too H soon as well as we just undergone all these inconvenience when Canada Line was built. Also, again we are concern reg building too tall & lose the character effect of the area.	Nice walkways & covers a nice plaza on Oakridge corner to give as a landmark, possibly fountain (grand) or a monument w/ seating spaces for events.	nice street maps greenery roadways and walkways	3	2	please take into consideration the bldg character & height I believe that the city planners knows what is best but please make sure that some issues such as crimes, parking etc are fully taken into consideration in planning as well as the "look" of the neighbourhood is maintained or even enhanced
77	OTC	Reject the proposed zoning changes as it does not fit with the single family density of the neighborhood.	Wish it to remain single family density.	No	Current elements of neighborhood is more than adequate and has all of the above.	2	5	As a resident, I would reject the Cambie Corridor Rezoning Plan.
78	CV	There is a lot of densification that is going to take place. I find the Cambie/King Ed area busy enough. Too much traffic now at rush hour. I am feeling truly defeated that very litt was scaled back. I believe that we were not listened to.	Well behind me on King Ed there is still going to be 4 story buildings where there was once a house. We will still be loosing our privacy. I see that 3 storey townhouses are recommended to be right on the lane. It is not what the neighbors wanted. To protect our privacy & prevent shading we wanted only 2 or 2 1/2 story townhouses on the lots behind us. NOT mid rise buildings	NO and with densification the neighbourhood will become less livable.	Will if I am going to have 3 & 4 storey buildings built behind me then I want to be able to build a 3 storey laneway house in my backyard. I want that too. And I don't care that I am on a small lot. It shouldn't matter given how many people you are going to cram into what used to be single family lots!			The city planners and builders obviously have an agenda that they intend to follow regardless of it's impact on the people who are presently living in the areas affected. So now, I feel that we need to begin speaking to city councilors instead! And we will!
79	CV	Terrible - not conducive to "community" transient condos with an established "neighborhood"	Not listening to feedback. Housing forms not RPSC approved.	No benefits identified - only increased density which is NOT a benefit!	Realm elements = "developer speak". Plan for my lane is to make it into a main access road for your 4 storey and 2 1/2 storey buildings.			Laneway houses (townhouses) - setback not right at lane - green space to "transition" to single family homes (many of which are actually multi-family). Parking will be a NIGHTMARE. Please listen to feedback ...
80	CV	Densities should be increased only in existing higher density areas e.g. Oakridge - It is the increased density (is these areas) is a must expand the area to go East-West from Main to Oak. Densification will be gradual throughout the area instead of being concentrated in small areas	should conform to RPSC as originally intended. If you spread increased density over a larger area you won't need to have 4 or 6 storey - if developers can't make money with 4 story structures too bad!	No public benefit in my neighbourhoods. More people more cars (or will people moving into these areas not be allowed cars) will make the areas less livable. e.g. how much longer will it take me to get from my garage to Kind Edward to go to work! Increased Density = decreased livability	There is not enough excess land to make anything but cosmetic effects	1	1	1)Don't increase density in single family neighbourhoods. 2) If you must increase density; expand the area East-West to Oak -Main so the development doesn't occur like a TIDAL WAVE from King Edward outward. Let it sprout up over a bigger area. 3) Listen to the people who live in the area. 4) Don't let the developers lead the process
81	Unknown	Strongly object to high-rises - even 6 stories are too high		no public benefits without corresponding schools, parks, community centers. The city is turning the Cambie corridor into a WEST END				Support more free standing smaller houses on shared lots with private entrances
82	QE	King Ed to 39th Ave should remain simple family homes. Increasing the height and density would be too disruptive and uprooting for the long time residents of the area.	My neighborhood has CHARACTER and it's a long ESTABLISHED character which MUST NOT be changed.	None what so ever.	I'm restricting my comments strictly to the area of King Ed to 39th. Please to change anything for the sake of changing.	4	2	We've lived in the neighborhood for over 30 years and we strongly object to any increase in the height and density of the Cambie area from King Ed to 39th. Leave the Queen E Park area alone because it has a regal character and identity.
83	OTC	Becoming crowded.	Should build talled buildings to accommodate more inhabitants.	Not enough "open green spaces". No provision for comprehensive community center - needed.	Wider streets and wider sidewalks with lamps and trees; good/better public transportation system - especially on weekends, Sundays and holidays.	1, 2	5	Ms. _____ was helpful
84	OTC	Retain Boulevard/greenspace nature of Cambie Street. Oakridge center policy "plan" improves utilization	Key concerns building heights 6-8 - 10 ok at 41st & 49th Canada line stations 6 (+8) might work for Cambie otherwise 6 too high, also parking will be huge issue	Oakridge center good pedestrian improvements very important to us	Tidying lanes would be good-disappointed to see "power" poles and "wires" remain in the artists sketch -they need to go!	2	2	Not additional but bad impacts - building height parking good impacts - improved amenities pedestrians considered

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
85	OTC	Good time for change - sooner the better	Single family RS1 for now. Like to see multi-family options such as rowhouses, courthouses, lo rise apartments, stack housing... etc. on Yukon st 39th to 49th avenue	Oakridge community centre - wight room/fitness centre, gym	Have more safety for citizens from drug dealers close to Canada Line Stations and public parks.	2	1	Re-zone Yukon St to multi-family and allow higher heights due to high 6-8 sotries buildings on Cambie St. (same as Ash St. 45th - 49th). Allow zoning to combine severallots together for multi-family options.
86	OTC	A matter of evolution that multifamily residences will be in the future for areas that are this close to rapid transit	SFD has had their time	Oakridge will always be an upper middle class neighbourhood	Current city planning does a very good job of it now. Not worried of the final product	4	2,3,4,5	It was helpful to have interpreters
87	LA	There is lots of mention of development along the corridor but little mention of how other areas will be developed, almost like "putting all your eggs in one basket"	Little change	Park maintenance e.g. the tennis courts surfaces are cracked and tennis balls can bounce everywhere		2	2	No mention of possible changes in crime rate or action considered to prevent or assist in dealing with that change
88	CV	I think it's great to continue building the commuity on Cambie. The corridor hs great potential and the additional shops/parks etc. will make it a destination in Vancouver.	The existing low-rise apartments 19th-24th are a great way for renters like me to live in the neighbourhood - we need more!	Parks and green spaces in general.		3	2,3,5	This is a much needed development for Vancouver. As a young, working professional unable to afford a house in Vancvover city limits, I realize the need for more dense neighbourhoods and a developed community. Please don't make me move to Surrey!
89	LA		10 stories on corner seems too high	pedestrian only lanes	Public plazas need to take our climate/weather into consideration			
90	ML	Many of the ideas is very good		Please built affordable housing., subsidized rental housing much more in this area near Canada Line. All tenants of 8150 apartment (present rental is \$495 big bachelor) should able to move in some of the subsidized rental housing without being waiting list. We really like this area but very hard to find rental suit for only \$495. We don't want to move to Surrey or Langley or Delta.	If there is a ice rink for hockey or skating more convenient.	4	2	
91	QE	Encourage the Phase 3 study. Would like to see a comprehensive plan rather than just 6 storey density on busy streets. The pain of change is in the transitions. 6 stories is too high when transitioning to 2 storey existing homes.	Would like to see consistent 3-4 storey character rather that stark transition in density. Why not rezone the whole phase 3 together to encourage development of a new community with an overall plan. Phase 2 is far too piecemeal.	Protects parks and smaller green spaces needed for relief		4	3	
92	QE	During canada line construction, the neighbourhood requested a small, non commercial entry to discourage loitering and crime, which was honoured, only to be dismissed with the 6-8 storey buildings and increase commercial space proposals. Emerging identity - maintain commercial development in areas with existing zoning, and not change residential areas to commercial.	2 blocks east and west of cambie along King Ed - maximum 3 stories with flat roofs, to maintain views for residents south of King Ed, and ensure shadowing of properties on north side is minimized. The proposal plans showed shadows at Equinox at 2pm, misleading the actual shadowing that will occur the majority of the year especially on the west side of cambie where there is sloping. The mix of modern and traditional archetecture is fine.	Public benefits - you know them and that is why there is a desire to exploit them. Additions that will be needed with increased density will be more child care spaces (already a shortage), more public school space, more traffic calming with increased density, more parking for hospital staff & canada line riders who park on our blocks instead of taking transit from their homes.	Sidewalks with wheelchair accessible ramps, country lane alleys that discourage speed and cutting through.			we have attended the open houses at Oakridge in June and last month. It surprises me that a majority of my adjacent neighbours are still not aware of the "invitations" to view the proposals the city are putting forward. It is not because this issue in not important, but rather the residents are busy, single & dual income families, many with children who are so busy with work, volunteer commitments and trying to maintain the integrity of the neighbourhood that they choose to settle in. Many did not notice the small city notices that are bulk delivered amongst the multitudes of other flyers put in mailboxes that look like advertising. If the goal is to candidly inform residents, then like city tax statements, they should be mailed. People feel like the process has been lacking transparency, starting with the initial notice of intent to residents starting in mid June when families are busy with school year end and summer holidays. This is the second time this neighbourhood feels deceived by the city, first was the undisclosed cut and cover for the canada line, and now the "improvements" to our c
93	OTC	Too much density thereby NOT preserving the residential character	Not enough information to the existing home owners	Public benefits are against the existing property owners also the subject properties on Cambie & W 41st Ave. are rewarded with higher land values!!	There has been NO extensive studies on the impact of street lands etc on the residential properties.	3	2	My impression shows very high density over shadowing existing residential properties. There should not be blanket zoning but on a case by case basis. All municipalities ask that a contract be shown of a land assembly before any rezoning takes place. Here the properties are carte blanche given the highest density thereby opposite to the standard norm.
94	QE	The illustration of the possible future of QE Preccinct looks very unnatractive. Our current neighborhood has an openness that leads into a welcoming QE Park and community. This proposal of increase urbanization ruins the beautiful and natural neighborhood that we have. The potential new housing types such as mell (?) house-infills or cottages on shared lots as well as duplexes are okay, anything more than 2 stories high ruins the landscape.	Mainly single property owners withing a tight-knit community. There are few duplex houses on Cambie st. It's a nice quiet homey neighborhood. Do not want buildings that are more than 2 storeys high.	Public benefits in my neighborhood are: easy access to public transportation (Canada line, busses), also QE Park provides natural greenery, recreational activities. We've enjoyed the walk paths through the QE park. Opposed to affordable and subsidized rental housing.	Convex side mirrors for neighborhood backlanes would be beneficial to prevent car collisions in blindspots. More lighting for the park sidewalk as well as surveillance cameras if budget permits to help decrease crime. Have signs to prohibit/prevent parking in backlanes.	1	1	We're opposed to the building of high and medium density housing on Cambie st. and the general urbanization of our neighborhood. These would bring more cars which take up our residential parking spaces as well as fill the already narrow streets and lanes.
95	CV	This corridor deserves a more commerical urban character throughout its length - especially with the installation of rapid transit line.	A continuous mid-rise form along its length, mixed use in nature, would be welcome.	Public benefits should include plazas, community spaces, libraries, recreation all focused within mixed-use forms on Cambie st. near transit stations.	I would like to see Cambie become a "complete" street - reduced car lanes, segregated bike lanes, wider sidewalks.	3	2	

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
96	QE	The emerging character sounds great, but I question the way 'phase 3', or planning off the arterials may or may not even happen much less be an integral part of the planning process now. Why is density focussed on Cambie at say 31st, but then at say 26th and Ash it will be single family residential—even though that is much closer than 29th/Cambie. The density should be basically concentric from the station to maximize the investment in transit. This can also foster a real neighbourhood or community around each station rather than just a humdrum line of condos with no real feel. Also, more commercial activity at King Ed/Cambie would be a benefit. And keep the rental properties along Cambie at 21st/22nd.	Built Form--The transition from Cambie west should be gradual, not 4-6 story buildings down to single family residential right away. On 30th, two brand new large single family homes are just being completed now. Why is this type of construction going in right where this plan calls for density? They should be townhomes, row housing or something similar. This is a City, it should be treated as such!	Public benefit—The plans for park acquisition for active recreation are critical for this area. QE Park is a great asset, but a significant portion is passive—there will be a growing demand for active park space, especially with the demographics that will live in these new condos.	Public realm—Make the lanes fun! There should be restaurants opening onto them, art, trees, interactive elements, unique signs, etc...This is another advantage of concentric development—you can have real integrated plazas and public places. It is more difficult to get that type of open space when all the buildings face one way (Cambie). Incorporate urban agriculture, fruit trees, etc.. into development and public places. Incorporate history into developments and the public space and above all else don't settle for crappy architecture! Everything nowadays looks the same—please be creative and be unique.			
97	OTC	Planning stage too long.	Re-zone neighbourhoods especially streets close to Cambie st. at same time to more than RS1 (rowhouses)	Public safety and property theft due to Canada Line.	None.	2	1	Allow options more than single family zoning on parallel streets to Cambie - similar to Ash St. such as Ast St., Yukon st, Alberta St.
98	OTC	Change for the good. Increase density on Cambie and houses behind Cambie (i.e. Ash st. and Yukon St.)	Big lots and single houses for now. Change the zoning to multi-family (rowhouses, stackhouses, court, townhomes etc.)	Public safety around skytrain station neighbourhoods.	Flexible	2	1	Since Cambie street buildings (41st-49th ave) will be 6-12 storeys (which is ok) our neighborhood would like to have the option of having multi-family and at least 4 storey high buildings on Yukon St which is backyard to Cambie st. 46th-48th ave. Thanks.
99	OTC	Far too much density is being added to this area. Density results in large increases in noise, parking, pollution, traffic, shading and congestion for the neighbourhoods, plus a general decrease in quality of life.	Currently there are houses along 41st. The addition of 12-6 storey apartment buildings will too drastically change the character of the neighbourhood and result in shading and a lack of privacy for the existing adjacent properties. Combined with the huge increase in density along Cambie and at the Oakridge Center this will too drastically change our area.	Queen Elizabeth Park is very nice	A public seating area around Oakridge would be nice. Trees in lanes behind apartment blocks would also be nice. HOWEVER, as a current resident I do not see that any number of bike paths, foot paths, cafes, etc, will in any way offset the negatives that densification will bring.			The residents of this area are being skid to absorb too much density. Townhouses on the North side on 41st in the first block East of Cambie would make a whole area seem a lot less like Metro town.
100	QE	I've looked through the materials online for the identity and character information but I do not find it. Is there anything? I will say this, as you know, the Cambie Corridor includes a number of neighbourhoods (Cambie Village, Riley Park South Cambie, Oakridge, Langara and Marpole). A corridor is a passageway and I don't believe the 'corridor' itself will have an identity. It is the individual neighbourhoods in it the corridor that will have an identity. The identity of each neighbourhood will depend on the vision that each neighbourhood has. They will grow quickly or grow slowly depending on what happens in those neighbourhoods. What happens in the neighbourhoods is a direct result of what the residents in those neighbourhoods want to see happen. If a current vision exists (such as RPSC) then respect it, especially if the residents have spoken clearly in support of their vision. If an outdated vision exists (such as Marpole) then work at creating an updated plan that respects the visions of that neighbourhood. Don't try and consolidate all these neighbourhoods to arrive at an identity for a corridor. That	The neighbourhood I live in is residential, quiet and beautiful. Our community vision does allow for increased density however the built forms that are approved within the vision are not the built forms that you are suggesting. I am a relative newcomer to this neighbourhood, however I lived for 13 years in the big box neighbourhood of the corridor (Cambie and 6 th area). I purchased this home in 2005 and undertook a major renovation in 2006 that lasted for 2 years. I feel that I (and others) should be able to rely on RPSC visions when I make decisions to buy or renovate. If the visions are current and this area has current vision (2005 council approval) then you should let the area develop under the vision for 20 years before imposing policy changes that go against the vision. I am not saying no changes to the neighbourhood in 20 years but changes that are consistent with the vision. Sure, check in with people and see if they are amenable to more aggressive change but if they aren't (and clearly from the walkabout/workshop King Edward is not) then respect that. Prior to purchasing and renovating, we inform	Redevelopment of land in the cambie corridor will provide opportunity to secure park space, improve park space". I do not support development under the guise that it improves Queen Elizabeth Park. I am not sure what improvements you suggest and an improvement in one man's eye will not be an improvement in another. Similar to how the response to the bikeway down the boulevard idea was not well received, the "improving" of something is not always the goal, because improving may not actually be what people want or are ready for, yet. This is why proper consultation is needed. So, my point is additions and enhancements are not always necessary.	"by creating more space for public use, the lane can become an enjoyable common area". Huh? I don't understand this. I picture my lane. How will you create a public space and still allow for cars to come into their garages and driveways? The lane is a dangerous place for public common space because although it is not a street, it will have cars in it as they travel to and from their garages and driveways. I've just read the board on plazas and spaces about 3 times and I am not sure what my comment is. I guess in general, I agree that we need space. However I am mostly struck by the sell job. Selling these 'plazas and spaces' to make up for the cramped conditions that the built forms will create. I see on the plan that the VW bug display is at the King Edward station is a 'street space'. Is this albeit temporary street space an attraction? Does it bring people to gather in the area? I've walked by it many times and mostly I am struck by the free parking that is there and wonder how in earth that ever came to be! Free parking in Vancouver. Wow. Encouraging car use. That's not very green. I don't see pec			Well, as you know, I am not in favour of the plan as you propose it. I describe it as an assault on my neighbourhood. I feel it accurately describes how it affects and impacts not only me but my neighbours all around this station area. 1. King Edward area is currently in RPSC community vision, stick to that vision. Now the city wants to pluck these King Edward blocks (and Cambie too) out of the RPSC vision and put them in the new Cambie Corridor "community plan". 2. Can the entire Cambie Corridor can be called a 'community'? Calling it a community plan is alarming not only because it is a large area, but also if this process we are going through is a new community plan, then proper consultation should be taking place, not this 'come plan the cambie corridor' invitation that doesn't even indicate the area we are planning. 3. Are 3 storey laneway houses a bit much? not to mention 4 storey apartment buildings? Some city residents are upset about 1.5 storey laneway homes that are popping up in their lanes. In our case, in our lanes the plan is basically for up to 3 storey laneway houses. 4. Demand our King Ed area to be removed from phase 2 planning. I note on the la 5. Our community isn't 4 quadrants. King Edward and Cambie are our community to
101	OTC		Quiet, peaceful residential area.	Remain the same. Additional 6-8 storey building will result in density problems, policing problems, and noise and pollution.	Stay the same.			Reduce the height and density of the 41st Avenue.
102	CV	I think it will improve the neighbourhood. I love the Olive building (on 16th) as an example. It will provide more housing which is necessary. I encourage you to add bike lanes where possible to encourage use of transit (not cars).	Olive building adds to the character of Cambie. Use as an example of good design. Lots of run-down houses on King Edward between Cambie and Ash!	Riley Park is great (near 25th and Cambie) --> green space/wide sidewalks	Trees planted - I noticed that the trees on King Edward between Cambie and Ash are NOT thriving. Please look into replanting/planting more trees in the land between the roads on King Edward.	4	4, 5	I believe, if done well, these proposals will add value to the existing neighbourhood.
103	CV	RPSC approved housing types only	RPSC approved house types only	RPSC approved housing types only	RPSC approved housing types only	3	2	I won't vote for them if the mayor and councilors insist to support this proposed plan. Please keep our Riley Park neighbourhood the way it is RPSC approved housing types only.
104	OTC	No comment	If City is proposing to build 12-storey building for Cambie 5500 to 5600 block it would be unavoidable to have big shadowing and privacy impacts for residents living at Ash Street 5500 to 5600 blocks. We strongly feel that City should consider land use change for Ash at the same time with Cambie.	Should consider having another entrance/exit for the skytrain station at Cambie and 41st	Please consider walkway at the intersection of W.39th and Cambie in order to calm traffic from 39th Avenue.			
105	OTC	No comment	If City is proposing to build 12-storey building for Cambie 5500 to 5600 block it would be unavoidable to have big shadowing and privacy impacts for residents living at Ash Street 5500 to 5600 blocks. We strongly feel that City should consider land use change for Ash at the same time with Cambie.	Should consider having another entrance/exit for the skytrain station at Cambie and 41st	Please consider walkway at the intersection of W.39th and Cambie in order to calm traffic from 39th Avenue.			

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments	
106	OTC	Overall I support the increased density along the main streets	Good the 6-8 storey along 4 lot is good. I would support the higher heights as this may allow density objectives to be met while retaining more single family off of the main street	Should ensure benefits remain local to the area identification in questions 1 e.g. should also be taking benefits from Oakridge and applying it to Cambie Village	Is any review of above ground utilities to be moved underground along the lanes, laneways lighting should be studied	4	4&5	The lowering of heights from Oakridge Centre seems to apply in the east west direction more than north south.	
107	CV	I like and support it. I certainly feel that density goals have been sacrificed in the latest plan - I gather partially due to feedback at immediate vicinity residents. I worry that compromises on density will affect the affordability of new homes in the area. It's difficult to please everyone. I hope the committee and council recognize that the vast majority of supporters of green, livable increases in density are unaware or unable to participate in these open house sessions and therefore a significant amount of the feedback received is from a vocal minority.	Specifically conservative at Cambie and King Ed. Give \$2 billion (!) investment in light rail. Please don't waste this incredible gift to the city.	Soccer fields are in short supply. Continued finding to maintain Douglas park and Queen Elizabeth Park.		3	3,4	Huge potential here. Fantastic work by the committee, but again, please don't let the vocal minority compromise the utility and value of this project to the city. Thank you.	
108	CV	Cambie is "commercialized use "premium" high end stores". King Edward "established" residential.	"Carriage Trade" classic established punctuated by the odd Chinese "Box Car" - not build on but overseas acquired (?) as safety deposit box for Cher... (?) - where "surplus" Chinese females lived out their lives, sent here to attend real estate as "unlucky" finding a husband (?) DO YOU KNOW THAT?	The "shooting ..." of observation tower in QE Park ... for ... locals, and "gas/diesel" buses, more shopping, enhanced Douglas Park	Remove "No Parking" signs which pollute our realm, have ... to guests, a dumpster for ..., continuous sidewalks and road construction everywhere ... 7 multi-culturalism (?) is a sham on our street most Chinese ... homes ... used as address of convenience to get to UBC.	5	2, 3, 5	Planning "principles" are very "subjective" not "objective" - poor language but typical for planners in this city. No comment on "harmonization" with existing conti... (?) home design - "Shaughnessy" ... harmed ... of "frontal" harmonization laws, which Van Planning does not employ as do other cities. Strongly object to extension of multi-use along King Edward Ave. The "renderings" are outstanding - I find "justification" language primitive and obtuse.	
109	CV	You haven't provided residents enough "accurate" information about the scope and details of your tentative plans. You have the model of development along 16th Ave between Cambie and Oak to help residents graphically understand the process of local change. There is a sense that you are violating a mature evolution of the identity and character of the area.	Whose "built form and character"? The planning department or the local residents? Why don't you walk around the area with a group of residents including seniors, kids, parents, singles and find out how they experience the buildings, streets, parks. You civil servants need to get out of your airconditioned cocoon.	The benefits include: housing at human scale which emphasizes privacy and independence; walkable streets and sidewalks; green spaces and parks that are intensely used year round; easy access to retail units that meet the needs of individuals and families who have a wide range of incomes - all reinforced by a social network that is comfortable and supportable.	What we have works very well. We could increase density gradually over the next 10-20 years and not try to recreate the 6 storey buildings of Paris and London and Istanbul. Have any of you taken a look at what is happening to international capital markets and housing commercial use markets over the past 2 years? You need a reality check about the market for your density proposals.	1	2	This is the type of top down planning process that resulted in "urban renewal" in the 1950s-1960s. There appears to be little evidence that your staff has been acquainted with the more human planning processes that have taken place in Portland and San Francisco. You guys need to start talking to real people and get your noses out of your textbooks and away from your computers.	
110	CV	The Cambie Corridor is not one homogeneous entity. In trying to reimagine an (over)densified street stretching from South West Marine Drive to the Cambie Bridge, you treat it as if it were. Although this iteration of the overall plan addresses separate sections of Cambie Street, acknowledging that it consists of several distinct neighbourhoods, each with its own character and geographical features, the Phase II imposition of highrise and lowrise buildings on just about every millimeter will create an "identity" which I and many of us who actually live here vehemently oppose. This plan will destroy the character of the neighbourhoods along Cambie Street; it will neither enhance nor improve them. The artists' renditions of what Cambie Street might look like should Phase II be implemented in its present flawed form envision a monstrously deformed, unfriendly, cold "corridor" (a wind tunnel) unrecognizable as Cambie Street. Who would want to live there?	My family and I have lived in the Cambie Village area for seventeen years, fourteen of those as renters and the past three as proud homeowners. The small independent businesses in the Cambie Village are trying to reestablish themselves after the major losses incurred by them during the three-and-a-half years of Canada Line construction and constriction. Allowing much higher buildings in the Cambie Village will certainly lead to more construction disruption and the destruction of the village feeling which makes this area so attractive to those of us living nearby. The building heights and densities Phase II still proposes are just as preposterous as they were during the first round of "consultation" with citizens last June. The massive buildings Phase II will allow around the West King Edward Avenue Canada Line station will have a totally negative impact on the neighbourhood and all of the homeowners who live on the adjacent streets. Those living south of West King Edward Avenue will enjoy a vision of highrise monoliths instead of the breathtaking vistas of downtown and the North Shore mountains they ar	The Canada Line construction created new and highly used sidewalks and beautiful new street lighting from West King Edward Avenue through to about West 12th Avenue. It is a pleasure to walk along this section of Cambie Street, because the scale and character of the area have not been "enhanced" by those who dream of transforming it into a (lifeless) "corridor." The street view looking north from West King Edward Avenue through the Cambie Village to West 12th Avenue is stunning. It invites pedestrians. Highrise buildings, arbitrary rezoning, and radically revising Cambie Street will dissuade pedestrians and cyclists and, ultimately, ruin the neighbourhood we call home. I see no "public benefits" arising from Phase II.	On the one hand, Phase II taketh away; on the other hand, Phase II giveth. After taking away public space through (over)densification, Phase II proposes to "enhance" lanes and streets (whatever that kind of double speak may mean), and create public plazas, habitat, and green space from a drastically reduced inventory of possible sites. This seems to be a sop for those saps whose neighbourhoods have been petrified through densification and whose quality of life has been drastically reduced by City Hall's draconian plans.	1	1	The entire Cambie Corridor plans is an ideologically driven assault by the myopic Vision party who rules City Hall. This is social engineering on a massive scale, which developers will love and those who love their affected homes and neighbourhoods will detest. It is an insult to our neighbourhoods and to the citizens and ratepayers who will bear the brunt of City Hall's flawed political agenda, pushed with unseemly haste and excluding (by design) those most affected—whose radar is not attuned to City Hall's feeble communications about its plans. We who live here are the unwilling guinea pigs upon whom Vision is conducting its experiment in urban and social(ist) planning. We appear have the dubious honour to be the first west side area City Hall wants to completely rezone, reorganize, and rewrite. Would residents of Shaughnessy, Point Grey, Southlands, Dunbar, Kitsilano, or Kerrisdale allow City Hall to impose its narrow-minded and arrogant will on their neighbourhoods? The Norquay Neighbours (a citizens' action group in the Norquay area of East Vancouver) has just lost its fight against City Hall, after a four-year battle. That neig The Riley Park South Cambie community vision was passed by City Hall in 2005. W Phase III is perhaps even more outrageous than Phase II, as it proposes to complet	
111	ML	For Cambie Village Q.E. area the proposed max heights seem reasonable. There is a problem for both developers and residents when the max in height near the station is NOT specified. For clear understanding and proper planning, the maximum height should be specified e.g. 8 storey + 2-4 storey's max in (add's) near station	The heights proposed for the towers at Cambie & Marine as well as Oakridge are too great. Langara Towers at 18-20 storey's should be the bench mark. Lower towers going north from Langara Towers and maybe 2-4 storey's more to compensate for the down slope to Cambie at Marine to a maximum of 22-24 storey - NOT the 300-350 ft. towers that are proposed	The proposed benefits would be welcomed but let us make sure that the neighborhoods are not so adversely impacted by the densification that the current residents feel so "pressured" that they leave because their neighbourhood livability is destroyed and their quality of life degraded. Only absentee (or local) landlords will be left - but you won't have the kind of community Vancouver has experience so far.	The public realm ideas are well thought out and does incorporate the ideas put forth at the previous workshops and open houses and the proposed elements look attractive and would be welcomed by any community.	2	1,2,3	1) put the word GRAPH on each diagram that is a graph. 2) for density - an AREA e.g. a circle with sectors to denote amounts/density - would be easier to understand - in living colours!	
112	QE	I am not a proponent of trying to attract unwanted density to our tight-nit neighbourhood. The presence of the sky-train station at the corner of King Edward has brought unwanted problems to our neighbourhood (including increased presence of vehicles parked along our lanes and streets, litter from commuters, loitering/vandalism), I can't imagine what will happen if the population is increased by 10-fold! The inhabitants of the Cambie Corridor love the village as it is - a charming, quiet, family-oriented area - which will certainly be lost by city developers trying to create a cookie-cutter high density commercialized block with no thought to the people who have invested not only their money, but their heart in to their neighbourhood. We chose this area for our quality of life - please have some respect for that.	I'm confused as to how one can possibly think they can fit both a 4 storey apartment and a 3 storey lane house in the lots along King Edward... The lots adjacent to my home are small and I can not imagine how two structures and a lane could be placed in that square footage.. Will me and my neighbours be packed in like sardines, with complete loss of our privacy and in the shadows of 4-6 storey buildings?! It is unfortunate that changes you propose to "enhance" the Cambie Corridor will in fact force many long-time residents to re-think living in this neighbourhood...	The public benefits in my neighbourhood are already good enough - we don't need more enhancements. We live in the middle of the city, 10m away from downtown.. why do we need more amenities/commercialization?	As previously mentioned, the current plan suggests that lanes will separate our homes from the new developments... but where are you going to put them? Our lanes are tiny already!				These plans need to be seriously re-considered in order to come up with an idea that is consistent with the vision the people who actually live in this neighbourhood....

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
113	ML	Very positive; high density and taller buildings at the transit hubs is appropriate for a more sustainable city; I like the midrise buildings along the corridor and between the transit hub. Density of this scale is needed to meet Vancouver's goals for greenest city. Nimbys need to get over it!	See above	The public realm master plan for Cambie and Marine is great. Would like to see that implemented as a very green and innovative, highly designed pilot project to push the envelope and transform the corridor. If this can be done then the height and density would be less of a concern for the neighborhood.	Lots of greenspace within streetscape; public art is key; find a way to implement the public realm master plan shown for Marine Landing; repedestrianize the street; use innovation like that found in Europe for pedestrianizing the corridor.	4	2, 3	Great job by the city to bring developers together to get a comprehensive plan; appreciate the efforts to gain community input; plans are good, moving in the right direction; push envelope on design, sustainability and innovation.
114	QE	So far phase 2 seems very well planned in line of the EcoDensity policy.	Changes are inevitable, encourage ridership of the Canada Line is a must.	The whole area within 500 meters from the transit station shall all be re-zoned into high density to encourage ridership of the train.		4	4	
115	LA	I don't like the idea of large, i.e. 10 storey buildings, being built along Cambie. Can these not be restricted to 6 storeys? 10 storeys is TOO dense.	Our neighborhood has a great feel and is a comfortable place to live.	The YMCA should remain.	There is some green space - more would benefit.	4		
116	Other	I'm troubled by the "silo" approach. The plans for this corridor ought to be dealt with within their neighbourhood plans	What is built form and character? There is a problem with the language used here. I feel that you don't really want my input because you are making me learn another language. When you use jargon, you make me feel inferior or stupid	This corridor development has the potential of sucking the life out of Granville St & Marpole.	I don't think the developers are particularly interested - horse trading? The "would be nice" stuff is not guaranteed while "they" build away	1		The proposals look very nice. The only inconsistent node is Marine Drive Station. All the other stations appear to have developments proposed on a human scale. Marine Drive PC1 proposal exhibits its phalloretric pre-occupation. Density can and in this case should not be achieved by very tall buildings. Something along what is proposed at QE is more suitable
117	CV	I think your house between Yukon & Cambie on 23rd Ave will be for sale. I don't think you can transition between 4 storeys on King Ed and 1.5 on 23rd in one city lot. I think density should increase by building 3 storey houses on King Ed.	Instead of 2 blocks of 4 storey buildings, why not 3 storey buildings Cambie to Main? Four stories instead of 6 is an improvement on the original plan. What happened to the RPSC accepted building forms?	Too much density will push transit users back into their cars.		3		
118	LA	Please get rid of deciduous trees on 49th ave from Canada Line to Langara College. Also fix the busted sidewalks. In the same area, for safety, remove high hedges and walls.	Small grocery stores other than Safeway and convenience stores near 49th, in other words low buildings with commercial use along 49th ave.	Towards campus medical, SPCA, laundry, restaurants, fabric, dollar store, meat markets, public benefits if it means they slow down to shop instead of speeding through.	48th Avenue for 2 blocks either side of area near Cambie has drug traffic. Opening it up by removing fencing and hedges would help and setting green spaces back by 10 ft from the sidewalks on both Cambie and 49th (private properties) would help.	2	3, 4	If someone already has building permits approved please add to information on posters.
119	OTC	No high density rezoning.	No high rises.	Town houses are okay.				I am against any high density developments. No high rises - no 6-8 storey buildings what so ever.
120	OTC	Far too much density is being proposed for too high buildings	Right now there are just houses between Cambie & Alberta on 43 - 37 Av. Adding 12-6 storey apartment building on 41st East of Cambie will too much change the character of our neighbourhood	Townhouses only on 41st East of Cambie Please!	N/A			I have live on 400 Block W 40 since 1964 and I am 86 years old. I want to remain in my home and do not want any apartments on 41st East of Cambie. NOTE: the area has already increased uncomfortably!
121	CV		Some guidelines to developers would be preferable to the HAPHAZARD changes happening now: older homes being changed/replaced, by house with bsmt. suites. Laneway houses that don't create anything affordable	Underground public lots could be used as neighbourhood recycling centers (moving around as development takes place.) Junk electronic, especially & oversize items could be brought to N.R.C. instead of sitting soaking for weeks in lands until they somehow disappear e.g. next to King Ed. station at the present time.	Lanes in Cambie Village tend to be a mess. I think it's unrealistic to expect they may become more inviting places.	1	1	Density around 33rd s/b allowed only when 33rd station is close to being opened. Cambie from Marine to King Edward and from the bridge into downtown as far as (approx) Granville are seen by drivers as fast moving arterial. From bridge to King Edward does not function as arterial. More needs to be done to advise vehicle from Richmond & south that the intended route into downtown & to the Lions Gate are Oak & Granville (if that's the case). If the congestion from bridge to King Edward is intended signage should let drivers know that Your "how it might look" drawing shows I think a built form that might exist 20 to 30 years in the future. To "sell" these "plans" you out to have drawings (based on your expectation) at 5,10,15, 20 years etc., from now.
122	LA	I don't know why you are still promoting old-fashioned strip development along Cambie. Especially between 45th and 49th. With the Canada line at capacity now, the extra densities in the proposal would tax it even more. I shudder at the thought of tearing down perfectly good housing without trying to salvage material of demolished housing. A lot of prime old-growth timber is being wasted, especially in my neighborhood.	Area around Langara College and the Y is a great route. Traffic is slow along 49th due to traffic lights at every intersection, narrow streets, well-lined trees etc. Perfect for making this the neighborhood center with south-facing commercial activity a la Kerrisdale featuring coffee shops, delis, and boutiques which can't afford the high rents in the malls. College can share parking, student housing on upper floors...	Vandalism, petty theft is already happening since the Canada Line was put in. It has also encouraged high speed traffic so more policing is needed. Traffic congestion at 59th and Cambie has to be addressed. Obviously Langara College, the Y, the linear trails and golf course are huge assets and should be encouraged i.e. not succumb to development pressures - bring back a neighborhood police station.	I note that "maintaining natural habitat" is a joke, since it is non-existent in some areas. Some of the stations (e.g. Langara) are pretty ugly. Are there plans to beautify them? Make Oakridge mall a plaza/node and forget the commercial/retail along Cambie past or south or 45th.	4	2, 3	I would have liked more information on some of the trends in the area, e.g. changes in school population and catchment area, changes in population profile, socio-economic characteristics, etc. Then we can determine if the plan really addresses the goals. e.g. does it really attract younger families? Do we just want high income folks; how will we accommodate a mix of socio-economic backgrounds? My banker and my friends' kids can NOT afford to live in this area.
123	QE	Very Good	Very good	very good	very good	5	4	This plan will make Cambie Corridor very beautiful and useful I love very much of this plan.
124	CV	Looks good! Sensitive to existing neighborhoods w/transition provided	No "villas" please! The existing homes in the neighbourhood are mainly small. A four plex works if the units retain a sense of individuality, not if it becomes a large mass	Very important - senior & childcare centers - pedestrian friendly sidewalks in front of shops - lots of green - spaces from tiny to expansive - lots of place to stop, sit and enjoy	See #4 - I like the idea of making our lanes more inviting - more greenspace please	5	2,3	
125	CV	I am not happy about the increased density - I live very close to the corridor & think this will result in me being forced from my house. I have many reservations about the "ecology" of this	Keep the new buildings as small as possible	VIEWS! One of the best things about Vancouver - VIEWS! Other good things - green space, wildlife in city, salmon in our rivers!	We have a very nice green area!	5	2,4,5	Presentation is good!

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
126	QE	I live in what you are now all of a sudden calling the Queen Elizabeth area, although I am right on the border of the Village area. I am opposed to you breaking up the area like this. I consider that I live in the King Edward station area. Further to that, I think that the 500 meter "walking zone" around the station should not be broken up. It is the immediate neighbourhood around that station and should only be considered for any rezoning as a whole and done in the same phase with proper public consultation. It is difficult to comment on this when you don't have the emerging identity statement on your web page. I'll answer as if it is similar to the last identity statement from the previous round of open houses... they sound like nice goals on the surface there just isn't enough substance to the words, too many buzz words that are unclear to the average resident. I also don't believe the plan you have proposed will deliver on your goals. The prime example is "neighbourhoods with distinct character which merit appropriate design responses". This point seems to be clear	I live in a beautiful and quiet neighbourhood. I'm very unhappy about what is proposed. In the King Edward & Cambie area 4-6 storey buildings are a very poor idea. The proposed heights significantly exceed heights of any other building in the area. Walking by buildings as big as this is unpleasant, and living beside one is unacceptable. Also, you should stipulate an exact maximum height that will be allowed instead of talking about storeys for these buildings, as taller than average floor to ceiling heights, and elevators and air conditioning units protruding up will contribute to the buildings being higher than 4 or 6 storeys. These proposed building heights (4, 6 and 8 storey) would create a wall that is double, triple and even quadruple the height of the average building in the area. I would like to remind the planners of the Cambie Corridor Planning Principles (Adopted by City Council January 22, 2010). Principle 4 (b) Consider creative and sensitive transitions in scale between developments around each transit station and the adjacent neighbourhoods. (d) Ensure new developments are in scale with the surrounding neighbourhoods. The proposed plan doesn't address these planning principles. Public views, especially of our local mountains, are one of	We have a lot of public benefits, especially Q.E. Park, and as long as you don't hide it behind a wall of condos, that is all I need.	One idea in the posters which I liked were "mini-parks" – small public areas where people can just sit and have coffee etc. I don't know what form that would take but I think they should be between some of the condos you envision so that it will break up the wall effect. More green space will certainly be need to "counter act" the effect of all these large buildings.			I am very opposed to the Cambie Corridor plan. When buying my current house I looked into the zoning and read the Community Vision for RPSC from cover to cover. While I knew that some kind of increased density would, and should, happen near the Canada line stations I thought they would be limited to RPSC Vision approved housing or possibly extend to "uncertain" housing types as they were close to having enough support to be approved. This exploration into "spot zoning" is far beyond what I ever imaged could be approved in this area (with the exception of on Cambie Street - north of King Edward only). Had I known what the city has really planning for this neighbourhood I would not have bought my current house and certainly would never have poured approx. \$400,000 down the drain into a major renovation. This proposed plan to put 4-6 storey buildings along King Edward Ave. (8 storeys at Cambie & King Ed), will force us nearby residents to sell our properties and move elsewhere. This is not what we want to have to do. Things that make the Cambie and King Edward area of Vancouver unique and a great place to live: • Great views • Light filtering down without being blocked by tall buildings(downtown no longer has • Greenery and trees everywhere along with birds and wildlife This will all be gone if the current plan is allowed to go ahead. The residents of the K What happened to Community Involvement? RPSC New Housing Particularly note these two items:
127	CV	When I compare this to say Montreal – another Canadian city – I am not so impressed. The tall buildings are human unfriendly. The area around Mount Royal, other than downtown pretty much avoids them.	Very unhappy about what is proposed. The really tall buildings proposed for the other areas will be ugly! In the 25th & Cambie area: 6-8 story buildings is a very poor idea. Walking around by buildings this big is unpleasant, and living beside one is terrible. I have recently been in both New York, Montreal and Berlin. In Berlin & Montreal, most areas seem to be very height restricted and I found it much more pleasant to walk around in than Manhattan in NY. (I enjoy NY, but definitely would not want to live there). The "4 story buildings" proposed along King Edward near Cambie are also too high. First, they are really 5 story buildings (the basement counts as a story...). Because of the slope these buildings will be a real irritant for those of us who live below them, and I think they will ruin the view for the folks on the South side of King Ed. Views are one of the things that makes Vancouver a great place to live. Tall buildings ruin them.		One idea which I saw in the posters which I liked were "mini-parks" – small public areas where people can just sit and have coffee etc.. I don't know how that would actually play out – and think it would be good to have some of those as commercial spaces – i.e. out door areas for cafés etc.			There seems to be an underlying philosophy that having more people in the lower Mainland is inevitable, and "better". I certainly disagree that this will make things better for most of us. Things that make Vancouver unique and a great place to live: • Great views. • Wildlife in and nearby the city. Are there any other large cities where you can see eagles in the city boundaries? Are there any other large cities that still have large salmon runs (or indeed any kind of large fish populations). • Green plants everywhere There are also some other reasons we should resist having more people move here: • This is an earth quake zone. (Yes, I know we have "standards" for large buildings which make them earth quake resistant – but do you expect to believe they will be effective? How well did our regulatory framework work with leaky condos – and that is an easy engineering problem. • The Fraser Valley is probably not actually self-sufficient for food supplies at this point – add another million people and how does that make us green and self-sustaining?
128	OTC	I am against it!	I like it as it is!	We have all that we need!	Leave the neighborhood alone!			
129	CV	See no "character" and don't feel you are listening to the neighbourhood/community. Destroying the actual "neighbourhood" that currently exists. Cambie VILLAGE it will not be. The whole corridor will become an overpopulated "metrotown" area with this plan.	WAY TOO HIGH - MUCH TOO DENSE. Row houses/ 4 plexes like in 300 block of 16th with PARKING at the lane/multifamily homes/town houses like 400 block of 16th - all much more acceptable. Will keep the CHARACTER/HERITAGE look and feel of the area.	We have Hillcrest centre and Canada Line - both of which will be much too crowded if you go ahead with this plan. Canada Line already "at capacity".	No real details... so hard to comment. You say increased green space, etc, but no details. Sadly, I don't trust what you say. BIG BEEF** Your "post cards: do NOT give any real info about what you are planning. Be honest/above board, and give REAL info!!! Also all photos on your boards are 3-4 not 8 stories again not "real" info. Looks good, but...	4	2 (EGADS!), 4 (friends of developers)	In theory I pay your and Council's salary, so LISTEN - This will reduce my property value/privacy. Don't feel like I am being heard - except by one _____ but he's apparently not on the "committee" - go figure. _____ should NOT be shrugging as people express their concerns. I realize he is in a difficult place, but... Need to consider slope - 4 stories are actually like 6 stories once slope is considered - especially along King Ed. Your "boards" say "what we heard" ... that higher density/mid and high rise buildings are "generally supported" - NOT at any meeting/open house I've been to. Cannot sell Olympic Village - close to transit, state of the art - why considering MORE? Not opposed to increased density - just not like this. Again... 4 plex in Heritage style (like 300 blk 16th), row houses... enough. Your plan will turn "lanes" into thoroughfares: and "Cambie Village" will lose its charm w.6/8 stories.
130	OTC	As residents, we are concerned with the changes to our neighbourhood. Namely the transition from a quiet neighbourhood to a busier one. While we understand the change is unavoidable, we would still want to maintain a similar identity.	I would like to see additional clarification in regards to future plans. While we understand "buildings will seek to activate and enhance adj lane ..." pertains directly with where I live, I would like Phase 3 to directly address this and clarify plans and locations.	We have several parks nearby, so public benefits, I'm satisfied		3.5	2, 5	Wished that there were more graphs from time to time, unclear (in regards to point number 5 on UBC Partnership b)
131	Other	This is a perfect opportunity to create an entity for Vancouver.	I feel it should be denser and greater height.	Well thought through.	Incorporation of green/live/function - yet not over bearing.	5	5	Opportunities to take a corridor as Cambie and considering it as major land use opportunity to shape things, I feel that such an opportunity should be even greater density and height along Cambie. We will not see such opportunities as this materialize again. Makes so much sense to let this happen. The timing is great as in most major centers in the world, along such a perfect arterial route to have life and vibrancy come to fruition (with the Canada Line).

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
132	CV	You must stop this insanity now and respect the principles laid out in the Riley Park Community Plan. You need to spread the density out over a wider area and get away from this plan to create height rise corridors within 500 meters of the station. This is bad urban planning	It provides no character at all. It is ill respectful of the neighbourhoods and it will cast many residential properties into darkness.	What public benefits. There is already inadequate green space, parks and community services in the area. You cannot add this amount of density without addressing these issues. Again live to the principles defined in the Riley Park Community Plan.	Poorly thought out. Go back to the drawing board and look at ways to spread the density over a broader area, using low rise structures, laneway and carriage homes.			
133	CV	City Planners & council remain on_____feed back for the King Edward areas was against 4 story buildings, do not allow 4 storey buildings East/West along King Edward - it just creates a wall. There should be no building more than 2 stories built at Ash & Heather on King Edward	I think many others will be voting against this city council (Vision) and will certain canvas for City Staff ___ - we the people never voted for a local body who refuses to listen - its so ___ in the public record what this mayor thinks of internal feedback	Where are the unilateral amenities to support the increase density -any new soccer fields - NO!		4	2,4	
134	OTC	This is not about planning. This is about destroying long-standing single-family neighbourhoods. This is about too much height, too much density, and the City ignoring its own guidelines. This is about making developers rich as they happily re-zone single-famly (cheap) to multi-use (expensive). There is nothing here for existing local residents. We are screwed.	Again, far too high, far too dense. No consideration for existing residents. Who wants tall buildings towering over their homes? Who wants the added local traffic?	Who is demanding the increase in density anyway? Certainly not the locals. Why do we need the extra density? Nobody has explained that. Where is the public benefit in making developers richer at the expense of the long-time residents?	No amount of public amenities will bring back there long-standing quiet and unique Vancouver neighbourhoods when they're gone.			You are not hearing from local residents. Notices are sent by mail (yellow postcards). For open houses and public hearings on specific re-zoning applications but NOT for Cambie Corridor Planning activities. I attended a re-zoning application open house last March (605-645 W 41st) and NOT ONE of the local residents in attendance had even heard of the Cambie Corridor Project. That is a major failing on your part. Or is it just convenient?
135	QE	Has increased impact on hydro surge been taken into account?	4 stories along west side of King Edward from Cambie Street too high. 3 stories with flat roof okay - will not have shadows	will need increase in school spaces, out of school space		5		Cambie Village - picture of Cambie St/King Ed station - Yukon - 4 stories - lot listed as 130 deep on west side - lot depth & 130 ft & measurement of shadows hown @ Equinox 12 p.m. In winter shadow will project into 3900 block of N/S properties - misleading demonstration _____.
136	ML			With Marine Landing an increase in Canada line service is required as it is already a capacity during rush hour. There also needs some increase in transportation from eh marine Landing east & west. The design of Marine Landing is too much a center & the design needs to promote more activities east & west of the marine Landing	The Marine Landing area requires a wider area of green walkways going east/west. It needs plans for community gardens & other spaces for people to gather.			
137	ML	It make sense to plan but not in isolation of each community. High rises ought to be avoided at all costs, they spoil the look of the heritage boulevard	It is just fine and ought to be allowed to develop organically No High-rises at stations - massing yes but not height	With the addition of so many people at the transfer points great care needs to be taken to provide services for the age friendly communities (i.e. from very young to very old)	Keeping expansive vistas is part of keeping the community livable	1		There should not be any high-rises next to Cambie - 6-8 stories (max) might be appropriate. There isn't enough park space now nor community rec facilities - pools libraries etc. let alone facilities to accommodate growth
138	QE	Very positive changes overall	I would urge consideration of higher densities along Ash St. There is a section of land caught between the high densities of Cambie and the Heather RCMP lands that will be negatively impacted if not rezoned alongside the other lands.	Would like to see more public schools - there are no elementary schools in walking distance in the QE area.	Laneway housing is an excellent start but we need to consider higher densities.	5	2	
139	OTC	ok. Except for lak of cycling in the Cambie Village area. The previous council approved a plan which has no cycling in either the near or for ter. Building setbacks only allow for wider sidewalk but not for bike lanes without upgrading general purpose lanes to cycling. I strongly recommend that either setback distance be increased to al minimum allow lanes in the distant future but strongly suggest that one lane be upgraded to allow bike lanes immediately or preferably to allow separated (protected) lanes. As cycling mode share in Vancouver increases to over 10%, businesses and residents will demand better cycling facilities along Cambie corridor.		Yes, separated bike lanes along the length of Cambie from north end of Cambie Bridge to Canada Line Bridge. At minimum, there should be bike lanes along the length of Cambie Corridor. Note that Canada Line capacity is equivalent to 10 lane or single occupancy vehicle traffic so surely one lane could be upgraded to provide two bike lanes where these currently do not exist.		4	2,3,5	comments: it is narrow view to only consider transit intensity. Also useful would be walking and cycling potential as well as balancing intensity figures by ---- prediction increases in motor vehicle traffic. Note: I chatted with _____ re: potential cycling upgrades for Cambie Corridor. He provided good information re current plans but to my view, plans related to cycling are inadequate. I would like to see more density in Cambie Village area and near King Ed station as this area is closer to downtown and thereby making walking/cycling a preferred transportation option - especially if coupled with superior cycling infrastructure.
140	Unknown	There are plenty of condos already in y area. I have no connections to more people they live < 1 block away. Condo dwellers do not share my concerns. The type of space you live in dictates community.	Please do not create these urban ghettos with tiny overcrowded boxes without character. I support townhouses and infill housing.	You cannot create community just because you say so. I don't trust developers who build for \$ to create a neighbourhood.				
141	OTC	Already there is skytraing along Cambie and Oakridge Center - parking problems and too much density around this area.	Objection to multistorey building on 41st E of Cambie					Please consider lower form R.E. Townhouse as an alternative.
142	OTC	Don't like it - too dense	I live at 5676 Alberta and oppose the high buildings proposed for 41st Ave between Cambie going east. Too busy traffic, parking problems, too many people, SHADING and too much change type of our nice residential neighborhood.					Townhouses would be better.
143	OTC	Excellent ideas!!	I like the idea of being able to rezone my neighborhood to build multiple strata units (or villa). This would provide more opportunities for more affordable residences in this beautiful neighborhood. The mid-way pedestrian block would also allow us to get to 41st or bus stops faster. The sideway (?) in front of the house is also a great idea!! However, regarding the mid-way pedestrian block (where 233 W 42nd neighborhood is), this would increase pedestrian traffic and there could be safety and privacy concerns - so I don't really like it.				3	

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
1	CV	Generally, the changes are positive and necessary.	Would like to see higher density in areas immediately surrounding Canada Line stations. King Edward Ave - only 4 storeys! Would like to see higher! Such a prime location with view potential for high end units and less expensive units. Higher density = higher ridership.					
2	OTC	Good	Give residents option of multi-family zoning on Alberta St. Yukion St. (behind Cambie St.) increase height restriction to 40-50'		More police around train stations.	2	1	Speed up the process please.
3	ML	Good bigger is OK				4	4	
4	LA	Good ideas I would like to see higher proposed outside the 49th station. It would be quite nice to see more storey's within the proposed 6 storey buildings diagonal the 49th stations gong north. Get the Cambie Village done fast (please	good ideas			4	2	love it
5	LA	Good, let us move forward quickly.	Well thought			4	2	Would like to see Phase 3 to start next year.
6	OTC	I am concerned about density on 41st east of Cambie Street. Should not be 6-8 storey height would block the sun fro houses behind units & their privacy would be affected. Consideration should e given to townhouses along 41st from Main to Cambie Street. this would be better for the neighbourhood. I object strongly to the present plan. Please consider the townhouses!!!						
7	QE	I am concerned about the step-change in character of the area in the Avenues adjacent/parallel to King Ed. Ave; apparent lack of laneway property-line building set-back; "busyness"/traffic in the lane. I am concerned about the impact on my view to the North. I am concerned about parking in the residential areas parallel to King Ed. Ave.	In an R1 zoned area - up FSR<<1.0 across the laneway you have FSRs of 1.5 (or higher) - Net FSRs. This is an incongruous step-change! Who would want to live across the back-lane from such a development? All measure of privacy associated with my backyard has been lost! I cannot build a high enough fence!		An absolute must is to provide stepped top floors with obligatory greenery. Not, simply, balcony space. OBLIGATORY/maintenance - planned greenery. Absolute must to have setback from laneway property line of >4 feet!			Do neighbourhood plan CONCURRENTLY. Guarantee neighbourhood plan in < 1 year! If energy conservation is a priority, make laneway homes w/ 1/2 sunk basements. Make adjustments to laneway home architecture - w/ i) obligatory setback; ii) obligatory rooftop balcony gardens iii) be somewhat prescriptive re: architectural forms! iv) oblige developers to have discrete laneway homes - gaps, no shared walls!
8	LA	I attend Oakridge United Church and live in the area. Multi-storey buildings along 41st and 49th will ruin the character of the neighborhood and will produce too much shading and parking problems. Townhouses would be much better.						
9	CV	I demand that Cambie/King Edward Avenue be removed from phase 2 of planning.	It's quite apparent that little or no thought has been given to the character of the neighbourhood. The 6 - 8 storeys (and even 4) will cast severe shadows on the north side of King Edward for about 5 months of the year.		I demand that you stick with the approved RPSC Community Vision: - Maintain and enhance single family neighbourhoods - Increase housing variety, more infill and duplex housing. - Focus large site redevelopment to RCMP 'Fairmont Complex', St. Vincent Hospital, Little Mountain Housing and the Balfour Block.			Listen to the people who live in the community - we want a community not a corridor. There is no requirement to have high density within 500m of the skytrain station it can be spread out as per the RPSC Community Vision.
10	Unknown	I disapprove of the multi-storey buildings on 41st avenue, east of Cambie. Too much density and indefinity (?) will affect the character of the neighborhood.						
11	LA	I do like the proposed plan. I would like more higher density storey's outside the 49th C-line station. I would like more storey's for the proposed plan north of the 49th line 6 storey building I like ideas you have brought	Like plan you have proposed about the plan			4	1	Love it
12	Other	I don't like the emerging character	Buildings are too much in character with the Downtown and West end. They are too tall at Marine and Cambie.		Grooming of streets and lanes is good, but how do you plant the trees in paved lanes and how can you do so without disrupting traffic in lanes?			Marpole needs a new community center to accommodate additional people coming in with the new developments.
13	QE	I don't like the height along King Ed and also along Cambie across from QE Park. These areas should stay down at 3 storeys max to retain views. Also, the areas around the park should be kept low and "green" because I don't want to have to meander through buildings to get to the park. With these tall buildings people can even see the park driving along Heritage Boulevard.	I don't like the mass and scale of the 4 storey buildings. Council should be respectful of what was decided on the RPSC Community Vision. Also, black in June 2010, there was a petition of 150+ people that is opposed to anything more than 3 storeys. Is this not a loud enough voice? Why is the City listening to the developers instead of the residents?!			2	2	
14	QE	I generally approve of the identity and character of the corridor. I also would approve or additional density at major intersections and skytrain stations.						Current zoning should be reviewed to consider townhomes and highrises at skytrain stations and major intersections.
15	QE	I guess I'm not amazed that you did not listen at all during the walk about around King Ed station. We did not mind the increase in density along Cambie north of King Ed but along King Ed and south of King Ed along Cambie should remain a neighborhood of 2-2 1/2 storeys as either single family homes or Town Houses similar to those being built along Oak from 37th to 43rd.						

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
16	CV	I hate it. I don't know where you get the information to suggest that the building heights along the corridor and in proximity to the Canada Line stations are generally supported. The neighbors that I talk to in Douglas Park are increasingly upset and angry about the proposed developments along King Edward Ave. From the very start I have faced a prospect of a 4 story building facing downhill into my backyard and bedrooms, bathrooms, etc. I have come to all of the open houses and provided comments absolutely nothing has changed - it's the same = prospect of 4 storey. My plan is to: 1) support _____ and _____ and the many other neighbors who reject these heights. 2) express my view to council 3) move, if all else fails.						
17	OTC	I have lived 40/39 Alberta since 1949 and seen many changes. Expansion of Cambie St (Canada Line and Oakridge Centre proposed) has already increased the density and traffic and has made it more difficult for me as a senior (age 90) to get around. Please reconsider multi-storey building heights which would drastically negatively affect the livability of our neighbourhood.	Currently there are just houses along 41st east of Cambie. Please do not allow anything higher than a town house from Cambie going east along 41st. The north side of 41st will be especially negatively affected by shading - please take this into account with respect to building height.					I look forward to staying in my home as long as possible without extreme changes to the neighbourhood. Multi-storey buildings along 41st would just be the straw!!!
18	LA	I like it. Was hoping for some T/H as well				4	2	Find it unfair that a property in phase 1 of the plan now is being pushed to phase 3, (Marine Gardens) we have engaged architects already.
19	LA	I like the proposed plan a lot. On the inside residential streets, 200 block W 64th and Cambie, I would like to see higher density in exchange for allowing gateway at Marine and Cambie. At 49th and Cambie I would like to see 12 storeys happen.						
20	OTC	I object to the multi-story buildings on W 41st Ave, especially on the North side.						Too much density being added to our area.
21	OTC	I strongly object to rezoning 41st Ave. 300-400 blocks and 37th to 41st on Cambie st. to allow more than 3 storey construction. I also oppose the proposed 12 storey building on the corner of 41st and Cambie.						
22	OTC	I strongly opposed the tall buildings in the north side of 41st ave from Cambie St. to Yukon St. I opposed the increase of traffic, density, congestion and noise. Please consider low housing such as townhouses.	It will increase the density and congestion.			4	5	
23	OTC	I support the increased density proposed.						
24	QE	I think more apartments along the Cambie corridor would bring more people to live there and use the sky train			We have a very nice Boulevard and green space at the center of Cambie St., It benefits the landscaping to both sides. If more flowers & small shrub add on it which will add the life to the blvd.	5	2,3,4	I think the "2 lots" next to the sky train station should extend to "2 blocks" so that more people could use the transit system. Those two block density should be higher.
25	ML	I understand the need to try to maximize density around the skytrain stations but I find that the height of the Marine Gateway buildings are way TOO TALL. Using the height of the Langara Gardens as a guideline and maybe a couple of stories higher would be more appropriate.						
26	OTC	I want to maintain the single family residential home concept on 42 - 48 ave						This is a single residential home neighborhood. I do not want any townhouse or condo development on 42 or 43 ave (between lane east of Cambie and Yukon). I am worried that new development would bring in extra noise, pollution, parking problems. This would have a devastating effect on the livability and the unique character of our neighborhood.
27	Other	I wouldn't want to see a uniform corridor wide identity each neighbourhood should reflect its own	It all looks the same. The illustrations describe a constrained urban form - especially of mid-rise residential buildings. For most of these neighborhoods it would be nice to see a closer connection at least architectural vernacular to its largely residential fabric		I feel that the lanes have the most potential for the corridor in terms of new and engaging public realms. The plazas seem to require a much higher density and overall population-they may sit empty.	4	5	I don't live in the neighbourhood and I'm asking myself why I would come here other than for passing through. Perhaps there is potential for a greater city destination. I also feel like the corridor style development doesn't lend itself well to a "neighbourhood"
28	CV	If re-zoning is permitted for 4 storey and higher homes character will change drastically. I do not like it and feel that the residents & neighbourhood concerns aren't being considered seriously NO 4 STOREY'S ON KING EDWARD!!! We've said that =before so why would it be considered for re-zoning? NO 4 STOREY'S!!!						Why are re 4 storey's still being considered for King Edward? Stick to the RPSC vision - no 4 storey at the walkabout we said it was okay to keep it to 2 and 1/2 storey. We paid to spread out the density. Don't keep it to the "T" shape at Cambie & King Ed. People don't need to live right on those few blocks (of the T area). They can walk to the Canada Line, the #33 bus goes along Cambie & east to 29th Ave station near QE Park People can live "spread out" & take the bus to that train. Are people so lazy these days that they can't walk a few blocks/10 minutes to the train?
29	QE	Interesting ideas emerging. This neighbourhood/corridor will be the best place to live in Vancouver.	I am in favour of the proposed massing & density			2	2	

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
30	ML	It does not fit with my vision of our neighbourhood or its current character. I would like to see some development but building upon & enhancing the affordable, family - oriented nature of our neighbourhood.	What is being proposed is a concrete jungle (okay glass & metal jungle) next to a waste transfer station (garbage dump) with all existing tall beautiful trees destroyed. They are the only existing buffer that contributed to unimproved air quality. Cambie & Marine is far too busy traffic wise to handle the proposed density. The proposed towers are too high. We keep saying this and yet every redesign comes back with the same height. I do not understand how this proposed development can in any way be considered environmentally sound.					
31	Other	Like it especially the renderings showing potential density	Interested in ongoing retention of industrial lanes except immediately surrounding Marine Drive station - best to make use of this role			3	2,5	Looks good - lets start building
32	OTC	Low rise and high rise mixed. Sidewalk cafes and small shops.	As above.		Public plazas and green space should be designed to consider security issues.	2	1	Graphics were confusing and sometimes inaccurate. Presenters were not very helpful in explaining graphs. They seemed confused themselves at times.
33	Unknown	Lower forms along 41st Ave, especially on North and East sides of 41st and Cambie	Brick would be nice					Too much added density to this area.
34	QE	My comments pertain to Ash St (between McGuigan and W 37th). If Cambie is going to allow 6 storey buildings and the RCMP lands will be redeveloped with similar height permitted ten I would like Ash St. (Between McGuigan and W 37th) to have similar height permitted. It doesn't make much sense to have those lots in the shadow of larger structures on both east and west of those lots.						
35	OTC	No 6-8 storey buildings in the 300-400 block with 41st. No 12 storey building on 41st and Cambie.						Reduce high density. Reduce high buildings.
36	OTC	no 6-8 stories in the 300/400 blk W 41st Ave. Would like townhouse all along to Main St., my block 40th Ave is single family dwelling where in Vancouver does 6-8 stories back across a lane to someone's back yard. This is injurious affection and will ruin my quality of life				2		
37	OTC	No high density and no high buildings on 41st Ave.						
38	Other	Not too sure about the community identity. Most of these changes are physical.			My girlfriend thinks this lane treatment is weird. How do I explain it to her? (He drew a small picture.)	5	2, 3, 5	Great visualizations. Really helped me see the intentions.
39	OTC	Over density is being proposed for the area between W 41st and W 40th Avenue on East of Cambie Street. This will definitely change the identity and character for the Cambie Corridor on Cambie and West 41st. Are you trying to change this neighbourhood to like MetroTown? To me, Oakridge area is a class area. We should make it an elegant landmark for the City of Vancouver.	At present, only single houses are on 400 block 300 Block West 41st Avenue. Putting 12 storey building on each corner of Cambie and West 41st and 10-8 storey buildings north side of W 41st on Cambie and also 10-6 storey building east side of Cambie Street on West 41 Avenue will impact the natural light, traffic, parking, noise especially for the first, second and third house immensely. (482 W 40, 476 W 40, 468 W 40).				5	1. please reduce the 12 storeys on corner of W 41st & Cambie to 8 storeys; 2. please reduce the 10-6 storeys on 400 block 300 block of W 41st Avenue especially on north side to 6-4 storeys; 3. please reduce the 10-6 storeys north of West 41 and W 40th along east side of Cambie street to 6-4 storeys; 4. town houses along West 41st Avenue would be as much change as the said neighbourhood would absorb, still it will increase density while making the neighbourhood more attractive and less problematic by reducing height by at least 2 storeys - 4 storeys.
40	OTC	Over density will change the character of the neighbourhood.	Adding 12-6 storey building will change the character of my neighbourhood because currently there are only homes along the neighbourhood. Not fair to neighbours across the lane in the area. Too much shading especially on north side of 41st.				5	Townhouses along 41st Ave would be as much change as the neighbourhood could absorb. The current plan produces too much traffic, pollution, noise, parking and shading problems.
41	OTC	OVER density will not achieve the objective of sustainability by creating environment peaceful, safe, providing adequate transportation (Canada Line and bus routes which are already congested), an acceptable noise level, adequate parking stalls for residents and for visitors (at present, parking is already very restricted).	Firstly, you need to reduce the height of proposed buildings: reduce 12 storey building to 8 storeys on north east side corner of Cambie and West 41st Avenue on the north side of West 41st Avenue and reduce the 10-6 storeys to 6 storeys east side of Cambie between W. 41st and W 40th Avenue. And reduce 10-6 storeys along W 41st from Cambie to 3-4 storeys. Secondly, townhouses along W 41st should be considered.				5	1. reduce all proposed height to 8 storeys on NE Corner of W 41st and Cambie; 2. reduce height from 10-6 storeys on NE of Cambie along West 41 and W 40th Avenue to 6 Storeys; 3. reduce height from 10-6 storeys on 400 block & 300 block W 41st Avenue to 4 storeys. By reducing heights it will reduce shading, traffic, parking, noise, transportation and pollution problems; 4. all 400 block W 40th residents are not very happy with the proposed heights and density as it creates more problems to the residents and takes away the beauty of this Oakridge neighbourhood.
42	OTC	Religious and cultural services should be promoted along the Cambie Corridor - since these two aspects of life are very important to every citizen and keep our society and community adhesive				4	1,2,3,4,5	Since Oakridge section is next to the Oakridge Mall, an even lighter density ratio can be applied - such as all Oakridge section can go up to 8-10 storey in high. This neighbourhood has every services, amenities and in between 2 Canada Line stops. With all these services, I believe it make logical since to increase its density.
43	Other	Seems that density is inevitable. Concern should therefore rest with making the communities vibrant livable places, especially enjoyed proposals for mid-block pedestrian linkages, laneways, path & walkways etc. Also, public gathering spaces (plazas squares small parks) are <u>So Important!</u> Would like to see more emphasis on fostering apt & culture to whatever extent possible - not just more Starbucks & boutiques.	Thought proposal provided evidence of careful consideration of the means by which the transition to higher density (building heights) might be effected along the corridor. However, it would seem a shame to build a city's - length of cookie-cutter glass & new concrete mid-rise buildings. More variation in form? Maybe a different "flavor/theme" for each of the neighborhoods? - not sure this is possible.		Streets lanes public plaza habitat and green space yes please. Also, pedestrian street?/artists restaurants culture quarter - spaces people can hang out and enjoy their community together if it is inevitable that the neighborhood must change perhaps consider preserving some history through heritage designations (saw was included) community museum (like proposed maritime museum in N. Van shipyards)? Or educational boards/panels with info & photos along pedestrian walkways? History is important.	4	2,3,4,5	Initially I was confused by the graph as it was presented on the "measuring performance board - might be a good idea to state more explicitly the rational at the outset (i.e. increased jobs/people - increased rider ship = more sustainable/lower emissions transportation; increased density provides opportunity for more sustainable "off - the - grid" energy systems). Once I got the picture, though the graphs were excellent in helping me to understand the proposed changes to neighbourhood density & how that could play into more sustainable energy & transit options. Also <u>LOVED</u> the comparisons to other neighborhoods in Vancouver...really painted a picture of the sort of community vibrancy that increased density can bring!

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
44	CV	Stay with plan written in RPSC vision approved by Council in 2005.	No 4-6 towers!			4	2,5	Please stick to the heights and types of housing described in the Riley Park South Cambie Plan i.e. 2-5 height not 4-6 towers east and west of Cambie Street. We do not feel listened to and are very disappointed in this Council. This will not get you my support or vote in the next election!
45	QE	Technically & professionally (on paper) good job! Missing professional approach to project, too much time spent in front of computer and drafting boards, pure info collected from project sites. Need planners to walk around and across area to get real picture of community needs (i.e. cross section showing lots lengths on Keng Ed southside as 150' are actually 124') and so on.	Not take in consideration surrounding housing in background of new development. Proposed number of storeys too high. King Edward (east and west of Cambie) should go max 2 1/2 storeys housing. Keep Cambie Corridor higher to composite lowering down King Edward developments.			5	2, 4, 5	Send planners on site! Ask them to collect as many info as they can (photos, resident comments)
46	Unknown	The emerging character at Marine and Cambie are too reminiscent of Downtown and is inappropriate for this single family neighbourhood	Buildings at Marine and Cambie are way too high, too dense.					The renderings for Marine and Cambie should show what the buildings look like from the street level, not just a birds eye view.
47	OTC	The emerging identity will be drastically altered by the introduction of high density apartment units. It is currently zoned for single family homes. The apartments will cause significant shading and reduce livability of the area!	The proposed development of 12-6 storey buildings will increase shading and we will lose privacy in our backyards. The character of the neighborhood will be completely lost.		Keep zoning as single family maintaining a quaint area. People are often out enjoying the nearby Queen Elizabeth park. We enjoy the neighborhood as it has been designed, for homes, not apartment high rises.		5	The proposed apartment buildings will decrease privacy, increase shading, increase traffic, pollution, and noise in the area. It will significantly reduce quality of life for residents.
48	Other	The following entire block not just 1/2 block facing Cambie Street should be included in the study; Reason: they are more closely related to what's happening to Cambie than the rest of the residential neighbourhood. Also: the park would provide a clear break for neighbourhood character. Areas: east side of Cambie between 33rd & end of QE Park east side of Cambie between 60th & 64th.				5	2,3,4,5	
49	QE	The vision still changes the neighborhood entirely. To say the new vision adds "vitality" to the area presupposes that the area isn't already vital. That said, I am not against increased density to some degree and I appreciate the effort to "step back" building frontage, etc. I can see 4-5 stories along Cambie as it already has buildings of this height by not 4 stories along King Ed.	Density can be tripled without such a significant change to the landscape or neighborhood feel. Already we have lane way housing going in on our block. Additionally, many new houses (again, on our block) are very large and contain 3 generations of one family (10 people in total and one on the way). Their garage accommodates their vehicles (3) and they maintain their yard and lawn area. In contrast, we have the same lot with 4 people. Using multi-generational housing, duplexes, attached townhomes (to 3 stories) or four-plexes would increase density without increasing height. People who buy/rent these places would likely have families and would be less likely to move often in contrast to younger people "buying into the market" with a condo and moving on in a few years. We have lived in our house for over 25 years. Our neighbors across the street have lived there for 30+ years. This kind of continuity creates safe, stable environment. Please don't discount it.		Effort has been made to consider the walkability of the neighborhood and public green space. (I know cherry trees die more quickly than other varieties but I encourage you to keep them as they define the streets around King Ed and Cambie, especially in the Spring. The new replacement species tend to drip sap in the summer and grow very tall, very quickly. This is a pain, especially in the autumn when the leaves - lots of them! - plug storm drains) I do like the green space in lanes... but who would maintain the grass etc? Neighbors in condos?	3 (Confusing at times, not always sure which way was north. On some this was clear, on others not. The "architectural printing" wasn't always easy to read. Looked cool, but... Sometimes things were set up in a confusing order (Some Cambie Village mixed with King Ed/Queen Eliz, we were confused until we sorted it out (not UBC's fault))	2	One concern I have as a resident of Cambie, south of King Ed is the lack of information regarding the Little Mountain Social Housing project (currently bulldozed land). While this area is "outside" the Queen Elizabeth zone by a few blocks, the area is very interconnected. Increased density in King Edward/Cambie coupled with proposals for Little Mtn suggest a traffic nightmare between Cambie and Main and King Ed and 41st. In addition, the three local elementary schools - Wolfe, Brock and Livingston - are already at or near capacity (and it's NOT due to cross-boundary issues. Wolfe closed its cross-boundary doors 4 years ago and Livingston recently lost its MACC classroom to accommodate all-day kindergarten). While a nice man told me that all planning departments were in touch with each other, the increased density of both areas will overwhelm local schools and the new recreation center at Hillcrest Park. Please look at the big picture. Please consider "family" habitat on King Ed and Cambie.
50	QE	This is a very significant change to not only Cambie corridor but also the character of the city itself	It is important to retain lots of greenery along the corridor to retain the character of the city			2	2	The neighbourhood along Ash Street between 33rd & 37th will be sandwiched between the new build out on Cambie and potential re development of the existing RCMP complex. Please consider bringing this area up to similar density or build character as the RCMP site, to make the whole area look more homogeneous
51	CV	This is an interesting area (CV). I think it is important to increase the density of the area, especially because of the proximity of the skytrain station. We should think of both the impact to the existing community, but also the potential for the growth of Vancouver.	I am concerned about the decrease in height in the Cambie/King Edward area. Decreasing the allowed storeys from 6 to 4 does not seem to satisfy people in the neighbourhood. I've heard unhappy feedback from those around me. In my opinion, decreasing down to four does not make much of a difference. I like the original 6.			4	2,3,4,5	
52	QE	Too big for neighborhood.						
53	OTC	Too much density is being added and it will change the character of the neighbourhood.	By adding 12-6 storey building will change the building form and character too much, consider currently there are only detached house only. Not fair to neighbours across the lane and in the area. Too much shading also, especially on north side of 41st.				5	Townhouses along 41st Ave would be as much change as the neighbourhood could absorb and still increase density. The current plan produces too much density, height, shading and other problems such as traffic, pollution, noise, parking etc. It will change the quality of current living condition of neighbourhood.
54	CV	too rigid - allow some flexibility to promote diversity, similar to SEFC rather than the repetitiveness of development such as Olympic Village	As residential density goes Willow & 13th is a livable density. I would rather see density in a larger area than concentrated along corridors - more ground oriented typologies (4 storey) in neighbourhood and commercial stacked on Corridor			5	3,4	Need a better representation of old or existing urban form
55	LA	Transit influenced area should be expanded for phase three to Oak & Main streets				3	5	Staff were great in explaining the process & history etc.

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
56	OTC	We are strongly opposed to any rezoning in the Cambie Corridor that defaces the look and character of the street. Cambie Street is a beautiful and unique street that is recognised enjoyed and admired by visitors (and residents). Tour buses often travel down Cambi so to erect taller denser buildings or structures along Cambie, especially where the Heritage Boulevard exists, would be detrimental to the character of the street which truly one of a kind. We are not opposed to appropriate densification of key areas (such as the downtown, where there is a different character and expected density/use, but to alter the face of Cambie Street is like destroying one of Vancouver's most famous landmarks. Please do not destroy or alter such a valuable landmark - otehrwise, what difference would be between us and any other city?			No comments except that lanes need to be well lit at night. Access to public transit (buses, Canada Line) should be unobscured and also well lit to increase visibility and safety.			Please see other side and consider carefully and wisely to any redevelopment that de-faces the Cambie Corridor. The part of Canada Line that emerges above ground is already an eye-sore (not to mention the stations - eg., at King Edward & 49th Ave that were poorly designed and they both look terribly run-down and poorly maintained). Please do not allow any new changes that will further degrade and de-face our beautiful city and especially the unique and irreplaceable Cambie Corridor! The beautiful esthetics and quaint character must be maintained and not destroyed by multi level new developments. Thank you for your consideration.
57	CV	We as the residents are frustrated, you are destroying the character of the neighbourhood. We bought out property in a residential area for that purpose, nto so we could have 4-6 sotrey and 8 story apartments peering into our pack yards.	We understand the need for higher density, however, by building 6-8 storey buildings, you are destroying the area. Why not build multi-unit houses or row town homes.			4	2	
58	Unknown	We attend Oakridge United Church and oppose the multi-storey buildings along the south side of 41st between Oak and Yukong - too dense, too high.						
59	CV	We supported the Canada Line on the understanding that development along be along Cambie and at Oakridge/Broadway. King Edward is uphill of Douglas Park neighborhood and height will shade neighborhood.	4 storeys (even back-set) is simply too high for King Edward and blocks east and west of Cambie. Winter shadows, especially over the downhill housing, will be excessively large (?). Equinox angles do not reflect the full impact of the 4th storey.					
60	LA	You people are moving too slow. It seems a waiting game.						
61	OTC		I opposed to any high buildings along avenues. These buildings block views of all houses behind them. If the city needs higher density, lots on both sides of Cambie can have higher storeys. Our city slopes down from Queen E Park to Marine Drive. View to the south is natural to all houses. Why block it?			4	2, 3, 4	
62	QE		I support your proposal.			5	2, 3, 4, 5	
63	CV		I think the built form provides a good compromise between competing interests and needs. Good work!				2,3,4	The priority on the graphs are very difficult to read from your website.
64	OTC		Proposed buildings height on Eastside of Cambie and 41st Ave is too high. As we all know the sun shines mostly from south. Houses on 40th Ave behind the north back alley of proposed zoning will definitely have shading problem. Crime and black ice are both almost certain. I strongly oppose to this part of the city planning. However, the current single family zoning may be changed to multi-family townhouse zoning which can accommodate higher density yet avoid shading					
65	QE		Senior housing or assistance living house, Childcare and senior adult care. Town house or 4-6 stories high houses. More green and quiet area. Community center.					
66	OTC		Too high the buildings. Too dense.					No 6-8 storeys in the 300-400 block of W 41st. Too much density and over shadowing of existing homes.
67	QE		We are long time loyal owners who take pride in caring for our properties. Being at the entrance of the Cambie Heritage Boulevard, we pay particular attention to our surroundings. Visitors have always admired the park-like care given to our properties. Now its going to be castrated.				2	What a farce holding open houses and pretending to implement residents' suggestions! The city has already made its decision. What's wrong with townhouses and 1 1/2 storey ane houses that blend into the landscape? (Of course, money!) What is the city planning to do to mitigate our property value losses? We know what is most suitable for our area since some of us have lived here for many, many years.
68	CV		We are very opposed to the 4 storey buildings proposed for our neighbourhood. We live on West 23rd Avenue, and our backyard would face this proposed development Our privacy would be greatly affected and we are very concerned about the increase of traffic on the lane. As well as the impact of looking at a wall of units. This is not a "gentle transition" into our neighbourhood! Let Council know that when the new elections come around, our votes will most definitely consider their decisions on this matter. We are against the proposal between Yukon & Columbia north or K. Edward!					
69	OTC		Would like more height to take advantage of the view. 8+ storeys			4	2, 3, 4, 5	lower the CAC and DCL!!! Taking too long.

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
70	CV					3	2,4	If it is the intention of the City to increase density around the Canada Line Station, I think it will be fairer for the neighbouring home owners, to increase zoning in a circular manner, with the station as the centre; rather than a single strip along Cambie and King Edward!
71	CV						3,4	This is the second open house I have attended. Although the Douglas Park Community has rejected strongly against the development along King Edward that reaction has been ignored by the planning staff. When discussed at the open house I was advised that it has been changed from 4-6 stories to 4 stories. NO CHANGE consider for elevation change from King Edward down to 24th Ave a 4 storey building is the equivalent of 6-8 stories building looming over the neighbourhood. Planning dept is continually messing with our neighbourhood, our lives our property value etc. All this on the assumption that increased density is beneficial. No more than 2 1/2 stories should be considered
72	LA				The current proposed guide stresses and address planting of open public spaces and green belts through out corridor that enhance living quality. City planners should really come up with ideas to raise tax to keep up these spaces well protected	5	2,3,4	As resident on south Cambie corridor am beneficiary of the program, I like to see incremental increase of DCL or all developments w/1 all corridor in next three to 20 years. Let's have a discussion together with developers as not to threaten affordability.
73	LA						2	We should build more 4 storey apartment within 10 minutes walking distance from the station area. In the Phase 3 of the proposal, we prefer to change the study area for a 4 storey apartment or at least row house or townhouse, not a duplex or 2 units additional cottage.
74	OTC					3	2	A more specific time line may be helpful. Not sure how the changes may affect.
75	OTC				Problem with back-lane traffic (back-lane between Ash St & Cambie & 45th/49th Ave.) this lane width at present can barely allow a two-way traffic certain sections of this is often blocked by resident/visitor cars parked on the side. The traffic in this lane is at times heavy due to drop-offs at the French school & church kindergarten at the 45th Ave end which spills over towards the 49th Ave exit. With the completion of the town-house project (35 units) and the project next to the French school, where the only access to the underground parking is, the back-lane traffic will be a total chaos day and night. What is the City's solution to this problem???			
76	OTC						2,5	I am opposed to the buildings on the proposed corridor on Cambie. I would see better a nice garden instead of houses
77	OTC							I live at 438 W 40th ave. I just finished built the house. If on 41st ave W 400 block build 5 or more floors higher is really bad for us. No privacy and a lot more traffic in back lane, not enough sun light. More crime and bring down property value on 40th ave. I dont like this idea at all.
78	OTC							No 6-8 storey apartment buildings in our area.
79	OTC							No 12-6 story buildings on 441st Ave. Same along Cambie st. Too high density.
80	OTC							Height on 41st Ave is too much overshadowing. Density too much for the flock. Should keep height on Cambie the same as now. Reduce proposal height and density.
81	OTC						5	If 41st E of Cambie has to be re-developed (I'd prefer it didn't) then please limit it to low rise. It will be cruel to deprive neighbors of the sunshine and the free movement they are accustomed to. The lowering of property values will also affect near neighbors.
82	OTC							No high buildings in the 300-400 block w 41st ave. Too much density.
83	OTC							Along 41st avenue (300-400 block) we would not like high density or high buildings.
84	OTC							I vote against build high-rise buildings in our neighborhood. It will huge increase in density, traffic, noise, pollution, parking problems, and a huge decrease in property values, and most importantly, liveability for our homes.
85	Unknown						3	Phase 3 comments will subdivisions of large single family lots into 2 to allow increased density and adding single family inventory at the same time. Consider allowing a large tower on the King David school play area and maintain existing height on the school.
86	Unknown							In phase 3 area off of arterials consider subdivision of single family lots into 2 lots to increase suitable single family lots as well as increasing density. Consider 8 storey in 6-8 as I do not think wood frame construction should be used on a large scale until more experience with the structures.
87	Unknown							Very concerned about the intersection of Cambie and 41st --> cars when they are turning left and right. Pedestrian safety has been impacted with traffic issues since the Canada line has opened. Worried about adding to the congestion.
88	Unknown							
89	Unknown					4	2,3,4,5	Would like to see phase 3 fast tracked as soon as possible to avoid adverse impact on existing properties
90	OTC							Our concerns are: the height limit on Cambie Street is too high because of shading to adjacent properties. The height limit on Cambie should be lowered.

#	1. Where you live within the Cambie Corridor	2. Comments on the emerging identity and character for the overall Cambie Corridor.	3. Comments on the built form and character for your neighbourhood.	4. Comments on the public benefits identified in your neighbourhood. Are there any public benefits you would like to see added or enhanced in your community?	5. Your comments on the public realm elements for your neighbourhood. This includes ideas for streets and lanes, public plazas, habitat and green space.	6a. To what extent did the graphs assist your understanding of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan? *	6b. In what ways did the graphs assist your understandings of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan?*	Additional Comments
91	OTC					1		We do not agree with Cambie Corridor Plan in building 12 storey-high at Cambie and 41st. We only agree with four to six storey buildings.
92	OTC					1		I strongly against building tall buildings. The city should be accountable to what you hear from residents. If not, many people won't support the mayor and the councilors.
93	Unknown							Myself and my family are against building tall buildings. This is a beautiful area and so three storey high buildings are good enough. Please listen to our ideas, otherwise, you won't get our votes.

Responses - Q6A	Responses Q6B
1 (very little)	1. Did not help my understanding of the Cambie Corridor Plan
2	2. Helped me understand the degree of difference between existing and proposed scenarios
3	3. Helped me understand how the proposed plan relates to other places in Vancouver
4	4. Helped me understand how the plan relates to city planning goals
5 (a lot)	5. Enabled me to consider new issues

#	Comments
1	<p>Hi, I did not like what you showed at the recent Cambie Corridor Open House for the King Edward and Cambie area for the following reasons:</p> <p>First, at the walkabout this summer, one of the suggestions the participants had was that Cambie Street north of King Edward be developed FIRST, before you consider going into the south side of King Edward. Cambie Street is already zoned to have buildings higher than what is already there (many 1-storey commercial buildings) so it is a logical choice, to develop along Cambie (north side) first, then monitor the additional traffic resulting from the developments before developing along King Edward.</p> <p>I went to the open house at Oakridge auditorium and I did not see anything that promoted this suggestion. I did not see any drawings of higher buildings or development on Cambie Street. Why do you not develop on Cambie first? We were told at the walkabout that one impediment to this is due to the number of units that must replace the ones that are torn down, and the residents of the walkabout responded by saying, change the law, then.</p> <p>Second, at the walkabout we also insisted that the planners follow the Riley Park South Cambie (RPSC) Vision, in which the idea of 4-storey buildings was not well-received. You are still considering 4-storey buildings, evident from the drawings of 4-storey buildings I saw and that were pointed out to me by the planners at your show. On the few blocks at King Edward and Cambie, (the 'T' area), if you have 4-storey buildings, they will be like walls that separate the apartments from the community.</p> <p>Also, at the walkabout, we expressed that we did not want a 'T' approach in developing the area, but to have higher density in the entire area, using a circular approach with the Canada Line station at the centre. We suggested that the planners stick to the RPSC vision for the entire area and higher density could still be achieved by having townhomes, rowhouses, even duplexes in the entire area, without the taller 3 or 4-storey apartment buildings.</p> <p>Now I see that 3-storey laneways are planned. This is too extreme. Definitely, 3-storeys is too high; even 1 and 1/2 or 2-storey laneway houses need to be re-considered. My issues with this with 3-storey laneway houses include lack of privacy and facing a wall of 3-storeys right across my lane.</p> <p>These are just some of the reasons I was unimpressed with the show at Oakridge auditorium. It shows that the ideas we proposed at the walkabout were not considered seriously. At your show, I was told by your planners that the RPSC Vision does not apply to the 'T' area, or along the 2 blocks east and west on King Edward. Why not? The people living in and near the 'T' area are a part of the community so why should that area be excluded from the RPSC Vision?</p> <p>Another point to consider is the transit/bus system in the area. There is a #33 bus that travels near Queen Elizabeth Park, and the route is from/to UBC and 29th Avenue Station. People can take this bus, and the other buses that serve the area (#25 UBC/Brentwood, #15 Cambie/downtown) to the Canada Line station. All 3 buses stop right at the Cambie and King Edward intersection. You can spread out the higher density instead of clogging everyone up at the intersection. People can walk to the station or they can take a bus to the station.</p> <p>The concerns of the residents who attended your summer walkabout need to be addressed. I did not see them addressed seriously at your show. We live here. We are the ones who are building the community. We are the ones building and maintaining the neighbourhood. I urge you to take the King Edward area out of Phase 2 planning and consider more seriously the concerns of the residents in the community. Your 4-storey apartments along King Edward will be a divider, not something that will unite the neighbourhood.</p>
2	<p>The Planning department asked for comments on their revised plan for the Cambie Corridor to be submitted by December 10th. In protest I am sending mine a day late and sending them directly to you. I fail to see the point of sending them to Planning when they said at the Core Area Group meeting on November 16th that it is this version of the plan that they intend to present to council early in the new year.</p> <p>Regarding the Cambie Village and the Queen Elizabeth areas, the only concession made from the previous plan is that on the blocks along West King Edward Avenue directly east and west of Cambie Street, six story re-development will occur within the first two lots from the allies instead of along the entire blocks. This tells me Planning doesn't understand the message we residents send or that their minds are already made up.</p> <p>I am not opposed to density however the plan is flawed. Mid-rise density is not an appropriate choice for developing this residential area with its close proximity to Queen Elizabeth Park. It contravenes the Riley Park South Cambie planning policy adopted by council in 2005. Our organized and cohesive neighbourhood voted against mid-rise density and will continue to do so in substantial numbers at every opportunity.</p> <p>During the Core Area Group meeting the planning department referenced the Olive, at 16th and Cambie, as a suitable model for development along West King Edward. The Olive was built on a formerly commercial site, not a residential one. This type of development is not suitable for a residential neighbourhood. Another point regarding this location is that I'm certain residents of the Olive and of the Pacifica directly across West 16th Avenue walk or catch a bus to use the Broadway/City Hall station of the Canada Line. It is not necessary to cram density directly beside a train station. There is no good reason to re-develop in this style. It doesn't even appear to be economically advantageous given the 400+ apartments and condominiums for sale beside the Olympic Village station and the fact that homes in this neighbourhood sell above asking price and are then renovated or rebuilt.</p> <p>Planning is better off to leave mid-rise or even high rise development to sites such as the former RCMP lands or the mall at Oak and West King Edward. That way, as they mentioned they desired, they can develop something 'off the grid,' an energy efficient, planned residential community with adequate schooling and other amenities.</p> <p>Keep this neighbourhood low rise, especially around QE Park. As the city grows in density thereby requiring more park space, it may be more important to expand QE park rather than hem it in behind tall buildings.</p>
3	<p>I live in the Cambie Village area. I own a property here, raise my family here. Pay taxes here.</p> <p>I think the proposed plan – which deviates significantly from the 2005 plan which many of us were far more receptive to – is a betrayal of the original vision we were sold. It's ugly and quite simply sucks. This neighbourhood – and I use the term neighbourhood in its more traditional sense – is in no way suited to 4+ storey development and the exponential increase in vehicular traffic it will invariably bring. Many of us moved out of the West End to escape that very fate. Not that I don't get the economics of it. I'm a Capitalist at heart after all. The greater the density, the greater the profit, which in this case also equates to a myopic vision of what the future could really look like without a little more consideration for creative planning. The concept that light rapid transit hubs=fertile ground for density increase is essentially flawed, parochial and skewed towards the developer, an unfortunate legacy of successive civic governments essentially funded and run by developers. And while I'm NOT opposed to redevelopment, I am opposed to the kind of urban blight represented by this current plan.</p> <p>I also see it as folly that such "redevelopment" is even being considered when the City has yet to sell 450+ empty units on the Olympic Village site, a prospect that could take years to realize under current economic conditions and even then quite possibly suffer a sizeable loss, one which will most certainly be underwritten by the taxpayer.</p> <p>So I'm left wondering what is the true motivation behind this "more is better" philosophy of urban redevelopment? Who will flock to Cambie Village to buy these \$800K+ condos? And who will this ultimately benefit? The good old boys from Tennessee, perhaps? You know the ones – they funneled a lot of money into the Vision Vancouver campaign that got the current Mayor and his Vision slate elected in the first place. Tides Canada anyone? Certainly NOT those homeowners/families/voters/taxpayers who live and/or work in this great little family enclave.</p>

	<p>So I repeat the pitch that many of us have made ad nauseam to you via email and at public meetings/open houses over the past few months: restrict redevelopment in the Cambie Village area to 2 ½ storey-architecturally-friendly + laneway housing, stepped down from King Edward Avenue north and south. Respect the natural view corridors which make Queen Elizabeth Park and Cambie Village unique in nature and integral to the liveability and beauty of this great city. If you must build 4+ storey complexes – and this is not nimbysm – pick areas such as 41st Avenue and Cambie (Oakridge Shopping Center) and/or Marine Drive and Cambie (the ICBC lands) – which ALREADY contain an historical preponderance of this kind of mix of residential/commercial (height-specific) development. Kind of a no-brainer, yes?</p> <p>Don't blow the opportunity to leave a positive legacy of urban renewal. Put some real vision in Vision Vancouver!</p>
4	<p>I have lived here for the majority of my life, raised my children and now my grandchildren in this area which has been a wonderful family home orientated neighbourhood.. Unfortunately this planning council seems to want to change the nature of this area to create vertical density and change the long standing atmosphere of family residences</p> <p>I agree with the comments sent to you by Carey Murphy and others. I have attended several meetings on the planning for the RPSC and I urge the Council to stay with this plan and look at ways to increase density that fit with the family residential atmosphere rather than creating high rises of 4 to 6 stories within the current single family houses.</p>
5	<p>As a homeowner at _____ and as a professional in the field of Real Estate, I am very concerned with the upcoming proposal of land use and densification near the Canada Line.</p> <p>I do NOT agree with the proposal to increase the allowable height of 4 stories buildings on King Edward between Yukon and Columbia. This will destroy the single family quiet neighborhood now sought out by the existing homeowners and potential Buyers.</p> <p>The introduction of laneway housing and perhaps changing the zoning to allow duplexes or row houses on King Edward would still assist in the goal of providing more accommodation without destroying the strong sense of community feeling that is becoming harder and harder to find in Vancouver.</p> <p>Anything higher than 2 stories will take away the view of Queen Elizabeth Park, sunlight in the backyard, one's privacy and property value will definitely decline. Who wants a single family home that would now look out onto a 4 story building PLUS with a 2 storey laneway house that is also being proposed on the same property? The property would definitely be sold at a discount.</p> <p>I understand the need to increase the opportunity to create more housing around the Canada Line stations, but what is being proposed is going way too far and loses sight of the responsibility the City has to maintain the integrity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>I have read many of the comments from other homeowners in the area and they all indicate a willingness and philosophical openness to study some densification BUT with a plan that follows the Riley Park South Cambie Community Vision and with a sensitivity to this unique Cambie neighbourhood.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this (which I am assuming you are doing!)and if you have any questions or further thoughts please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
6	<p>I am writing to you regarding the plans YOU have for the Cambie Corridor, and specifically about the King Ed – “Cambie Village” area. I have attended the open houses you have had (June and late November) and have many concerns.</p> <p>Firstly, your timing... you plan meetings during times when most people are busy or away – summer and near Christmas. Your feedback deadline for today is right in the middle of holiday planning – a very busy time for most.</p> <p>As well, NONE of the information you send out to the neighbourhoods that will be most affected by the rezoning and BUILDING heights you want to IMPOSE actually says this is what you are planning. Your pretty postcards (last one depicting trees with a few people – NOT what you are planning) does in no way explain or lay out what you are planning. I am sure there are many people in my neighbourhood who still have no idea of what you are planning and how it will adversely affect our lives. I expressed this concern the last time an “invite” went out in June ... obviously not “heard” by you as I got a similar if not more deceptive invite this time. If you really want this to be transparent process and have feedback from the people who live in the area, BE HONEST in your information that you send out. Residents need to have a clear picture of what you are planning – many have newly renovated homes that will either be slated for rezoning and torn down or back right on to YOUR 4 story buildings...</p> <p>On one of your boards at the open house it says your plans are “generally accepted by the communities”... Have you been to any of the King Ed area meetings? Have you not READ the feedback?? I would in no way say your plans are generally accepted in this community!</p> <p>You did a survey not long ago that resulted in the RPSC community vision... your plans DO NOT in any way reflect this plan. You are planning a Metrotown like area in a residential neighbourhood. Keep to the RPSC guidelines – that is what the COMMUNITY wants... the community that will be destroyed if your plans go ahead.</p> <p>Just because you build near transit, it does not mean people will use it. Most residents will have at least one car, even if they do use transit. Perhaps you need to take transit to the people, not build unwelcome and unwelcoming buildings around transit. The Canada Line is already well-used and “near capacity” according to media reports.</p> <p>Too late now, but the Canada Line SHOULD have gone down the Arbutus corridor – on the EXISTING designated transit land that used to be rail lines. How about spread out the transit, put street cars on that line, and do some densification in many neighbourhoods, rather than targeting Cambie. Take transit to the people, don't try to the reverse. It doesn't work. One reason it is such a desirable place to be is because it is NOT Metrotown. And you cannot tell me Metrotown is a “walkable, livable, desirable” neighbourhood!</p> <p>Much more thought and input from the community – REAL input – needs to happen before this even goes to Council. There is clearly not a market for condos at the moment seeing as you cannot sell the Olympic Village condos a year later. SLOW DOWN, take some time and really look at the best way to densify the city... Don't put it all down Cambie. For one, the Cambie Village will be a village no more. Don't you think you have those businesses through enough already with the CL construction?? Not to mention us residents?? You ARE planning a CORRIDOR - a CORRIDOR of condos, NOT communities.</p> <p>I invite any one of you to come for a visit. Sit in my backyard or look out my back window and tell me that a 4 story building and a 3 story townhouse on ONE city lot right across the lane is going to be OK for us. This is not a “sensitive transition” to a single family home. You come, and look, and tell me that is not going to affect my quality of life, the traffic in the lane, and our privacy... not to mention lower MY property value.</p> <p>I echo a neighbour's sentiment, that “The massive buildings Phase II will allow around the West King Edward Avenue Canada Line station will have a totally negative impact on the neighbourhood and all of the homeowners who live on the adjacent streets. Those living south of West King Edward Avenue will enjoy a vision of high-rise monoliths instead of the breathtaking vistas of downtown and the North Shore mountains they and all Vancouverites now enjoy. Those living north of West King Edward Avenue will lose their privacy and their sunshine as their homes are shadowed and their backyards overwhelmed by highrise developments across the lane”</p> <p>Please note that I refer to YOUR plans for this area. I have been a resident for over 10 years and I do not feel in any way like I have been included in the plans for MY community. This is YOU imposing your plans on US. And somehow you think a couple</p>

	<p>of open houses where you are TELLING us what you are planning is somehow including us in the process?? I beg you to hear us – me, my neighbours, and the community. We do NOT want this kind of development in our beautiful community. We are open to increased density, but not like this. I have said before I am one of the few that DOES vote in the municipal elections. You were voted in by the people, so LISTEN to them... you are meant to be working FOR us, not against us! And work WITH US; don't impose YOUR vision on OUR community.</p>
7	<p>This email letter is in response to the new proposals you have for development in the area you refer to as the Cambie Corridor. I am questioning why the original developmental plans for this area are not being adhered to by City Hall? You developed these plans with the help of residents of this area. Why are you not honouring this?</p> <p>The residents of this area are clearly opposed to these new proposals you have. We voiced our opinions and extreme disagreement with your proposals in June. Modifications you are proposing since June do not meet the approval of us, the residents.</p> <p>Please, if at all possible, adhere to the original developmental plans for this area. At the very least, please form a committee comprised of residents of this area along with city hall personnel to determine what, if any, changes could be made to the original proposals.</p> <p>We are fighting for our neighbourhood, our very way of life. We are decent, hardworking people. Many of us have made considerable financial sacrifices to buy homes in this area and of course we do not wish to lose our sense of community, our privacy, our views, our sunshine and our light. Please be understanding. I am willing to serve on a committee should you agree to form one.</p>
8	<p>Amenities. Cambie Village needs a public library branch (ca 16th Ave). Hillcrest Centre pool is already frequently at capacity and new community centre space is inadequate to meet current needs (less than at existing RPCC, which is to be demolished), let alone serve an expanded population due to Little Mountain redevelopment, new development on and around Fraser and Main Streets and proposed Cambie Corridor development in King Edward, Queen E precincts. Parking at the Hillcrest Centre will be inadequate to meet demand for pool, ice rink, CC, library and other uses. There are concerns that green space at Hillcrest will be converted to parking, or street parking will become a problem in surrounding area.</p> <p>Affordability Proposal includes no plausible strategy (e.g. inclusionary policy) for ensuring purpose-built below-market or even market rental housing. This is not acceptable. The existing mixed-use rental building on east side of Cambie at 40th Ave should be excluded from phase 2 rezoning policy to encourage retention. There are concerns that new development in Cambie Village will displace existing, mostly independent, businesses, and replace them with chains, resulting in a loss of commercial diversity, character and economic development potential. A comprehensive strategy is needed to ensure that this does not occur. 6-storey mixed-use buildings should include commercial/office uses on second level. Marine Gardens should also be removed from rezoning policy to discourage redevelopment and prevent "redlining"(disinvestment resulting from land-use policy).</p> <p>Systems The Marine Gardens rental complex is already on a district energy (central hot water) system. This was not indicated on the displays. District energy may not be feasible on east side of Cambie between 33rd and 37th Ave. due to QE Park.</p> <p>Habitat and greening No recognition in display text or diagrams that the Marine Gardens complex is an important existing wildlife habitat (especially for nesting, feeding and resting birds) and a key link in maintenance/enhancement of the wildlife corridor. Retention of the grove of mature trees on south side of Marine Drive between Cambie and Yukon Streets should be a pre-condition for rezoning of the Station (PCI) site.</p> <p>Public views Retention of public views to Van Dusen Gardens from the sidewalk of the road through Q E Park should be given greater consideration; Also retention of views to the park from key points on the west side of Cambie Street.</p> <p>Building form and scale. Due to topography (north-facing slope), buildings higher than 4 storeys should not be considered on King Edward Ave. The 6-storey apartments with townhouses on laneway shown in renderings for Q.E. precinct are misleading because they are not practical. Developers specializing in townhouse and midrise apartments indicate that given a 15-foot setback from property line (assumed in policy proposal for this precinct) and a minimum building depth of 65-70 feet, a minimum lot depth of 140 feet would be necessary to include laneway townhouses. Since the lots here range from 125-129 feet, this would not be feasible. Where buildings over 6-storey are considered (e.g. at stations) addition setbacks and stepping should be indicated in policy to mitigate shadowing and massing impacts on neighbouring properties (sensitive transitions). This is of particular concern at Marine and Oakridge stations. The policy for the Intercorp site on the east side of Cambie and north of Marine must be revised from highrise to mid-rise to prevent blighting of the excellent Marine Gardens complex with heavy shadowing, especially during crucial 3-6 p.m. period when resident and neighbourhood children are playing in car-free lanes. PCI proposal must also be modified to prevent shadowing of the complex.</p> <p>Development timing and strategy. Phase 2 and 3 policy for Q.E. precinct south of 33rd Ave. should be deferred until a comprehensive policy plan for RCMP Fairmont site is undertaken, which would also determine if and when a Canada Line station at 33rd Ave would be added. In the meantime it would be better to focus development around existing stations. In Marpole, phase 3 should be integrated into comprehensive community planning process. Consideration should be given to pre-zoning of the mixed employment zone south of Marine Drive to reduce uncertainty and ensure a desirable mix of uses and performance. This could include a limited number of live-work rentals on each parcel.</p> <p>It would not be acceptable to include in the Report to Council "Consideration items" or policy recommendations that were not introduced for public consideration.</p>
9	<p>I am forwarding the comments that we sent to you in June 2010. They remain an accurate reflection of our objections to the proposed rezoning of the Cambie Corridor. We saw nothing in the most recent Open House that addresses the concerns we registered in any meaningful way. In our view, if ever there was a case of too much, too soon, the plan for the Cambie Corridor is it. It is our strong hope that the plan will be substantially scaled back; the removal of King Edward from Phase II would be a good start.</p> <p>We believe that the plan for our neighbourhood (Douglas Park) reveals a cavalier disregard for the interests of the residents in this community. We wonder if the planners have an actual appreciation of what it is like to attend an Open House and see mid-high rise developments standing in place of our homes, blocking our views, and eradicating our privacy. The erosion of the quality in our lives that will come with the implementation of this plan is real. We have already started to see this erosion by virtue of the time and energy that is being expended in an attempt to resist a plan that we do not want. Yet, when we attended the Open House, we saw only this: Concerns about building heights along King Edward.</p> <p>To suggest that the evolution of this plan will be driven in part by the choices of individual property owners is unrealistic. Once the wrecking ball starts to swing, the choice for owners will be to endure the construction and the buildings that will crop up all around or to sell our property at a substantially inflated or deflated price, to be determined solely where the residence falls within the plan and its consequent desirability to developers.</p> <p>The erosion of the quality of our lives and neighbourhoods would perhaps be more palatable if the greater public good was apparent to us. After all, we are the same residents that endured the years of havoc wreaked by the construction of the Canada Line, which included constant noise and dust, traffic disruption, ruined businesses, and basements flooded with sewer water when the pipes were relocated to Ash Street. We believe that many of the assumptions underlying your plan are inaccurate: the Cambie Corridor is not a community; this is not a green plan; and ecodensity is an oxymoron, at least in the context of pre-existing communities. If the planners want to realize the city's investment, please consider starting by retaining the residents that</p>

	<p>already live here, pay taxes, and are now using the transit system.</p>
10	<p>I was not impressed with your show at the recent Cambie Corridor Open House for the King Edward and Cambie area. These are some of the reasons:</p> <p>First, at the walkabout this summer, one of the suggestions the participants had was that Cambie Street north of King Edward be developed FIRST, before you consider going into the south side of King Edward. Cambie Street is already zoned to have buildings higher than what is already there (many 1-storey commercial buildings) so it is a logical choice, to develop along Cambie (north side) first, then monitor the additional traffic resulting from the developments before developing along King Edward.</p> <p>I went to the open house at Oakridge auditorium and I did not see anything that promoted this suggestion. I did not see any drawings of higher buildings or development on Cambie Street. Why do you not develop on Cambie first? We were told at the walkabout that one impediment to this is due to the number of units that must replace the ones that are torn down, and the residents of the walkabout responded by saying, change the law, then.</p> <p>Second, at the walkabout we also insisted that the planners follow the Riley Park South Cambie (RPSC) Vision, in which the idea of 4-storey buildings was not well-received. You are still considering 4-storey buildings, evident from the drawings of 4-storey buildings I saw and that were pointed out to me by the planners at your show. On the few blocks at King Edward and Cambie, (the 'T' area), if you have 4-storey buildings, they will be like walls that separate the apartments from the community.</p> <p>Also, at the walkabout, we expressed that we did not want a 'T' approach in developing the area, but to have higher density in the entire area, using a circular approach with the Canada Line station at the centre. We suggested that the planners stick to the RPSC vision for the entire area and higher density could still be achieved by having townhomes, rowhouses, even duplexes in the entire area, without the taller 3 or 4-storey apartment buildings.</p> <p>Now I see that 3-storey lanehouses are planned. This is too extreme. Definitely, 3-storeys is too high; even 1 and 1/2 or 2-storey laneway houses need to be re-considered. My issues with this with 3-storey laneway houses include lack of privacy and facing a wall of 3-storeys right across my lane.</p> <p>These are just some of the reasons I was unimpressed with the show at Oakridge auditorium. It shows that the ideas we proposed at the walkabout were not considered seriously. At your show, I was told by your planners that the RPSC Vision does not apply to the 'T' area, or along the 2 blocks east and west on King Edward. Why not? The people living in and near the 'T' area are a part of the community so why should that area be excluded from the RPSC Vision?</p> <p>Another point to consider is the transit/bus system in the area. There is a #33 bus that travels near Queen Elizabeth Park, and the route is from/to UBC and 29th Avenue Station. People can take this bus, and the other buses that serve the area (#25 UBC/Brentwood, #15 Cambie/downtown) to the Canada Line station. All 3 buses stop right at the Cambie and King Edward intersection. You can spread out the higher density instead of clogging everyone up at the intersection. People can walk to the station or they can take a bus to the station.</p> <p>The concerns of the residents who attended your summer walkabout need to be addressed. I did not see them addressed seriously at your show. We live here. We are the ones who are building the community. We are the ones building and maintaining the neighbourhood. I urge you to take the King Edward area out of Phase 2 planning and consider more seriously the concerns of the residents in the community. Your 4-storey apartments along King Edward will be a divider, not something that will unite the neighbourhood.</p>
11	<p>I've been to the open house and I as a resident of the Cambie and King Ed. area, I feel its important that I pass along my comments. I'm continually surprised by how little the city listens to the local residents when they do their urban planning. The new Norquay area is a recent example of this. In our neighborhood development, the residents were all caught by surprise and a lot of the comments we from the last community meetings were not implemented this time. A major comment last time was that the cambie and king ed. area should stay within the RPSC community plan and it should stay at 3 stories for a better transition to the neighbourhood. What's the use of building a big wall of buildings to block off Cambie and King Ed from the residents behind the arteries? At the very least, King Ed should be removed from this development or restricted to 3 stories max because there's no other tall buildings along it. It would drastically block off views and create shadows for residents both north and south of King Ed.</p> <p>If council passes this proposed plan through as is without listening to the many comments that our residents have, I for one would take note of who the councillors are and not vote them back in for the next session.</p>
12	<p>As I have reviewed your plans for the Cambie corridor, I am appalled at how deeply insensitive your proposals are to the many residential neighbourhoods along, and adjacent to, Cambie Street. I am a home owner on the 200 block of West 23rd Avenue, between Yukon Street and Columbia Street. What initially got my attention is that your plans propose four-storey apartment buildings and up to 3 story lane-way houses directly behind our home. I am very opposed to the scale of this plan, which ignores the Riley Park South Cambie Community Vision that states, "no more than 2-storeys", and mandated "sensitive transitions" to residential neighbourhoods. As I have had more time to look at your plans in their entirety, I am further appalled at the scale of buildings proposed all along Cambie Street. I am shocked at the massive changes you are rushing through without proper transparent review, nor a longer, and better advertised, season of public input and consultation. What are you thinking?</p> <p>First off, I am all for sustainability, but I disagree with how you are going about it! You cite places such as Portland, Oregon, as cities that have built up density around transit. Well let me tell you, Portland has a large network of transit that is well-planned and integrated throughout the core of Portland, and to all of the outlying communities including Clackamas, Tigard, Beaverton, Gresham, Hillsboro, Tualatin and Wilsonville. Portland has communities that have stayed intact, while weaving the network of transit around them. Portland's transit includes buses, MAX Light Rail, WES Commuter Rail Line, and the Portland Streetcars. Wow! That's a true web of transit, much of it rapid, that links all the areas of Greater Portland, not to mention the bicycle routes. See for yourself their transit map at http://trimet.org/maps/trimetsystem.htm The density has come in gentrified areas such as the Pearl District, once industrial, where the high-rise developments have appropriately reflected the scale of the downtown area. Take notice, that the transit has gone to the communities. They have not forced increased density around one line of transit.</p> <p>In stark contrast, Vancouver proper relies heavily on buses. Sky Train is mostly a commuter rail, and also serves parts of downtown and East Vancouver. And the new Canada Line, along which the Cambie corridor density is proposed, is the only rapid transit which serves the West Side of Vancouver. This proposal of eco-density along, and adjacent to, Cambie Street is really like "putting all of your eggs into one basket." We have one rapid transit option on the West Side of Vancouver, and you are making plans solely around this line. Massive changes of scale and form, forever changing the livability of our neighbourhoods are being proposed, and rapidly pushed through. Have you conducted an independent study to determine whether the Canada Line will be able to support a major increase in ridership, when it is already at capacity during peak hours? Have you crunched the numbers of new residents projected along Cambie Street, to determine by how much the ridership would increase, and whether the Canada Line would be able to handle this increased ridership?</p> <p>It's not about bringing the people to the transit, it's about bringing the transit to the people. Enlarging the scale of development, and therefore increasing the population around the Canada Line will only increase the population of Vancouver. Those people may or may not choose to use the Canada Line. And you better believe that they will all come with at least one car per household. Expect an increase in traffic and carbon.</p> <p>And what about all the folks who live further west in Kitsilano, Kerrisdale, Point Grey, Dunbar, Southlands. Will they be using the Canada Line? Or driving their motor vehicles to get around the city? We need more rapid transit to reduce our carbon footprint, not plans for massive change of scale in residential neighbourhoods just because they happen to be along the Line. We need Light Rail and Street Cars to access more neighbourhoods of Vancouver.</p> <p>This is not a plan that aligns with sustainability. This is a plan for an increased population—with more cars. And it is not a plan that has followed the Riley Park South Cambie Community Vision mandate for "sensitive transitions" to residential neighbourhoods. It is a plan that will coerce home-owners adjacent to the proposed mid and high-rise developments to sell their properties in order to recover a sense of privacy, and scale that feels human like the neighbourhoods we know and love. And</p>

	<p>finally, this is not a plan that makes our neighbourhoods feel more livable. This is a plan that will give our beautiful Cambie Heritage Boulevard the effect of a ghetto.</p> <p>This attempt at sustainability has not been well thought through. It is, rather, a forced approach, not one we would expect from wisdom, experience and sensitivity. Clearly, this idea of eco-density needs a new and more sensitive approach. Vote NO.</p>
13	<p>We have lived in _____ Avenue for over 30 years and many of our neighbours have lived in this neighbourhood for 40, 50, 60 years. Cambie Corridor includes neighbourhoods that are quite different in character, so it is reasonable for us to limit our comments on the section around King Edward Station. The height changes proposed by the planning team will increase the density of the neighbourhood in the King Edward /Cambie area and adversely affect the view from houses in the 300, 400, 500, 600 blocks of West 26th Avenue.</p> <p>Cambie Corridor has always been identified with the beauty of Queen Elizabeth Park and the North Shore Mountains. We honestly hope that the planning department will take into consideration the long established identity of King Edward/Cambie neighbourhood and will not adopt revolutionary principles which were formulated without any sensitivity to the well-being and interest of the home owners and their families of this neighbourhood.</p> <p>To make changes more acceptable to our neighbourhood, we would like to suggest the following re-zoning criteria for inclusion in the proposed plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum height on Cabie Street from 16th Avenue to King Edward be limited to 6 storeys. 2. Cambie Street from King Edward to 39th Avenue to remain single family homes only. 3. West King Edward from Ontario Street to Laurel Street to remain single family homes only. <p>We do believe that the identity of this long established neighbourhood, the beauty of Queen Elizabeth Park and the view of the North Shore Mountains must be taken into consideration in any proposed changes to the Cambie Corridor.</p> <p>We earnestly request that the planning department will consider the community's input..</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to our input.</p>
14	<p>Our neighbors live in 1 or 2-story houses. Some of us can see top of north mountains and things quite far away as most Vancouver's houses. After the Cambie Corridor plan, all of us will be enclosed by 4-story and 6-story high buildings. Consider high walls of 4 and 6-story surround you at a very short distance. Our sight will be limited to 20 or 30 meters, and all of them is brick walls. It is real a very bad feeling.</p>
15	<p>I am the resident and the owner of _____ Avenue. I am really upset about the rezoning project in our neighborhood. The followings are the reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -There will be no more PRIVACY for us, as the project will be RIGHT BEHIND of our house. -There are lots of traffic already since RAV has commenced, and it will be even more if the rezoning has approved, not to mention car accidents due to the steepness slope from King Edward to West 24 Avenue especially in the winter time. Please double check with ICBC regarding the car accidents records around that area. -Parking has been created a lot of problems already, and I cannot imagine what will happen after rezoning. -The crime rate definitely will increase. -My family and my neighbors will not have a SAFE AND QUIET neighborhood environment. <p>I hope you will think thoroughly and listen clearly with all our feedbacks before making any decision that will endanger our neighborhood.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>
16	<p>Bottom line is my wife and I worked extremely hard for years to attend university and find jobs so we could afford the house we have on the 600 block of 26th Ave. We paid a premium for our view and the quiet residential area.</p> <p>Putting up a four story building in front of us is totally unacceptable. Previous studies consistently supported keeping the existing "zoning". The large number of residents who went on the walk with planners made it absolutely clear tall buildings were unacceptable along King Edward.</p> <p>After getting frustrated with people repeatedly complaining about the plan for 6 and 4 story buildings during the walk, I remember one of the planners respond "I got it, I got it, no tall buildings on King Ed"!!</p> <p>One important point for you to research now..... Where are new kids going to go to school? Emily Carr and Edith Cavelle are full. I know as my own daughter who lives 3 blocks from Cavelle and is within in the catchment area was put on a waiting list to get into kindergarten two years ago and it is worse now.</p> <p>The Canada line is near capacity and no you can't add cars as the stations are not long enough.</p> <p>We are furious about the proposal and the lack of "listening" from the planners who heard directly from residents who will be so negatively impacted by the plan.</p> <p>I am sure you have read many letters like this. While it may not have much of a personal impact on you, it sure does for us. Please take that extra step to ensure the frustration from home-owners like us are taken seriously enough to make tangible changes.</p>
17	<p>I have been to a couple of your meetings and found that you have not listened to the people in effected areas. I have yet to talk to anyone that wants your changes.</p> <p>We do not want any high-rise buildings even your new designs. If you are so confident this is what we want why don't you have a referendum for the effected areas and you will see no one wants it. I personally find this city government that we have (for now) only does lip service and do not listen to what we want.</p> <p>In case you have forgotten we are the TAXPAYERS.</p>

65 signed copies of the letter below were received by mail. Names, signatures, and contact details have been removed by City staff.

To : Planning Department, City of Vancouver	By Hand or By Fax to : 604-873-7898
To : City Council, City of Vancouver	By Hand or By Fax to : 604-873-7419
And To: Whom This May Concern	

Re : Rezoning near the King Edward Station / More affordable housing near Hub Supported / Higher Density or Height Along Hub Supported

With respect to the upcoming Cambie Corridor Rezoning plan, please note that I am in support of higher density increase and height allowance along the first block to the East and West along King Edward Avenue near the King Edward Skytrain Station (up to six storeys, as proposed in the rezoning plan from the 2nd Open House). Higher density and height has a number of benefits, including:

- providing more affordable housing in the neighbourhood particularly near hub or intersection,
- stabilizing rental rates by providing more supply,
- making the Skytrain facilities more accessible (in line with the transportation plan and the goal of public services), and
- promoting the neighbourhood's urban growth.

I believe that a higher density and height would provide a stronger base for sustainable growth of the Cambie Village and Cambie Corridor area, and of Vancouver in general.

Six storeys for the first block around the intersection of Cambie and King Edward as proposed in the plan shown in the 2nd Open House is ideal and is not too high. Given that the King Edward and Cambie Hub is very close to the Cambie Village area where stronger growth is desired, please allow for a higher density of FSR 2.5-3.0 and up to 6 storeys along the blocks closest to the Cambie Street and King Edward Avenue intersection in the upcoming rezoning, so that more affordable housing can be created along the hub, in line with public housing and transit goals. [This includes the block along King Edward Avenue from Cambie to Yukon Street (to the East), and the block along King Edward Avenue from Cambie to Ash Street (to the West).] Thank you for your kind attention.

Full Name:	_____	Email or Tel No.:	_____
Signature:	_____	Date:	_____

Further Remarks or Address (Optional) :
