

Do you have any specific concerns or comments about the Traditional Rowhouse zone?

No questions. It was a good clear presentation. Thanks

Allow this zoning on Clarendon Street (Bus Route)

Since this is bus route, it's better to have higher ridership to Skytrain. Allow Rowhouses / Stacked houses on Clarendon

Please allow higher density on Bus Routes - Clarendon Street from 41st to Kingsway. Thanks

Yes - too dense. If laneway housing is to be part of this planning, no higher than one story and monitor, monitor. Consult with neighbours. Constant inspection of development.

I think this is better than RT 10 Zoning. Please keep the D.P. time shorter. Builders are losing too much money waiting for 12 months for their permit.

Ok. In moderation.

Too narrow

Along arterials would be fine, but not in neighbourhood.

Great zoning.

a) The zone is too small. Traditional rowhouse was the new housing form most favoured at the community housing charrette. It should be zoned for more than the small area now included, specifically for much of the area zones for stacked townhouses.

b) The units are far too narrow. The Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan (hereafter called "the Plan") approved by Council in Fall 2010 states at 3.4.2 that what can be built on two 44 foot x 90 foot lots is "Five Traditional Rowhouse units, each 16 feet in width (minimum)" This latest iteration alters that specification to six units, each 12.5 feet in width. This makes rooms unacceptably small and dark. Provision for storage is not adequate.

c) A lesser front yard setback is good, but only if the result is increase in functional backyard.

d) Garages should be eliminated for this housing type. If units are built as drawn, residents will park on the street and use garages for the storage space that does not exist in their houses. Perhaps where two or more lots are involved, open parking spaces could be grouped together behind 2 or 3 of the units. Other units could then have enough space for a functional backyard.

e) The purpose of the side yard between the two blocks of units on Board 8 is not clear. Is it fire access?

I would like to voice my dissatisfaction with the following.

April 30 Planners Proposal goes beyond the plan approved by Council in November 2010.

i.e. The width of traditional rowhouses has been decreased from 16 feet to 12.5 feet. Rooms will be small and dark.

Do you have any specific concerns or comments about the Stacked Townhouse zone?

Implementation time - not mentioned what is the time scale for this approval.
No guidelines for properties not fitting the standard 33' or 66' lot size. We need more info on what a 40' lot size will look like. Also most houses on Ward Street are 100' depth, while the presenter only mentioned 110' or 120' depth lots.

Allow this zoning on Clarendon Street (Bus Route)

Since this is bus route, it's better to have higher ridership to Skytrain. Allow Rowhouses / Stacked houses on Clarendon

Particularly don't like stacked - far too dense. Locked off suites - future problems. Will be totally out of character. How will this plan impact on planning for rest of city? Is it City wide?

Great work. Like to see other area to be rezoned. 41 to 33, and Victoria to Fraser. RT 9, but 0.85 FSR.

Don't like this idea at all!

They lack character, are too big, and will reduce sense of community

There won't be sufficient space or light for green. Way too big.

Great zoning.

a) FSR for two or more lots, which stood at 1.1 in the Plan (3.5.2.1), has increase to 1.25. Green space is minimized and concentrated in front yards. (That less private outdoor space contributes less opportunity for the social interaction that builds local community.) It is not clear who will have the use of this front yard, or who will be responsible for maintenance.

b) Discussion in the Norquay Working Group was about stacked flats, 1 per storey, possibly with a shared stairway. Now buildings are being attached across lot boundaries and units exist on multiple floors. Together with (a), this means units are very long and narrow (about 50 feet long and as narrow as 12 feet 4 inches). Very little light will enter through end wall windows. Too much space is lost to stairwells and hallways.

c) What was basement crawl space has become a full floor. This pushes the building up from the "2 full storeys and a partial third" in the Plan (2.5.2.3) TO 3 full storeys and a partial fourth. The height of the building is increased from 35 to 37.5 feet. These redrawn units fail to replace the lost storage. What is provided under staircases is not adequate.

d) Preferable roof line for all types is sloped (minimum of 8/12 feet. If flat roofs are ever allowed, the top storey should be set back at least 12 feet from the front of the building.

e) Eliminating garages in favour of open parking spaces is an excellent proposal. Open space is more likely to be used for the intended purpose and has a smaller footprint.

I would like to voice my dissatisfaction with the following.

April 30 Planners Proposal goes beyond the plan approved by Council in in November 2010.

i.e. The FSR (floor space ratio) for stacked townhouses built on more than one lot has been increased from 1.1 to 1.25. Units will be about 50 feet long and as narrow as 12 feet 4 inches.

Do you have any specific concerns or comments about the Small House/ Duplex zone?

Would like to find out more specific details on the requirement for RT-11, in terms of what an existing owner with a less than 20 year old house can do under the RT-11 (i.e. specific requirements/ opportunities for in-fill house without tearing the existing house down).
There could be examples and plans for building an in-fill house, so that property owners can get a good knowledge of what they are dealing with.

Allow higher density on bigger lots or combined lots e.g. 50 by 120/ 100 by 120. FSR of 1.0 or more.
Thank you.

If the city is concerned about Green Spaces - more yard needed - for gardens. Don't take up the whole property. Parking not enough. Lock off suites poor idea.

Depends on the use of the lot - not too crowded.

"Duplex" is a misnomer if there are more than two units.

Great zoning.

I owned a big lot (48.33 by 140) in this zone. My question is whether I can add a unit to my principle building other than adding a laneway house. My house is only 10 years old.

The Plan's provision for required retention of character houses where development involves two or more lots (3.1.2 and 3.1.3) has been removed. Protection of the few remaining character houses in Norquay, an older neighbourhood in Vancouver, requires strong incentive. The Norquay Working Group identified the character of Norquay as eclectic, and planning must not allow new zoning to foster architectural monoculture.

The material presented at the April 30 Information Session is disappointing.

I would like to voice my dissatisfaction with the following.

April 30 Planners Proposal goes beyond the plan approved by Council in November 2010.

i.e. The requirement to keep character houses in the small house/duplex zone when two or more lots are being developed has been removed. This will make it more attractive for developers to assemble lots for more intensive development

Do you have any other comments?

I am prepare to work with City plans when they draft the final details prior to submitting to council. With residents raising some common questions on what can be done with existing property, the City planning deparment can address different scenario to address owner concern

Please complete this process ASAP

I am opposed to the large scale development without neighbourhood consultation. Save our Heritage '2400' motel. Should not be bulldozed - keep artists. Need to have a more generalized City Wide Plan.

I'm I am opposed to developoment without enough consultation.

Too big, too little green space left, and concern about gentrification (present houses have low cost suites).

We need to see the regulations and by-laws before the public hearing (there is just too little detail at present)

No garages - instead require permeable parking pads in back.

Considering many homes are already divided into separate units, this isn't really making it more dense, but rather, more expensive.

No. All zonings are great because they have more FSR and rental units, which will be affordable for new buyers. I hope this zoning approves soon and I support it.

Please provide separate space for presentations and Q/A session as there is too much reverberation in one large space because of a variety of other discussion remote from the space set out with displays for presentation and Q/A sessions.

a) Notice of event was received less than eight working days ahead of April 30.

b) The extensive and very complex material was not made available in advance (nor provided quickly following). To read and comprehend the material at the Information Session itself proved impossible.

This made it difficult to ask many meaningful questions.

c) Drawings were often misleading, not to scale, and poorly labelled. In one case (Board 11, Concept Design B), the actual area of the design exceeded the allowable area.

d) No zoning specifications were provided, only examples of what might be possible in some locations.

e) No design guidelines were shown.

f) There is no provision for evaluation of new and experimental housing types. There are few existing traditional rowhouses or stacked townhouses in Vancouver. Likely none have been built to the specifications for the zoning that is being written for Norquay.

g) Multiple significant departures from the Plan adopted by Council in Fall 2010 remained lost in style of presentation and quantity of detail. One of the first boards on display at any public session should clearly set out "What Has Changed Since Last Time".

Of greatest concern are the ever ongoing "creep" of FSR and height manifested in the current planning, and the removal of the requirement for retention of character houses in the small house/ duplex zone.

The Plan that went to Council must be respected.