

1. Norquay Park and Earles Street In general, what is your opinion about the low-rise apartment zone? Do you have any specific concerns or ideas to improve the policy?
Need a comprehensive plan
I am opposed to mass rezoning. There needs to be a comprehensive study- Ellen Woodsworth's proposal. Does this meet the Community Vision 2004 Renfrew Collingwood - as approved by City Council. Keep the buildings low around park area.
What is considered low-rise? Low rise < 10 storeys or > 10 stories? I do not object to 3-6 storeys but not any higher.
There needs to be attention paid to reducing social isolation that happens in big complexes. Who will do this work?
Excellent Idea
ok
City has taken well care of the area and have done a very good job. I was the first person to purchase RT-10 Lot in Vancouver. Changing zoning brings more affordable housing for small family. By Profession, I am a realtor and I have spoken to many buyers who are looking for affordable housing. I would like to see the Plan to be more relaxed for permitting purpose. Take long to get the building permit out in RT5, RT 10, RM1 and new zoning. Make it shorter time for permit, also increase the FSR for RT-2 and RT5 Zoning.
In principle, I agree with the increased density. However, please mind that increase density around a park can lead to crime in the park.
Not for social housing
very sound idea. Will provide more eyes in the park plus much needed body heat. Hopefully the same concept can be accomplished around Slocan Park. Would be great if a similar concept could've been applied around Brock Park.
I think the low rise apartment zone is the best use of the space. The greater the density close to Kingsway, the greater the chance that new businesses on Kingsway will succeed and the more vibrant the community will be.
Good idea.
We strongly support the density. For the area to change we need density to bring younger base (small family to area)
With all the high rises being built, there will be no access to Norquay Park for anyone on the south side of Kingsway - example is Sasamat Lake, White Pine Beach, only the closest residents get access.
I hope they will be <u>rental</u> apartments & not too expensive. We seem to have a great many too many expensive condos. Who is buying them?
Why the question is left out from the translation?? "In general..." Concern: the existing owners will be squeezed out under the higher property tax assessment, even if the property is NOT developed. The proposal MUST include a clause to "ONLY INCREASE" the property tax when the existing use is converted to the new zoning.
The way the apartments frame the park actually accentuates the park. The park becomes, in some ways, the frontyard to the apartments. It is a positive move.
I do not like the low-rise zone. It allows for more apartments which mean more shadow for some neighbours and more incentive for developers to buy up and demolish existing character homes in these areas. This will drive out existing families (like us) who desire a house not an apartment. We are already bracing ourselves to have to move when these plans are implemented. Very sad.
I like it.
I would welcome low-rise apartments along Kingsway in Norquay Village if these developments and even the urban design was held to a high standard. If you create a welcoming pedestrian environment, it would certainly fit into the neighbourhood relatively well.
I think this is fine since the area is slated to be redeveloped for a brighter, more vibrant residential area.
Low-rise apartments with ground floor office/business services within walking distance from skytrain and also Kingsway. Apartments should include mixed rental, subsidized and owned; NOT just condos.
I'm in favour of increased density in Norquay village, and think the plans proposal for low-rise apartments around Norquay Park is appropriate.
i THINK the maximum number of storeys should be 2.

<p>I have attended one of the working group sessions and have read lots of material on the Norquay plans. It appears to me that you people are intent on ramrodding increased density into Norquay, no matter how much the residents express their opposition. Do you not understand that this neighbourhood provides lots of low cost accommodation for Vancouver residents, and that your plan will result in loss of this accommodation? Are these low income earners going to be forced to move to somewhere like Surrey and produce more greenhouse gasses getting to work? Where are the plans for additional public amenities for the increased population - day cares, community centres, libraries, parks, etc.? I'm one of the few people who were born in Vancouver in the 1940's and who still live here (in the same house where I was raised), and I'm dismayed and incensed at what you planners and city council are doing to my beautiful city. You seem to be intent on turning this jewel with its unique setting into another crowded, expensive, noisy, city like Hong Kong, New York, or any others, displacing lower income residents as you do so. Shame on you!</p>
<p>board #4, like best picture #1 picture #2 looks too busy, maybe too high</p>
<p>If you are rezoning near a community's major park consideration should be given to a no road, no car edge to the park and the low-rise apartments. Automobile entrance to the low-rise apartments should be from the rear of the buildings, and you should get rid of the streets in fronts of the apartments - othwise all you are doing is creating an unsafe pedestrian, child environment which is also detrimental to the neighbourhood. For heaven's sake clean up your professional and do some planning that is ecofriendly !!</p>
<p>This was not an option that was in the Renfrew Collingwood City Plan document that the Norquay village centre plan was supposed to follow. More surveying of the community is needed in this regard.</p>
<p>I object to the last minute addition of low-rise apartment into long-established single-family areas, which makes further mockery of a core Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision (RCCV) principle: 11.1 Maintain Most Single-Family Areas. The addition of low-rise apartments around the park was not community supported and I do not support this.</p>
<p>Low-rise apartments create a barrier between a community and its park space.</p>
<p>Allowing apts by the park, where it's now detached homes: > 'increases housing choices'--no kidding. What's your purpose, besides circularity? > 'recognizes the urban design benefits of apts by the park. Why not list some? The Earles St parcels are wide and deep, and you say that suits them for apts. No kidding. Evidently you think this area should have apts, but you don't say why. Why not?</p>
<p>Norquay has always been a residential, single housing zone. I do not understand why this sort of zoning is necessary. It is going to change the area in ways that will resemble the Joyce/Collingwood area. I am not in favour of low rise apartments in this area at all. It is disappointing that the city made all these big decisions without the real and full consultation of the people who already live in those areas.</p>
<p>This idea was sprung on the community without discussion. Irrespective of its merits, it is an example of the top down process of planning. Such major changes should at least have been part of the community planning process.</p>
<p>This - and the proposed densification along Cambie Street - is increasingly converting the west side of Vancouver into a 'jail' cell, by impeding both cars and buses that cross Vancouver west to east. It's bad already. Since the conversion of David Hunter's garden shop at Broadway & Arbutus last year to condos and Murray's Nurseries formerly at Balaclava & 57th to housing a few years back, we only have Southlands Nursery on Balaclava & Art Knapps at 71st & Granville left in Vancouver to support urban agriculture. This is forcing me to drive across Vancouver (Kingsway) to GardenWorks in Burnaby for a half decent selection. Two small nurseries for all of Vancouver West? This is just a disgrace. But not surprising, given Mayor Robertson on July 8, 2010 called Vancouver residents 'f... hacks'. The psychopaths are winning!</p>
<p>I don't like the idea of low-rise apartments around the park. It will make the area seem too urban; I think we should aim for a higher-density neighbourhood with a single-family feel, and this can best be achieved through townhouses. Also, I don't buy the "more eyes on the park" argument. Apartments tend to be rented by younger, single people who are often out in the evenings and/or are generally not invested in the neighbourhood. Townhouses, in my opinion, would attract families who would actually use the park and mean more eyes on it in real terms. Also, I don't think there are enough townhouses in the city.</p>
<p>More eyes on the park from low rise apartments will give criminal elements more surveillance.</p>

Council adopted policy to allow for low-rise apartments on properties adjacent to Norquay Park. The objective of this policy is to increase the amount of housing choices close to public open space and to recognize the urban design benefits of low-rise apartments next to Norquay Park.

Council also adopted policy to include a section of Earles Street (part of the block between Duke and Horley Street) in the low-rise apartment zone. The parcels here are wider and deeper than typical lots for this neighbourhood and are located adjacent to the Kingsway Rezoning Area. These are the main reasons that make these lots well-suited for low-rise apartments.

1 (a) – The report approved by some of Council on 4 November 2010 is a defective, contradictory document and therefore has dubious legal standing. Consideration E refers to an Appendix C that shows *no* parcels adjacent to Norquay Park south of East 38th Avenue. Consideration F refers to an Appendix C that shows *no* parcels whatsoever designated on Earles north of Kingsway. This carelessness characterizes a City of Vancouver that is prepared to proceed on clumsy fluid notions of doing whatever it feels it would like to do – without bothering to make precise and consistent plans, or ever to stick with the planning already shown to the community.

1 (b) – The map of new housing types provided on page 2 of Newsletter #7 does not match up with boards presented at the February 2011 open houses. This constitutes false advertising. The Newsletter #7 allocation of additional apartment makes more sense than what the open house presented.

1 (c) – Why is this expansion vaguely called “low-rise apartment,” rather than the maximum four-storey specified (considerations E and F) in the report to Council?

1 (d) – Last-minute incursion of “low-rise apartment” into long-established single-family areas makes further mockery of a core Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision (RCCV) principle: 11.1 Maintain Most Single-Family Areas. Verbal contortions about “Retention of Single-Family Housing” on page 19 of the report do not stand up to logic.

1 (e) – The widely imposed triplex form [3.5.2 on p. 19 of Norquay plan] enables 9 dwelling units on two 33-foot lots. This far exceeds the sixplex form that RCCV listed as *Not Approved* at 15.5.

2. Height and Density on Kingsway

Please tell us what you think of the revised policy for rezoing along Kingsway - are there specific concerns that you think need to be addressed or are there any further revisions that would result in an improved policy?

Nothing over 3 stories

Do not like the massive height. What about amenities? The open house has consistantly shown new proposals - what next?

I look forward to change along Kingsway with added shops and amenities. However, I am concerned with losing my view. As minimal view as it is, it's still a view of the mountains. Building higher would take away my view.

"10 storeys" - where are the retailers who were supposed to move into exiting new buildings? "Pedestrian environment"- shadows. "benefits" - questionable - there may be disbenefits too - who pays for these?

I like the increased density, especially if it creates more commercial buisness in the area.

No specific concerns. It would be great to have a mix of larger tenant plus small tenant space which could support local businesses and start up. The inclusion of retail which are too small for chain stores will help ensure the inclusion of small/local businesses.

10 storeys is too high. Buildings this high do NOT build neighbourhoods, in fact, they destroy them. (check your copy of J. Jacobs). 4 should be okay.

No. Only the Plan and design need to improving and there should not be any further revision.

I like the idea of 2 extra stories. Increased density on Kingsway makes sense. However, you must ensure traffic through Kingsway is maintained. Kingsway is a major thru-way for vehicle traffic and additional bottlenecks in Kingsway will result in diverting traffic to smaller streets that can't handle the load.

We want a Library, daycare, community centre, supermarket, just like T&T supermakret built in 2400 and bank. Green belt too.

Very supportive of the additional desntiy and height. They will provide the catalyst that is missing and prevent the status quo which is preventing the area from prospering.

Please see answer to #1- As long as Kingsway is pedestrian friendly in look and design and feel - wide sidewalks, benches, trees, greenery - as proposed - I feel again that increase in density will add vitality.

I am in favour of increasing density and height. To revitalize Kingsway, we need more traffic to come through and that brought by increase density will increase pedestiran traffic as well. This is crucial for buness to be willing to invest in Kingsway and for businesses to thrive and grow.

1. The walkway on Kingsway and supporting shops are vital to area. 2. Important to keep traffic flowing on Kingsway.

Why are your drawing showing cycling "on" Kingsway when you have a perfect opportunity to "LINK" the north side alleyway system to an underused system from 12 & Kingsway to Knight Street.... And 22nd to Gladstone. (since your objective is to tear it all down to rebuild -- get bikes OFF of arterial routes and make their own arteries)

For a better pedestrian environment after the traffic lights so that pedestrians can get all across Kingsway, not less than halfway as at present. Also allow pedestrians to get a slight start so that they are not hit by hot rod drivers eager to make a right turn from behind them (as at Kingsway & Slocan)

Concern: existing RS1 or existing owners of lower density zoning will be squeezed out and be forced to sell to developers unless they are prepared to (or can afford to) pay the much higher property taxes under 3.8 FSR. It is highway robbery!!

I live in the area and I am the property owner of Kingsway's single family house. I support City's policy on Kingsway. I understand it would require several lots for one new zone development. I wonder whether City staff could act as liaison to communicate between owners on such possibility and help implement rezoning. I hope the area will consider a new library, farmer's market, banks, pedestrian assistance cross walks.

Other than commercial use along Kingsway, add library, daycare, and large scale supermarket (such as T&T, Safeway, or Superstore), banks, community centre, centre for senior activities. These amenities will help liveability as population increases. Chinese is the prominent ehtnic group in the community. Chinese Restaurants are assets.

There needs to be assurance to the community that the guidelines to sculpt the 10-storeys components are acted out so as to prevent the 10-storeys from becoming more than 80 feet wide. Design-wise, the FSR3.2 look produces a rather uniformed streetwall which, in my opinion, is visually less appealing. The variations in height and architectural expression produce a visually more dynamic streetwall. One may think of this variation as architecture miming the mountain ranges to the north.

This part of the plan appears to have been very well thought out.

I would like to see the zoning remain unchanged. The reason a number of local businesses have failed has been due to rents being too high. I don't really believe the increased density will change that. Who will choose these new apartments? I think not the people living here now being forced out by impending construction congestion and lack of green space. What of the beautiful gardens and vegetable plots that fill the existing area? They can't all be squeezed into "community gardens" and landscaped condo inches.

I hope such areas as the 2400 Motel just west of the intersection of Kingsway and Slocan is maintained. It's a landmark with some significant architectural distinction!

I have concerns with street level retail / commercially zoned spaces which lie vacant. Observe units West of Kingsway and Nanaimo - as units are finished with residential above the storefronts are vacant. Is there a need or plan for attracting businesses or relocating existing businesses in these new spaces. From the drawings and plans it appears that there will be quality materials and an attractive plan for the facade of these new buildings. I would limit the apartments to 8 storeys on kingsway, and do 1 - 2 apartment towers.

Agree with 10 storeys, as long as there is ground-floor service businesses; and not just offices. Also, only agree if there is mixed rental and condo and subsidized units; not just condos and high-cost rentals.

I support a density of 3.8 FSR along Kingsway in Norquay Village. The current street is a failure as an urban experience, and I would use neighbourhood shops that would be supported by the additional density. I also think our neighbourhood schools would be supported by the additional families that would enter the neighbourhood.

The policy should not have been changed. The 3.2 FSR and 8 storey proposal is the maximum I'd want to see.

I do not like. Tall buildings make street dark and louder, not friendly, too much like empty king Edward village. board #7 middle picture is better, but am very worried new shop space will not be affordable to existing and favourite businesses. we will lose our local flavors. Why no street trees in middle picture like big one on right? City can't afford a few trees?

Why do you call it Norquay Village and there is no village just an elongated commercial strip. The higher density proposed will not provide value to the neighbourhood because it is not centralized - all you are doing is encouraging people to shop by automobile at future commercial sites along a 1.6 km roadway, stopping and going (the worse kind of pollution) instead of biking/walking to a centralized site and not using their car to do this.

Again, this was not an option that was supported by the Renfrew Collingwood Plan. I am not sure how 10 storey buildings would build a "village" so I have never supported this option.

The additional height and density is not justified and is not community supported. I particularly object to the potential of expanding Transfer of Heritage Density to land in the Norquay area.

The policy could be significantly improved by paying attention to the concerns and suggestions put forth by the residents who have devoted countless hours to consulting with their neighbours about how to support the revitalization of Kingsway and this area of their community.

Developers say 'Well maybe we won't....' and you capitulate, grovelling. Surely there's a more nuanced way to deal with developer demands. Then you fob off the public with generalities about "revitalization" "locally oriented" "choices" "convenient". Two stories of the original eight could also be carefully sited so as to make an even better "pedestrian environment." So how about two more storeys... and two more again.... Walkability will never suffer, no matter how high the canyon walls; just use some clever design. I dunno --two extra storeys for each Open House? Grottesque dishonesty.

Traffic, road safety, accessibility, and noise levels are all concerns that come to my mind. I can understand revitalizing but higher density zoning is suppose to lead to revitalization?

The prospect exists to turn Kingsway in to a canyon

I wouldn't buy a single family house with 10 Storey appts a few blocks away looking down into my yard and windows. You seem to think that the people screwed by these forced rezonings are just going to suck it up, eh?

I do believe that more apartments, including ones up to 10 storeys, will mean more retail options on Kingsway, and that's a good thing. People often complain about the high rises around Joyce, but there's a lot of shopping and restaurants, etc. around Joyce Skytrain and along Kingsway near Joyce, and you see a lot of people walking in those areas, something you don't see in Norquay. I would like to see some incentive for community services like daycares, clinics, community centres, etc. too though - not just retail.

With increasing density, rezoning should mandate more LEED type sustainability and community amenities and more light corridors (building setbacks, etc)

2 (a) – Kingsway will never be “revitalized” by encouraging construction of concrete-and-steel safe deposit boxes designed for unoccupied investment ownership.

2 (b) – The dramatic loss of local retail, even as Norquay has densified, points to socio-cultural factors that planners have refused to take into account. Planning that is limited to physical and financial considerations alone is doomed to fail. The dominant culture in Norquay probably drives to big box retail and seems unlikely to alter that habit.

2 (c) – Talk of “a better pedestrian environment” seems fatuous, after consideration of developer incentive and profitability has overridden a clearly expressed community desire for retention of the human scale that encourages walking. Comment on the June 2010 open house provided reference to solid academic consensus that six storeys is the upper limit for human scale. While city officials fawn over Copenhagen-based planning celebrity Jan Gehl during his recent visit to Vancouver, they concurrently proceed to plan on dumping excessive heights into Norquay, condemning the community to ongoing facilitation of automobile ownership and traffic.

2 (d) – “Benefits” crudely translate into nothing more than the dollars produced by DCL and CAC, since Norquay residents have been told repeatedly to have no expectations of other funding sources. Without an area DCL provision, those revenues will disappear into general coffers. Without provision to land CAC at the neighbourhood centre, small increments will be chained to (and possibly only serve) particular development sites. Workshop 5 (14 May 2009) demonstrated clearly to the Norquay Working Group that any DCL/CAC payback will be miniscule or non-existent in proportion to what will be taken from the community.

2 (e) – Without compensating injection of capital from other sources, such as general capital planning and the Property Endowment Fund, residents of Norquay will have little reason to support specific rezoning proposals.

2 (f) – A primary function of rezoning is to generate development fees and additional property tax revenue to support the city's general operating funds. A major political consequence is apparent minimization of property tax increase, even though Norquay residents will in fact bear increased burden. Higher-value areas of Vancouver also benefit from being shifted closer to the average. Plan comments on page 19 provide no longitudinal data for the Kingsway and Knight property tax experience subsequent to mass rezoning. The report's bare assertions and facile anecdotes are nothing but fluff. Three-year averaging offers no significant mitigation of impact and serves only to fudge the issue.

3. Height and Building Massing

Please tell us what you think of the recommended height limits for rezonings along Kingsway - are there specific concerns that you think need to be addressed or are there any further revisions that would result in an improved policy?

Further revisions are required. Nothing over 3 stories.

No higher than 6 storeys. Perhaps good to develop along Kingsway shopping and amenities. Taller buildings create shading.

Tall buildings increase social isolation - they are also more costly to operate - costs that the developer avoids

Can buildings be higher with more open space at the bottom?

No specific concerns

(see above)

The current height proposed is great.

I like the idea of staggering the building heights such that sight lines are preserved. I think the idea of mid-block pedestrian spaces should be elaborated upon. I'm not sure how they will look.

No comments.

Fully supportive of the heights proposed. In exchange for this height, please ensure only top quality materials are used to enhance the street feel for the area.

Mid block pedestrian spaces and public plazas - would encourage outdoor café space, etc. Some concern that areas could become hang-outs - which could be positive or negative depending on the nature and temperament of the people involved. Public plazas would make me want to walk and shop in the area.

In favour - increase density - increase economic benefits - increase business - increase jobs - increase appeal to live and shop here.

Support density provided the area also attracts the business to make local community area.

20 stories is a much bigger allotment than was ever agreed on by any working group advisor

I can't really comment on this. I don't live on Kingsway.

Restrict height to prevent view blocking the RS1 residents

Don't allow taller height to impact our view

No comment

Avoid glass as material for tall buildings to reduce light pollution

Architectural expression is important to provide variance. On another note, what kinds of public amenities at some of the 12-storeys buildings - for instance, the creation of small mid-block parks - can be garnered from developers of these sites? Can these be included explicitly in the future district schedules?

Also well thought out, provided that the economic incentives are great enough for developers to actually create these pedestrian zones.

I think the mid block pedestrian spaces are a good idea, but the public plazas are not desirable unless they are filled with plants and trees. More barren concrete /stone/ brick space like at "King Edward Village" is not well used or esthetically pleasing, I do not believe it fits in with ecologically sensible planning either.

The heights are acceptable. Buildings should be setback further than at present so that the sidewalks will be wider.

This sounds just a bit too dense. Has city hall thought of the following factors: + transportation infrastructure: increased transit, traffic, walking, cycling + area schools + view corridors + sunlight

I'm not impressed by the plans for skyscrapers to stretch along Kingsway. Already there is King Edward Village at Kingsway and Knight Street, A new development where the El Dorado was at Kingsway and Nanaimo. With a plan for 2 - 3 tall buildings on the land where the 2400 Motel sits, as well as up 12 - 14 storeys along kingsway-mid block- It will appear this stretch of road is a housing block and not a community. It is a renters dream, with little character and where neighbours don't know each other. The plan of row houses / development along Earles across from norquat park is sound. I would look at Row Houses / Town House style apartments with balconies. Attract families and people who wish to stay in the community in these eco friendly, quality buildings. I certainly don't buy the trade off's of pedestrian spaces and public plazas for huge towers of apartments - these amenities should have been included in the urban design.

"No" to the up to 14 storeys in exchange for public plazas because experience in City Gate and other bright ideas like this, 'public' ultimately becomes private. Kingsway must be a lively, safe and comfortable pedestrian stroll; so the focus of the main floor storefronts need to be primarily community services....mid-size grocery store; affordable restaurants and coffee shops; eyes-on-the street businesses. Services needed: hairdressers, barber shoppes, laundry facility, retail shoppes. Community storefront for community police. Maybe relocate Collingwood library to buildings in the block just East of Purdy's. Wishing for SOMETHING to finally be developed in the old triangle gas station site at Rupert and Kingsway like street front with housing above on the Kingsway northside; and parkette on the southside. Or, move the Collingwood library to the Kingsway northside of the old triangle gas station site; and have a parkette/playground on the southside. Have the library face south and it becomes a true community space turning it's back on the traffic.

Design control is desirable to ensure developers provide public amenities and attractive designs/ materials. I support the density and building heights recommended by City staff.

Too high. Would prefer to see maximum 4 stories along Kingsway.

14 story. no. terribly dark, loud. this is not what was promised. you make another King Edward village mistake. very bad,

Who in their right mind planned this - go up to 12 storeys, 14 storeys and get public plazas along an elongated highway strip - this is 21st century planning? Perhaps consider a centralized village area with one large plaza - skip the other plazas and don't elongate the future commercial shopping area and build low rise apartments along Kingsway with work/office space to help create a sustainable/liveable/workable neighbourhood.

I would prefer if city staff are looking for 10 storey buildings that it be divided into 2 five storey buildings and 12 storey buildings into 2 6 storey buildings; 14 storey buildings into 3 4 storey buildings and the remaining 2 stories to be townhouses. There is no reason why public plazas mean that more tall buildings are needed. In fact visitors come to Vancouver and comment on how Vancouver is made up of mini villages - not any more if there are going to be highrises everywhere. We will look like any generic large city in the world and the characteristics of Vancouver as a city with an unique village characteristic will be lost.

I do not think any increase in height and density is necessary. I think that the existing four storey height limit should be maintained. Further, four storey buildings are the most energy efficient form of development, have the lowest ecological footprint, and are at a human scale.

Having experienced some of the public plazas adjacent to towers in other areas, I can't imagine why anyone would see them as an amenity worth the exchange. Even in crowded areas, they are not well used and suggest a sterility which is unlikely to foster the revitalization of Kingsway.

Christ, 'locally distinctive' means...? "Following questions" are? [that this error is still here indicates your disinterest in the entire exercise, and your disrespect for residents.] Ah, there's the extra, extra two stories: now it's up to 12! No! now it's up to 14! "In exchange!" we get 14 storey towers as deserved punishment for demanding a public plaza. Serves us right. What do I think? They're too tall for walkability of the street. I'm opposed.

I object to higher density so taller buildings are not in favour of.

first it was 8, then 10, now 14!

Do people really use public plazas and mid-block pedestrian spaces? Not in my experience. I see this particular option as a way for the city to just squeeze more density out of this area. We've given enough with the 10 storey compromise. Rather than "open" (read: dead) spaces, I'd prefer to see city amenities like libraries, community centres, neighbourhood houses, seniors centres, etc. These would actually be used.

These 3.8 FSR mid-rises should conform to garden landscaping and setbacks, as for example at East Hastings and Boundary Road.

3 (a) – Nothing seems to matter, except what “city staff recommend.” Evidence is needed that all these words of open house response are not pure wastage – only serving to satisfy city staff’s pro forma need to assert “consultation” after a deal has already concluded in a back room.

3 (b) – “City staff suggest a number of options.” This is not a true statement. Differing heights (always *additional* to the base maximum) should never be called *options*. Even that perverted notion of option might include *lower heights* and greater site coverage? Workshop input made it clear that no amenity and lower height might well be preferred by the community. That alternative must be presented.

3 (c) – Decent planning time needs to be given to consideration of alternatives. Extreme rush to implement is the opposite of “planning.” One example: In the presentation of the Norquay plan to Council on 4 November 2010, Director of Planning Brent Toderian called attention to the option of lower height and continuous cornice, and even expressed personal preference for that style.

(con'd)

3 (d) – Cloning a rejigging of podium-and-tower form into Norquay does not amount to creative “placemaking.”

3 (e) – The understandable desire of profiteering developers to continue grinding out a familiar form should not determine the structures of the Norquay future.

3 (f) – Mid-block pedestrian pass-throughs might warrant height trade-off. This should be case-by-case, during the circumstance of rezoning, and not mechanically written in as policy ahead of time.

3 (g) – Norquay Village does not need or want “gateways.” This jargon does not justify dumping ever more height onto the Purdy’s and Canadian Tire sites. Tossing in bits of “public plaza” at the outermost fringe of the “neighbourhood centre”

- will never compensate for additional height
- in fact amount to amenity for the development itself rather than the community
- make a joke of the pretense of creating a *centre*

If any height whatsoever is traded off for public plaza, all should transfer to making the central 2400 Motel site plaza as large as possible. Note that the Urban Design Panel in September 2010 said *one* neighborhood space, *not three*.

4. Design Strategies

Please tell us what you think of the recommended design strategies for rezonings along Kingsway - are there specific concerns that you think need to be addressed or are there any further revisions that would result in an improved policy?

Further review and revisions are required

Too much glass - causes heat build up from window glare. The designs are not attractive but rather resemble - same old bunker style. * What new amenities will Norquay get?

Translink needs to be onboard with increasing services along #33 Bus and #25 bus with the increased traffic and density in the area. Adding Parking Permits to current SFD Homeowners does NOT make sense. The City is increasing density so should ensure that SFD Homeowners are not affected by the increased density on our blocks.

No specific concerns

The design strategies shown are not relevant if the buildings are too tall.

So far it is better than other zoning.

The design guidelines appear well thought out and will improve greatly the feel of the area. Ensure that they are enforced when approving projects.

Attention to detail and design will add much to the overall look and feel of the development. A very important consideration and in my opinion well worth the time and money needed to make it successful and sustainable. Good design adds class. Beautiful detail is a luxury which all people will enjoy.

In favour - all looks great.

The thoughts on transitions from high to low and taking consideration of light will work.

Pedestrians and cyclist are not SYMBIOTIC!

Higher density, more traffic demand. Please do NOT block more streets. No more bicycle lanes.

Add appropriate pedestrian assisted lights to improve accessibility

Again, current design in this area seems to be well thought out.

The only improvements that would please me would be to decrease the building heights and get rid of the transition zones. I am glad some small consideration is being given to lessening the shadow/privacy issues that will be a huge concern for the affected home owners. Feeling very disheartened and railroaded by the whole process.

More must be done to encourage the pedestrian experience on Kingsway. I'd like to see traffic calming measures, public art, food carts, benches, greenery that would make it attractive for pedestrians using Kingsway. Also, it would be nice if they could encourage a diversity of local businesses as well as storefronts without bars on the window.

I would prefer 1 wider mid rise building with varied podium heights. It appears more aesthetically pleasing to my eye that the buildings are distinct. I think having patios or a common open area on the roof of the 2nd floor on taller buildings, so that the building is set back after 2 storeys, will appeal to anyone walking on the street - they don't have a tower looming overhead. I'm sure you have other visual solutions to fix this. And Please be aware of the shadows - to ensure Sun gets to Norquay Park, and any new green spaces that are being planned. I believe the finishes of glass, metal, and wood - similar to the modern Olympic style of buildings, or downtown newer construction (Think Olympic apartments or Trout Lake Ice Rink) where multiple building materials are used. I'd like to see masonry or finished stucco as opposed to bare cement. I also believe Light is important to set the mood of a neighbourhood at night - when we are in the dark evenings / nights of the fall and winter. Think of old buildings using spotlights to highlight the architecture. The use of color changing art like the 3 lamp posts at Kingsway and Knight. A playful neighbourhood using light as a modern homage to its history of The Walley's Burger Sign and the Dragon Inn Sign - and many others when Neon lighting was popular. Observe the art sculpture installed on the corner of the North Vancouver Theatre - all done in Neon Light. This type of bright and welcoming atmosphere would be welcome!

Eyes-on-the-street windows a MUST on main floors; wider sidewalks to look and feel safe and pedestrian friendly. Over-hangs from buildings to provide protection from rain/snow when walking or strolling to and from. Of course, interesting architecture with attractive finishing detail.

The area currently suffers from buildings with a lack of design sensibility. I support the cities recommendations with respect to design strategies.

why you tell us what design is best? you asked us and we said. now you make up crazy "sense of comfort" words. I know what i like, not you. board # pictures say 4 and 4-6 storeys, but building are 10 and more. all look the same and look ugly. we need local business and cheap rents.

You planners need a trip to Paris - human scale is at most seven storeys in most of Paris, your talking 10 to 12 storeys as addressing human scale? Which human is approximately 4.5 metres tall? Where are you hiding the gargantuans?? Most people I know are 1.68 metres tall - perhaps six to eight storeys is something for you all to consider and for heaven sake - civilize yourselves with some real planning by considering successful walkable cities - stop trying to be world class - with a second rate plan.

No more cheap glass materials such as was used at the 2300 El Dorado site. Also the boulevard idea with treed medians around Knight and Kingsway hasn't worked to improve the look of the area. However on the west side, on Cambie Street, Main Street, Arbutus and 12th Avenue, Kerrisdale, 10th Avenue, 4th Avenue the design team that went into building the look of a "high street" or village walkable area is quite pleasant. Recently Cambie Street was also "updated" to become a pleasant walkable street again after the completion of the Canada line.

I do not support any of the proposed design guidelines or plans. They are all too dense and should be left at four storeys.

I have trouble treating this question seriously, given the way in which the planning department has treated the views of the community to-date. It would seem to be highly unlikely that any concerns or suggested revisions that did not comply with the present plan would be given any attention.

"Addressing" the: sense of scale pedestrian street experience transition to other properties ...is what you have to do to when you throw entirely experimental levels of density and height onto Kingsway. But no problem-- I doubt any of you have any connection whatsoever to that neighbourhood: It's just blocks on a table, playing in university. Please let me know if I'm wrong

Generally speaking, I think it's a good idea. It would help give our neighbourhood a distinctive "feel" or "brand" - hopefully it would give it some character.

These design guidelines make some sense but where are all the green, energy and survivability requirements that the future will desperately need?

4 (a) – Planners are trying to make the best of a situation forced onto an unconsulted neighborhood at the last minute. Base FSR of 3.8 exceeds the huge blockbusting project at 2300 Kingsway. Human scale for Kingsway has been abandoned – any attempt to claim that it is retrievable is ludicrous. (Ask Jan Gehl.)

4 (b) – Panel 8 uses dubious kiddie drawings (no context, no perspective, uncertain vantage point) to make massive buildings look cute.

4 (c) – Panel 8 uses a dubious graphic to assert that 10-storey impact is minimal. Honest representation would also provide a face-on representation of the 10 storeys from the sidewalk in view, and another from an additional block away. (10 storeys is a new base height that seems unlikely to be respected in the long run, and is already being upped to 12 and 14 in certain circumstances.)

4 (d) – Anticipation of “eclectic streetscape” (panel #8) is black humor. Only organic evolution over time can produce a Main Street or a Commercial Drive. To deliberately incentivize rapid redevelopment through massive FSR is nasty “planning” for monoculture (a current proposal for the corner of Robson and Granville in the *center of downtown* is only 3.5 FSR). The main purpose of the plan is to facilitate rapid and maximized profiteering from hungry offshore investment.

4 (e) – Shadow impacts deserve even more than an entire panel (panel 9). They are the epiphenomenon of a sordid real interest to maximize height and density without regard to other costs and impacts. Dubious graphics downplay the shadow reach of 10 storeys (no 12 and 14 storey are shown). Honest presentation would show the full range of shadow impact, from summer solstice to winter solstice, with a line demarcating equinox. Propagation of these visual lies is shameful.

4 (f) – Panel 9 states: “A slender mid-rise building casts a narrower shadow than a wider mid-rise building.” Tautologies should not masquerade as information.

4 (g) – Panel 9 states: “Despite an increase in height to 10-storeys, the additional shadow does not extend beyond the transitional apartment zone.” This is demonstrably not true for the north side of Kingsway. Why does planning retail such lies?

4 (h) – September 21 at 2 pm is said to be “the standard benchmark used in Vancouver.” Can this assertion be referenced to the Canadian Standards Association or a comparable body? The reality of northern latitudes is that shadow is wanted for June to August to promote cooling (except for garden areas), and light and sun for November to January to mitigate cold and darkness. To promote the opposite abandons human values.

(con'd)

4 (i) – The two sides of Kingsway require different height treatments. A north side height of 10 stories or more would shadow well into the “character retention” area and do much to destroy existing character. General land slope downward to the north further exacerbates height impact on the north side. The overall plan needs to be nuanced to respect and compensate for north-south difference. Greater height on the south side could be matched by lesser height on the north side to achieve the same overall height and density, and to provide better views from upper floors.

4 (j) – The proposal in panel 10 for “architectural detail” (and no glass towers) is one rare instance of planners reflecting what the community wants.

4 (k) – The panel 10 recommendation to control building width needs to be strengthened. Even in cases where land assembly makes possible frontages of 80 to 100 feet, design requirements should enforce an appearance of at least two distinct separate buildings. There is a human scale requirement for horizontal diversity. Without variety along the street (example: Pender Street between Granville and Victory Square), there is no pedestrian joy (example: Victory Square to Pacific Boulevard).

5. Other Comments

Have we missed anything? What other comments, concerns, or ideas do you have about the revised policies for properties adjacent to Norquay Park, Eerles Street (between Duke and Horley), and Kingsway?

Overall idea is good. Just make sure BC Hydro is up to speed with plans and permits are passed in timely manners, especially for small sites Duplex etc. I went (through?) too much trouble while building a laneway house. Thanks.

I do not agree with the proposed changes to the original plan. The higher density. *my view and parking spaces are at risk of becoming obsolete.

2400 Motel block - keep as centre for Arts and Crafts. The massive height - too much. Is there consideration for livability, affordability?

Help strictly along Kingsway is required. Commercial/retails shops that I would actually want to walk to are required. Do we need 10 storey high buildings for that?! Probably not. There may be increased crime due to increased density. Kingsway and Knight development has not helped area. Roads are still congested. Retails shops are not drawn to area. You have a lot of empty commercial shops. Which equals decrease in value of area and property. Sidewalks are dangerous and require replair. Not aesthetically pleasing at all. Hopefully this doesn't happen in Norquay area.

Overall, the neighbourhood is well thought-out

How many new (additional) people are being raised - what about question like an addition 1 or 2 schools - library-recreation- community gardens - seems like you're expecting everyone to watch TV and not much else.

100% support infill houses or duplex

Great Job.

Do not want 2400 Motel to be demolished. Do not want 14-16 storey apartments. Kingsway & Knight development almost deserted - computer modelling is no predictor.

Encourage owners to maximize their potential when they approach the City with a project. The Plan is terrific and hopefully we can see it realized and not have Kingsway properties continue to pursue C2 Zoning. Hopefully with the additional density now proposed, additional public amenity space can now be realized at the 2400 site.

We (my husband and myself) are excited and happy to see the attention focused on Norquasy area. It will give the area a much needed sense of community. Thank you for moving forward with all of this.

Keep up the wonderful job.

1. Try to expedite the greenway to accompany the density changes. 2. Prioritize work effort towards zoning changes so can make this year (July) date. This allows the transition to work with Kingsway area.

Do people actually spend time fixing Norquay Park. They certainly have spent a year making it inaccessible!

I am concerned about possible heights along current residential streets such as my own (Slocan). Also what effect will all this have on residential taxes?

My address is East 30th Ave, back line is on east Kingsway that near the Norquay Village Plan, would you think about extend to rezone our area too? Thanks!!!

The consultation process (Since 2008) is a failure from the residents' point of view. The original proposal remains intact with NOT modifications to accommodate resident concerns !! Please ADDRESS the property tax increase issues!!!

Since height is increased along Kingsway, there is the need for a library here. Townhouses bring too much density. Parking and safety are problems.

I hope this area will become an affluent and beautiful commercial place.

Since height is increased along Kingsway, there is the need for a library here. Townhouses bring too much density. Parking and safety are problems.

Overall I am very optimistic about the plan. I would love to see some improvement to General Brock Park included in the design however; A little landscaping work here would go a long way to improving the overall feel of the park. Lets see some more trees and flowers!

I do not think such a mass rezoning is worth the promised grocery store or park improvements. I am mourning the loss of my neighbourhood already.

I was disappointed to see that some of the area in the original plan (specifically the area closer to the Slocan Park skytrain station, ie: northeast of Euclid) was excluded in the final plan. The trend in the lower mainland seems to provide for increased densification in areas closest to a skytrain station. Without a plan the residents of this particular area are unable to plan future development.

Please ensure the 2400 Motel is saved for heritage purposes. I'd like the hotel revived, perhaps taken over by a progressive owner like the Ace Hotel who could refurbish and restore the property to its former glory.

I believe this will rejuvenate the neighbourhood - anything is better than what is there at present and in my eyes a modern touch is welcome. I look forward to new businesses arriving along Kingsway, and local businesses taking root and expanding. My warning thoughts are that with imposing such high residential volume the sense of neighbours and community will be lost - with no community services nearby to organize street parties etc The residents of these new towers and buildings along kingsway will be nameless families and individuals who go home to their "Ticky Tacky Little Boxes" and not sit on thier front porch and chat or play at Slocan or Norquay Park. Other examples I have mentioned, King Edward Village - Installing a massive housing project with little infrastructure around. Yes there is transit and schools, And the building project brought the needed Supermarket and upgrade to the library - but new businesses in the area have not experienced the foot traffic of a community. People Stay Home! Big Name businesses stay away because there isn't the feel of a neighbourhood where people are out and about like Main Street or Commercial Drive. Local Businesses don't touch these new places because rent is expensive for beautiful new retail spaces. And no where in this plan has parking been discussed - no underground parking for the residents of the new buildings. Kingsway is a major Thoroughfare - even if it is calmed by this development, if we get fantastic shops in this area, where do people park to shop on their way home or a Sunday Drive? Lastly to complete the neighbourhood picture there needs to be some discussion on a community service in this area where residents can go - for welcoming as well as safety. My suggestions would be a Community Policing Office, a branch of Collingwood Neighbourhood House, or a teen / multipurpose room as a branch of a community centre. It doesn't have to be huge, at Minimum a community events board in the outdoor plazas - but something to tie the community together.

Ensure roads/streets that intersect Earles have 4-way stop signs, NOT traffic circles. Reaffirm that Earles is NOT a truck route and put up signage accordingly. At present we live with semi-trucks, not simply delivery trucks. Earles IS a residential area and should be enforced as the not-a-truck-route that it is now. Designate street parking as resident/permit parking. Pave the lane East of Earles. Take out the 38th Avenue right-of-way that goes West; and let us have it as a community garden as has been done with the right-of-way going East.

I support increased density in the city of Vancouver from a sustainability perspective. It is wrong to continue developing distant suburbs and provide expensive services to low density areas. Increased desnity will increase the efficiency and diversity of city services provided. I am not concerned with this plan providing developers an opportunity to make a profit. I am concerned with improving the quality of urban experience in Norquay Village through a healthier more lively, diverse Kingsway, and with increasing the supply of housing stock and options within the COV. I support the City's plan for planning changes in Norquay Village.

why you not listen? why you make ugly our neighbourhood? real neighbourhood is around Kingsway, not on loud street that you make louder. Fix up side streets and make a real neighbourhood place to be.

After viewing your plans it seems they are exactly that - plans put forward five or six years ago when your previous head of planning said there was going to be 10 storeys all along Kingsway !! Did you planners actually consult with the community that seems to be RS1 or did you go defacto before you held any open houses to the public. Great planning when the planners plan everything before the public has input. Which planning school teaches planning this way? I've only seen this once before in Melbourne, Australia - they're is still not schools in the dockside area they planned there for the approximately 800 kids that moved into that area. I would hate to imagine you are saying to the residents in this community - we'll build it and then we'll worry about other things later! Sounds like another receipe for disaster like your planned Olympic Community site - ended up having to market it in China and sell it to the mainland Chinese - good for you - only 1.4 billion left to house ! Should keep you busy- what about these poor local Canadians - where's the affordability and talk specifically about benefits for any community you plan for !! Anyone can make anything out of nothing verbally, what is your real plan - where are the benefits for the public - several plazas along 1.6 km highway - sounds like a cheap way to give an excuse for adding to the community. Why don't you put in a recreation centre? or at least leave zoned space for one ...

<p>We do not want the Norquay Park area, the Earles Street area and Kingsway to look like Joyce Skytrain (Joyce Skytrain is just towers and towers that look all the same). Again the Norquay community went into this process to build a "neighborhood centre" a "village community feel" and that is what we would like. We were also told that we could use historic markers to talk about the community, have improved bike lanes, and if there were some way to connect the long streets along Kingsway into one walkable pedestrian corridor that would really help to improve the community feel of Kingsway. Thx.</p>
<p>I do not think that staff should be proceeding with the zoning schedules as proposed. The City should listen to the residents and the plans should reflect their concerns, which presently the plans do not.</p>
<p>The lack of meaningful consultation with the residents of this community is truly distressing, and the last minute increase in density in a plan which many of the residents had already opposed, added within weeks of the plan going to Council for approval, makes it clear how little weight the views of residents will be given.</p>
<p>I don't live there, and I only know it as a result of my visceral shock some years ago, driving up Knight, to the Kingsway intersection. Suddenly I was assaulted by the the Great Fortress on that corner. A medieval fairy tale kind of fortress, one where the King is cruel to his subjects. Have you seen "Throne of Blood"? Unbelievably, grotesquely huge and angry. Designed to intimidate, to oppress. And to call it a Village... that can only be conscious self parody, again indicating your excellent sense of humour and complete contempt for the people in that neighbourhood. I don't know why they don't lay seige to the Fortress, take off a few FSR's, fill the Mews with dead cats... Your "GREAT FORTRESS of the VILLAGE ON KNIGHT" must surely be recognized by planners as a huge error of visualization, at least. All your techniques with photos and panoramas and dwgs (and the words!!) predicting something... did someone say "iconic"? -- turned out to be not worth nothing. Worse than nothing, because you and your Planning Department colleagues have to live with that horror for the rest of your careers. And you wonder why fewer and fewer people believe anything you say. Puts me in mind of that Monty Python sketch about the slaughterhouse. Except you have to see the clients as residents, the architect as the planners.</p>
<p>I just think it is very important to consult with those who live in the those areas about what they think as this will affect their living the most.</p>
<p>The rezoning will in all probability raise property taxes and continue the city's march towards unavailability of housing but for all but the most well off.</p>
<p>I think I've expressed it all. Please consider bringing some city amenities this way. They will serve as "anchors" in the redevelopment of this area, and help potential retail business believe that there will be a pedestrian customer base in the area.</p>
<p>A pedestrian overpass at Norquay Park to the stream walk to Slocan Park should be provided for.</p>
<p>5 (a) – Planners have refused to listen to the input they do not want to hear, usually voiced by persons whose primary motivation is future quality of the neighborhood – rather than “How much can I build now?” or “How much extra can I sell my property for?” Comment based on narrow financial self-interest should be discounted. Instead, it has been favored.</p> <p>5 (b) – General planner failure to address the many concerns expressed in the September 2010 Urban Design Panel review of the Norquay plan is deplorable. See Report on Urban Design Panel Response to City Planner Presentation of Norquay Village Planning < http://eyeeonnorquay.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/udp3-udpnorquay.pdf >. Here I remark only one salient example, the designation of the ubiquitous tower-and-podium as <i>not appropriate</i> [reference 3(d)].</p> <p>5 (c) – Each iteration of the “Norquay plan” seems to amount to nothing more than a new baseline for yet further increase in height and density.</p> <p>5 (d) – Will planners be able to offer any evidence that the effort put into this considered comment amounts to more than spitting into the wind? To claim that “open house” represents consultation is a cynical tactic, because planners know that the residents their “process” has ignored, dispirited, and burned out will stop participating. Planner stonewalling builds out an ugly fortress city.</p> <p>5 (e) – Use of the Kingsway median for tree planting is misbegotten. (East of Knight Street in fall 2010, twelve of 21 trees stood there dead – and earlier on, knee-high weeds). Planners insist on pursuing their preconceptions and refusing to listen to a community desire that precious road space be allocated to a bicycle lane. A single westbound bicycle lane would facilitate downhill traffic and contribute much to pedestrian safety on Kingsway sidewalks. [Let this cyclist confirm that other routes are preferred for eastbound travel because of land slope and inability to match traffic speeds. Let this pedestrian confirm that downhill sidewalk cyclists induce great fear.]</p> <p>5 (f) – The difference between north side and south side Kingsway, as detailed in 4 (i), must be reiterated as an outstanding opportunity to mitigate imposed inhuman scale.</p>

(con'd)

5 (g) – It is hard to know what to make of “planning” that circumvents and violates the foundation laid so recently by the local Community Vision [see 1(d) and 1(e)]. Has the City of Vancouver just wasted the millions of dollars that have gone into this recent planning?

5 (h) – Lack of attention to anything other than the economics of height, density, and mass rezoning stands out like a sore thumb. The refusal to examine social and cultural factors points to an unhappy future for the Norquay community and the entire city. More justice is currently being shown to the Downtown Eastside, though the outcome there remains uncertain.

5 (i) – Further reference my response (apparently ignored altogether) to the June 2010 Norquay open houses:
< <http://eyenorquay.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/100626-nrqohcomment.pdf> >.