

Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centres Program
Open Houses: January 30 and February 2, 2010
Comment Sheets Responses
1. What We've Heard
Have we missed anything you've said?
Yes - higher density means more children. The existing two grade schools are too far for young students to walk from areas like Dundee St., crossing Kingsway will need adult supervision. High schools are also too far. Low cost day care, before and after school care, is necessary for families with working parents. It is an average to below average income area. Affordable day care and places for before/after school care must be given priority.
No
It sounds as though you have taken the time to consider a wide-range of input and are well on your way to evaluating the needs, diverse as they are, of the community.
I am opposed to any changes that allow infill houses on the back of lots - too crowded for comfort.
Yes, input from Norquay Citizen Group. Guarantee of increased highrise development for the future. Guarantee of future neighbourhood involvement in future neighbourhood areas. Ensure balance of community, otherwise 20 years from now area will look like skid row. No more major densification. Leave 41st alone! Don't keep "pushing the envelope". We try to believe but hard to believe. Prove me wrong!
There seems to be no guaranteed amenities
City wants to crowd the neighbourhood around Kingsway. Wants too many townhouses and "where are the backyards for these townhouses?" Will the parks be bigger if we have more people in the area? Not likely. No to more high density, as it is now. There's 3 families in each house, these houses pay "one" tax, 1 garbage pick-up, "one" water" rate! If the City needs to increase income - Charge! 3 families in "one house" tax, water, garbage rate. And the City need not squeeze more people along Kingsway in "hi-rises". Build no higher than 6 floors along Kingsway. Poor example, Knight and Kingsway, Nanaimo and Broadway.
Not that I can see.
Just about everything. Even when you repeat one concept expressed, such as maintaining residential character and making sure shops are "locally-oriented" you push podium towers and retail spaces only affordable to destination retail outlets. Neighbourhood centers nowhere in the world are on major arterials yet you continue to push Kingsway as such a centre.
Laneway housing on a 35' lot. Double garage with living accommodation above, approximately 420'.
Kingsway sidewalk to increase to 25" setback; what is the economic impact? (cost) versus the existing concept or condition of 12" considering the area is commercial spaces and small gain in noise pollution and people will not stay or have recreational gain being it's a busy street.
Add density in pedestrian and traffic corridors between Skytrain (expo line) and Kingsway to take advantage of the trips people are already making.
No more high rises.
With the increased density, this will likely attract more crime and security issues. Although "safer" is mentioned in the input, there is no concrete evidence to improve the safety of the neighbourhood in the Norquay area. Has VPD, Translink or the block watches been consulted? One only has to refer to the Vancouver crime maps to see crimes (e.g. B&Es, auto break-ins, etc) concentrated around the transportation hubs like Nanaimo and 29th sky-train stations.

1st time visitor, hoping Purdy's Chocolates (industrial factory) can be phased out and relocated in favour of either houses or small business. Truck noise level is a major nuisance during the peek periods during the wee hours. Major hindrance to my sleep.
New resident. N/A
The City has done a great job in this community process. There has been an organized effort by a few people to disrupt the process at every step of the way. The City has shown great restraint and worked hard to work with the community at large.
Yes. Missed opportunity for a mostly RS-1 yet dense neighbourhood with sufficient population to support local services and a predominantly walking/biking transit infrastructure so we don't need a car for basic services. Essentially making 2 standard 33'x110' lots into 6 lots with the houses fronting a narrower street and a slightly wider alley. All fee-simple-mostly common-wall. It promotes families and green spaces. It satisfies land ownership desires. Green space is protected in isolated backyards. It's gradual and can be subdivided as opportunity arises no-need for any mass rezoning (NO MASS REZONING) in any plan.
More mixed housing! 'Average' people are being pushed out of Vancouver. More townhouse and mixed housing is needed everywhere - especially in the Norquay area!
No...it's time something is happening here. It's important that within 1 km. of any Skytrain station, we get high density to get people out of their cars and everyone will benefit in the long run. A lot of old people will be able to sell their houses at a good price and can finance their retirement.
There seems to be a lack of options regarding adding more density to the area. Specifically the amount of high density options should be extended beyond the Kingsway corridor.
Higher density housing on Kingsway should be balanced with medium density housing inwards, especially in the corridor between Kingsway and the skytrain stations.
No.
No senior housing, no doggie park, no coffee shop.
The intent of current proposals of creating sustainable neighbourhoods and revitalizing Kingsway is flawed. The approach is to make Kingsway facing a place where community will congregate. 1. Nobody wants to see changes that affect the traffic thoroughways. 2. People will not. A better approach shown to be success at numerous places is to create a courtyard area not facing the main traffic area. To accomplish use the first two blocks off Kingsway to create courtyard not facing Kingsway. Create more of a transition area by making next few blocks row houses to existing single family area
Yes, height should not be "7-12" storeys. Maturity opinion is 4-6 storeys, maximum. Kingsway will likely not be a "café" type street. Suggest the City buy side streets properties (in about 2-3 lots) every 3-4 blocks off Kingsway. This will allow retail level/cafe type enclaves off the loud Kingsway street, with housing (2-4 storeys) above. More green space, connected walkways. Bike paths.
Nothing except the Citizen Plan. The development should be in priority along the skytrain in which its other generic name is "mass transport". Make use of mass transport by developing along the skytrain.
I would like to see an emphasis on development and density between Kingsway and Skytrain.
Another use of skytrain is mass transport. Thus the dense development should be initiated along the skytrain and Kingsway. As Kingsway is one of main roads to downtown, development helps face lift. However areas other than Kingsway should be secondary as residents who live in other area hardly rely on skytrain mass transport. It is too far to walk. If taking transit the time is not justified. However, residents who live along the skytrain route are most likely taking skytrain as it is in walking distance and convenient.

<p>My neighbours and I thought all areas in Norquay village were supposed to be optional multi-family housing types--- especially on bus routes (Clarendon St.). We strongly support multi family zoning.</p>
<p>Have small area that is proposed to be only single family zoning into optional multi family housing. This will give more people the option to live in single house or multi housing for the extended family.</p>
<p>I live on a bus route (Clarendon St.) and I strongly suggest that city should make all areas into optional multi family housing zoning. From Kingsway to 41st Avenue. From Nanaimo St to Earles St.</p>
<p>Density focussed along transportation and pedestrian traffic routes, primarily between Kingsway and Expo line skytrain. Routes like, Nanaimo, Slocan, Earles, etc.</p>
<p>I believe there should be more emphasis on density north of Kingsway given pedestrian traffic that currently exists between Kingsway and Skytrain stations.</p>
<p>I was interested in having the entire Norquay area zoned for multi family housing so it would be feasible for my kids and other people to afford to rent or own a place in our neighbourhood. Please amend the proposed single family zoning to reflect this.</p>
<p>Our neighbourhood was interested of having the option of multiple housing development-- encompassing Clarendon St. to Earles St. and Kingsway to 41st Ave.</p>
<p>Most of it. What about a neighbourhood centre on a 6-lane highway do you find appealing? What planning school teaches this? The community has come up with a tremendously livable, safe, and attractive solution--based around development of fallow public land, and you just scoff at it and stick unsustainable glass and concrete towers where they do not belong. You have not listened at all.</p>
<p>Yes, we don't want 12 storey tower buildings or any buildings higher than 6 stories in Norquay. We want low-rise senior's housing.</p>
<p>You say people wanted to retain single family atmosphere but your proposals don't reflect that.</p>
<p>I am happy with the majority of the proposed improvements. The idea of the green linear park along Renfrew Creek is very good. There are some new and upmarket houses along this corridor, so it may be a while before the corridor is realized. Perhaps 35 or more years, unless the properties are expropriated - I am sure this would not be popular! Please consider traffic movements in your plans. While it is a nice idea to slow down traffic through traffic calming, these measures tend to create congestion. Kingsway is a nightmare to drive on as it is because of all the traffic lights, and the horrible drivers. This will be made worse with some of the traffic "improvements" proposed. Slow, congested traffic leads to frustration, in turn leading to aggressive driving behaviours.</p>
<p>Clarendon Street and Wales street from 38 Ave. to 41st Ave. should also be included for optional multi-family housing type - especially when Clarendon St. is a bus route</p>
<p>Yes, a great deal has been missed. The City received a considerable amount of community feedback at the five workshops and five working group meetings about Norquay. I attended a number of those workshops and working group meetings and see very little of the community feedback from those meetings and workshops in your panels.</p> <p>You have not requested feedback on panels 1-4. Why is that? Here is some feedback about one of those panels.</p> <p>Panel 3: The station planning represents a major shift from the workshops and working group meetings. Nanaimo Station received next to no attention before, but now there is to be planning 400 metres all around the station.</p> <p>Panel 5: "Strengthen Kingsway as a ... 'High Street' for Norquay Village." Citizens at the working group meetings proposed a High Street off Kingsway, along 33rd between Kingsway and Nanaimo. This proposal does not seem to be mentioned in any of the panels.</p> <p>Panel 6: "Support new development with ... neighbourhood focused amenities." People</p>

at the working group meetings proposed an arts centre and seniors centre at the 2400 Kingsway site. This proposal receives some kind of indirect reference on Panel 20 which says “we need a community space that provides recreational activities including arts programming to meet the needs of residents including seniors and youth” and “focus on large sites within the neighbourhood centre (such as the 2400 motel site) to provide a key community meeting and public amenity space.” This is vague – my description more concisely reflects what people were saying.

Panel 7: Where is the Norquay Citizen’s Group Land Use Plan?

You have not requested feedback on panels 8-10. Why is that?

As a Working Group member who attended all of the 15 Workshops and Working Group meetings for the planning of Norquay Village, I am amazed to see how much community input has been “missed.” Many of the 23 panels of “plan options” presented at the Open House directly contradict the clearly expressed views of the majority of active Working Group members (those who attended at least half the meetings) and of most participants in community workshops. Here are some examples of what community voices have said loud and clear during the past year:

1. The “heart” of the neighbourhood centre should not be Kingway, but the triangle of land bounded by East 33rd Avenue, Kingsway, and Nanaimo. This was the clear consensus in both Working Group and Workshop meetings. Kingsway is a major truck route which will never become a “pleasant pedestrian environment.” (And any organism with two hearts is a freakish anomaly that isn’t expected to live very long!)
2. There should be no more highrises in Norquay. We should negotiate with the developer to bring down the height of the tower proposed at the Eldorado site in exchange for increased coverage of the site (density would remain the same).
3. The 2400 Motel site should be retained by the city and developed to include an arts centre, a community plaza, and leased commercial space on the ground and possibly on the second floor; housing (but NOT highrise) could be built above. This concept has been current and popular since planning began in Norquay in 2006.
4. Transitional housing types should be concentrated around the triangle “heart” of the neighbourhood centre and around SkyTrain stations and should include, but not be limited to, fee simple traditional rowhouses (not strata). Open House Panel 16 is particularly misleading: what the RC Vision says should be considered around parks and schools is not specific new housing types, but whether these are suitable locations for new housing types at all. The Vision does not even mention arterials as a possible location.
5. Most areas now zoned RS-1 should stay that way. With the city-wide introduction of higher basements (now commonly including one legal and one illegal suite) and laneway houses, “flexibility on individual parcels” already exists.

Unless these principles voiced by the community are “heard” and become “directions” underlying proposed “plan options,” the choices that we are being offered are a sham, and response to the rest of the Comment Sheet seems to have little point.

buildings heights of 4-12 stories along Kingsway - How did the height of new building stock become 4-12 stories?

<p>2. A Kingsway: Buildings and Sidewalks</p> <p>Please share your comments on the proposed options. (Option 1: Continuous Mid-Rise; Option 2: Mixed Heights)</p>
Mixed height is better
We need safer crosswalks to cross Kingsway
Mix of heights will give a variety look for the Kingsway updates
Uniform mid-rise (6-8 storeys in height). We still need to feel like we are part of a community. This is not in opposition to development but rather, an attempt to preserve community which could ultimately be dismantled altogether by such sudden change.
ok
No 8 storeys - why are you pushing 8 when advised 4?
Why not 8-11 storeys, then give the neighbourhood more amenities
Mix of heights would create a more interesting built form allow more sunlight, reduce uniformity. Should have variety and not a 6 -8 storey wall -also construction cost inefficiencies in 6 - 8 storey buildings.
No more than 6 storeys - people need light!
A diverse arrangement 3 -4 to 6 would be ok.
How can a "uniform mid-rise approach" create "more variety"? Logic anyone!! Mixed heights are preferable and the lower the better. Think Granville St. not 4th Ave.
Good
I would agree to heights not to exceed 12 storeys at major intersections. Wider sidewalks would be nice. Definitely no retail along 33rd as there is not pedestrian traffic there.
None are good (they create a noise dark canyon). Create instead an open area that dissipates the noise. Do so with low 3-4 storey setback as far as possible from Kingsway.
How about better lighting (e.g. LED lights) to increase the visibility at night?
The higher the better, the more people = more security presence.
Mixed height seems more attractive with a few conditions: that the density of large buildings does not approach that of Yaletown/near the roundhouse, the EXPO lands - that the low parks of mixed height are real low and not 4 or more storeys.
If we must have higher density living in our area, definitely no higher than 8 storeys. A mix of heights to allow sunlight is important.
I don't think it needs to be one or the other for the whole stretch. There are some blocks that are too narrow to allow the widest sidewalks while on other blocks it makes perfect sense to go higher and provide those extra wide sidewalks.
Maintain 4-storey along Kingsway. Use greatest setback possible.
More high-rises.
A mix of heights would seem to be a more interesting design. I have no preference for the maximum of minimum of the buildings but do believe that the over plan should maximize the "opportunity" for redevelopment of the area.
Option 1...6 - 8 storey max. Away from 'nodes' --> 4-6 storey is more ideal.
Excellent ideas.
Neither
40 ft. sidewalk too wide. People prefer sidewalks that have people gathered and 40 ft. makes it too wide for the feeling of energy when people are gathered. Option mixed heights, is preferred option.
Increasing sidewalk width would eat into the road width. If so, this could cause an increase in traffic management. If it is taken from the building start point, then higher buildings should be allowed to achieve the higher density desires of the city.
Supportive.

Mix of heights preferred.
Sounds good.
Sounds good if it allows community amenities i.e. arts/cultural centre - green space.
Flawed approach - use select areas to create two blocks to do this rather than offset existing. This approach has too much impact on 2nd block.
Mixed used and varied height for buildings are more suitable
I would support greater heights at major intersection up to 12 storeys. A mix will add diversity to Kingsway.
Greater than 8 storeys would be acceptable at major intersections with varying heights mid block. This will help to preserve views to mountains and City.
A mix of building heights would add to the character of the street, with higher buildings at major intersections.
This artificial claptrap is useless as a planning tool. We are NOT giving Planning discretion to decide what buildings go higher and which lower. Eight is too high anyway!
We don't want 6-8 storey buildings all along Kingsway. This is not attractive street scale. An example of a low-rise well presented pedestrian friendly area is the area of South Main - Main and 18th to Main 25th.
A maximum height of 8 storeys needs to be broken up on the street facade and different heights required for parts of buildings so that there is variety and room for sunlight within the 8 storey maximum. The sunlight on the sidewalk should not be an excuse for high rise towers.
A mixed height solution is my preference. However, the taller building should be placed at regular intervals to provide a unified look. And the design of the buildings should be somewhat unified. Take for example Arbutus between 10th and 13th, or some of the new areas on Richards downtown. Arbutus is an example of uniform mid-rise, but has a somewhat unified look. Richards is a mixed height area (also with a uniform look) with a regular interval between tall and lower buildings. Notwithstanding a preference for mixed height buildings, the lower buildings should all be of a similar height, and the taller buildings should all be of a similar height. Perhaps the Eldorado site has already set the standard - 22 stories and 6(?) stories.
Panel 11: There is mention of "continuous mid-rise (6-8 storeys)" and "keep the maximum number of storeys to 7-12 on Kingsway." This is not an accurate reflection of what I heard at the workshops and working group meetings. What I heard was a maximum of four storeys, with the exception of a single eight-storey building at Kingsway and Earles. Where did "6-8" and "7-12" storeys come from?
I'd like to clarify that I am in disagreement in regards to Panel 11's Option 2. By bringing a mix of heights up to 12 storeys, does NOT allow for more sunlight on the sidewalk. Twelve storeys were not even talked about at the Working Group meetings that I recall, and so I was surprised at your mentioning of 4 storeys and up to 12 storeys at the 2400 Motel location.

<p>2. B Kingsway: One Street, Two Hearts Please share your comments on the ideas for the two hearts along Kingsway.</p>
We need more street parking
Good
No particular comment
We need a place like courtyard public shopping area on 2400 Motel site
What will be the price of neighbourhood village in regards to pay off? Concern!
Your idea is a "bad idea" - one neighbourhood should have one neighbourhood centre
Agree. Like the idea of nodes where more density is centred.
Would make the neighbourhood look nicer - more like Commercial Drive area.
The Kingsway and Slocan diagram is close to the neighbour plan. Wrap-around commercial is crucial.
Pedestrian access through to 33rd good ideas though 2400 site. No retail though.
Have one node/centre only.
Get rid of Purdy's and I'm for anything else.
One of the biggest things I have not seen is any mention of bike lanes along Kingsway. As a cyclist a diagonal route with a gentle grade is ideal. All of the other routes in the city follow the street grid. Kingsway would be a remarkable exception that other routes could be built around. As not everyone will be able to work here. Good non-car connections to the rest of the city should be a priority.
Attractive pedestrian areas are appealing, especially if some greening can be added. One concern is that it also becomes attractive for an area where people can sleep and beg.
I love the dumbbell concept of two nodes connected. We need to ensure there will be enough residential density to support these nodes.
Have one-node only --> Kingsway Slocan. Low-rise complex of shops and community public
This seems to make sense from an overall design perspective as it spreads the improvement over a larger area presents a "natural" bookend to either side of the development.
Very good.
Do not like either.
Either make a strong connection between the two nodes or they will both suffer. An anchor at both ends will mark traveling between two nodes more appealing with commercial and small destinations along the way. Connectivity for pedestrians is important.
Allocating space for public plazas should be balanced with increases to housing density. Agreed we need to allocate area for plazas, but other areas should be compensated with increases to dwelling.
Supportive.
Support this idea.
Coffee shop in there.
Two hearts increase the offset from Kingsway at this area. There should be a bigger transitional area of high density in next two blocks (e.g. row houses).
More public space at Kingsway and Slocan
I like the 2 hearts, but development south along 33rd Avenue would be a mistake as there is no pedestrian traffic there.
The 2 hearts concept is good, however, at Slocan, density and development along 33rd Ave is a mistake as there is little activity in this area. Focus should be placed back to Kingsway with development opened up to the Street rather than turning its back to a major thoroughfare. Also, development and density should be focussed between Kingsway and the Expo Line skytrain.

<p>Looks good. Unfortunately, any development or rezoning along 33rd Avenue would be in vain as I don't see how it would be successful given there is very little exposure and pedestrian traffic in this area.</p>
<p>Large busy intersections DO NOT create a neighbourhood centre. If you continue to see ROADS as the HEART of a community, you are living in the 1950s. GO BACK TO PLANNING SCHOOL.</p>
<p>We want a village centre - a Norquay centre as identified in our community vision. We don't want "hearts" or "nodes."</p>
<p>In the Kingsway/Slocan node several new houses have been, or are currently being built in this area. I know of one house on Kingsway going for just over \$1m! It will be a long time before these areas can be converted to the proposed zoning. As mentioned in one of the slides, a higher population density is required to support a community centre, especially as there are three major community centres nearby (nice work advertising those!!) Notwithstanding that, I totally agree with the zoning. I note that Purdy's chocolate factory has been re-zoned. Keeping Purdy's may add a little talking point to the community. It focuses outsiders on where they are. You know, "Norquay is where Purdy's is!!".</p>
<p>I don't believe you can have one street with two hearts. As the city has adopted a model of the organism to refer to the area, no organism can survive with two hearts and I believe this will fragment both movement and flow of people and traffic and defeat the purpose set out. The village should have ONE HEART - or centre, with the look and feel of a village, where there is green space, shelter from traffic, amenities, and pedestrian connectors. The 2400 motel site is an ideal location for such a centre, and the office and a few bungalows facing Kingsway should be saved, even if they are gutted and repurposed, or MOVED and used to create a small museum of the history and culture of the area.</p> <p>The development idea for the Eldorado is too big and would act more as a major shopping mall/centre, which completely defeats the purpose of creating a neighbourhood feel.</p> <p>More input into the planning should be given by local residents, and the city planners need to stop preparing fancy poster boards and start LISTENING."</p>
<p>Panel 12: What about the Norquay Citizen's Group Land Use Plan? Panel 12 shows a "Kingsway and Slocan – ideas sketch." Given that the citizen's group put a lot of thought into their plan and that the panel is reporting a node at the same location, why not include the Norquay Citizen's Group Land Use Plan, or at least acknowledge it?</p>
<p>The heart of the Norquay Village that we at the Working Group sessions talked about I thought was the 2400 Motel location. The dumbbell or two hearts idea was a City Planner's idea.</p>
<p>Two hearts of Norquay - Where did the two ""hearts of Norquay"" come from? New housing on the 2400 motel site - How did that area primarily become new housing with a little token plaza added on the opposite side of Kingsway?</p>
<p></p>

<p>2. C Kingsway: Design Principles Please share your comments on the proposed options and design principles.</p>
<p>Prefer lower street wall punctuated by taller bldg w/frame views</p>
<p>I like mix-height approach</p>
<p>Buildings that are crafted in a way that preserves and encourages a small-town yet urban community feel would be most desired.</p>
<p>ok</p>
<p>No 8 storeys, only 4 - 5 maximum</p>
<p>Mixed height.</p>
<p>Higher building should be set back from street</p>
<p>3 - 4 storey preferred - 6 storey max.</p>
<p>What design? This is massing, not design.</p>
<p>Mixed height approach, open to Kingsway and respecting view corridors.</p>
<p>Low-rise only services centralized at Slocan and Kingsway on south side away from Kingsway.</p>
<p>Mid-rise seems the way to go as high rises bring more unsavourables to the areas (drug dealers like penthouses)</p>
<p>The development at Kingsway and Knight is not bad, externally it's quite attractive except that the lower portions are still massive at street level. It's like a canyon along Knight. The towers are fine but a stepped lack street face would have been significant improvement.</p>
<p>Same as A --> allow some sunlight <i>(Answer to 2A : If we must have higher density living in our area, definitely no higher than 8 storeys. A mix of heights to allow sunlight is important.)</i></p>
<p>For the nodes I believe a mixed height approach is best. There needs to be a sense of place and a combination of height and additional ground public spaces would go a long way in creating this sense of place.</p>
<p>1. Max. setback from Kingsway as calming effect with wide pedestrian area and possible bike path. 2. Maintain 4-storey maximum as standard along Kingsway. 3. Step back down to north and south. The building height. Go with 3.5. and 3 storey RS-1 or townhouse.</p>
<p>Do not densify southeast Vancouver - we've had way too much.</p>
<p>Varied buildings allow for flexibility. It is areas like Main Street (Soma) that have awesome shops and cafes in funky buildings that make great neighbourhood character. The generic glass and metal developments are expensive to rent and boring to sit empty.</p>
<p>I would consider more than just mid-rise buildings, wider sidewalks would necessitate higher-rise density housing.</p>
<p>I prefer the mid-rise building.</p>
<p>Mixed height is better.</p>
<p>Agree with approach of mid rise building but should be two blocks and then two block transition areas with row houses.</p>
<p>Uniform height for buildings is more harmonious</p>
<p>I prefer the mixed height approach.</p>
<p>Development should be facing Kingsway to revitalize the streets, and should absolutely not turn their back on the road. A mixed height approach would be best to add character and scale to the neighbourhood. Areas such as West 4th Ave and Hastings Street in Burnaby are good examples. King Edward Village with its back on Kingsway is an example of what doesn't work.</p>
<p>mixed heights to preserve views to City and Mountains through this corridor</p>
<p>AGAIN, the neighbourhood can and will decide what gets built. That is the only way proper development has ever occurred.</p>

We don't want mid-rise buildings that are higher than 6 stories. 4 stories are best. No more highrises like at the Eldorado site. We also don't want to look like Joyce station. We want a village with a village feel.
My preference is for a mixed height approach, with the caveat of my comments in question A.
3. Transition Areas Please share your comments on the proposed options for the transition areas. (Option 1: 3-storey Low-rise Apartment (Stacked Townhouse); Option 2: 4-storey Low-rise apartment)
Need more affordable housing, 20% is not enough, the city has a shortage
Apt building will be good for Kingsway's commercial character
Townhomes and row houses would be awesome, similar to those located at the south end of Commercial Street in the Cedar Cottage neighbourhood.
Don't like this concept at all - no canyons please
Good idea.
OK.
Artificial "transition" concepts are not relevant or appropriate without context. Central planning died in 1989 when the Soviet Union fell apart.
I think both would be good depending on location. I would also extend 3 storey stacked townhouse up transportation corridor between Kingsway and Skytrain (i.e. Nanaimo, Slocan, Earles).
Keep the Kingsway and adjacent buildings low (mainly) therefore no need for high buffers.
Kingsway and Nanaimo needs a supermarket (Nesters/PriceSmart)
N/C seems fine for either.
Either proposal is a vast improvement over the current conditions. Personally I prefer the 4-storey apartment block for the transition area as the increased density will add vibrancy and body heat to what is currently a dead area. The extra application will also go a long way in ensuring my new retail along Kingsway remains.
Keep 4-storey along Kingsway. It makes a reasonable transition now.
I have no issue with the proposal to rezone and density.
Do not approve of any.
Due to the angle of the street (Kingsway), transition zones may allow for unique parcels. More emphasis on providing amenities in lanes streets needs to be made. Making lanes more like front streets w/planting and special paving and not just for vehicles. The traditional front of building is blurred due to units looking out into lanes.
The proposal doesn't go far enough. I would like to see the new transitional zones.
Supportive.
This "transitional" housing work well i.e. Hastings in North Burnaby.
Transition area is one block so does not accomplish what is required. Increase this transition to 4 blocks.
Three storey townhouses are more suitable
I prefer stacked townhouses as opposed to apartments
Apartments will work only if you further transition behind with stacked townhouse. I believe the residential area between Kingsway and Skytrain should be fully integrated with housing options that retain the character but allow for greater densities. Allow infill homes on lots, larger than "laneway housing".
I would prefer stacked townhouse instead of apartment to retain neighbourhood character
One size does not fit all. This "transition" is arbitrary and ignores CTPED.
It would be o.k to have some townhouses and some duplexes.

The transition areas are far larger than what is needed to act as a transition between higher densities on Broadway and lower elsewhere. In fact, they are a whole new apartment zone. Also many of your questions so far are very value laden. How do we know that these areas will be pleasant and effective?

My preference is for higher density housing in this area, not single family. The proposed rowhouse, stacked townhouses, duplexes and small apartment blocks are all great ideas and should be approved to provide a variety of housing options. The variety will both attract a variety of resident types, and provide a visual break. The Mt Pleasant area is very "pleasant" embracing a variety of housing types, with lots of green space around. This will give the area a pleasant - there's that word again - ambiance. The great attraction of higher density housing is that it increases the population density of the area, therefore improving the business opportunities in the area, perhaps even attracting a grocery store and coffee shop. Use 4th Ave as an example, or 10th Ave, or Main, etc. etc. We complain about the unattractiveness of Kingsway in this area, yet people do not want to attract the people by increasing the density. People are the only things that bring money into the area.

There will be enough density with the new change in '09 to single family housing, no need for any new type of housing.

<p>4. Park, School and Arterial Edges</p> <p>Please share your comments on the proposed options. (Option 1: Infill - Small Lot; Option 2: Duplexes; Option 3: Cottages and Small Houses on Shared Lots; Option 4: Traditional Rowhouses; Option 5: Low-rise Apartments (Stacked Townhouse))</p>
<p>Prefer 4 & 5, affordable rental & co-ops</p>
<p>Cottages/small houses and duplex mix will make good combination</p>
<p>Refer to above comment (<i>Answer to 3: Townhomes and row houses would be awesome, similar to those located at the south end of Commercial Street in the Cedar Cottage neighbourhood.</i>)</p>
<p>No infill, cottages. Low-rise apartments along Kingsway or arterials only. Rowhouses, parks minimal or remain residential C2 best.</p>
<p>Not every park, every school, should have this new housing type - your planning of every park, every school shows bad planning. You're leaving nothing for the future - ideas do change with time ... who are you to suggest all these areas get done now?</p>
<p>Larger lots (especially deeper lots as those along Earles behind Purdy's are not practical for any of the options because courtyard rowhouse is not an option. These lots should qualify for stacked townhouse or low rise apartment in order to be developable.</p>
<p>OK.</p>
<p>Again, artificial constructs are inhuman. Grow up. There is a language in community that you appear not to understand.</p>
<p>I like all depending on area.</p>
<p>We like the infill housing - should be bigger than laneway housing. We fully support this idea.</p>
<p>Option 4 only - fee-simple common wall homes and lots.</p>
<p>No call either way.</p>
<p>Option 1</p>
<p>The only drawback I can see is one housing type taking over i.e. nothing but row housing. In a given area a % balance of housing types should be required.</p>
<p>I liked proposal 4 & 5, there needs to be more units around park edges and those units should be outward facing both towards the park and towards the street. We should avoid any inward facing options in these areas.</p>
<p>Infill small lot. Low rise apartment (townhouse).</p>
<p>4 is best option for livable family community. Build as lots become available for subdivision...retain fee-simple RS-01. Make alley a street, narrow the street, reduce the frontage.</p>
<p>More parks!</p>
<p>I have no strong preference for either one of the five options, to me there are two key points: 1) The area needs to change - status quo is not an option. 2) The quality of the buildings is more important than the type. Regardless of whether the decision is to propose one or more of the five options. City planning must impose standards on the style and components of the development.</p>
<p>Mixed options ideally - rowhouses especially desirable.</p>
<p>No to density.</p>
<p>I think it is important for entries to be visible. Duplexes w/front and rear usually leave the rear as being secondary. infill and rear lane housing good for eyes on park. Each unit need allocated outdoor space either in garden or balcony. Increased density should require more sustainable building practices such as all stormwater to stay onsite, drought and tolerant landscapes. Rowhouse, infill and duplexes preferred. Make sure traffic calming is dealt with at schools and parks.</p>
<p>Option 4 provides a good balance.</p>
<p>Supportive.</p>

A higher density housing is preferable to create affordable.
All 5 options would be appropriate, as long as it's not all of one kind...varied.
Good.
Please protect our greenspaces...eyes on parks/greenspace is not always what is needed. Look at Trout Lake so many people use for multi use that it is becoming impossible to find a quiet place to sit - an unscheduled field to play "ball". Our children grew up "playing" in Renfrew ravine a certain amount of "safe wilderness is attractive.
General concept is good but need to blend approach to area.
all except stacked apartment look good.
Apartment areas should only be retained near Kingsway. Higher density housing options would be great backing onto parks, schools, playgrounds.
all except apartment
This is ludicrous as well. Every park is different in use and activities permitted. The streetscape also determines what housing form and ultimate density is appropriate. A park is not automatically a reason to densify, as this merely creates a barrier between the rest of the neighbourhood and the park.
We don't need all the parks, schools, arterials to have new housing types. Where is the parking for all the people you propose will live here? How about neighbourhood safety and crime? How will that be addressed?
This is a terrible idea particularly around parks and schools. There is no reason why single family homes should not exist beside parks and schools. They are lower traffic and families are very vigilant "eyes" on the spaces- probably much more so than transient apartment dwellers. Higher density will act as a barrier between the neighbourhood and its parks and schools. The years of construction and land assembly will create very unsafe and undesirable conditions and, since these areas are not beside transit, will create more traffic just where its not wanted. This really destroys any suggestions that this area will retain any of its single family character since you take chunks out of many of the remaining blocks of single family in addition to taking many other blocks closer to Kingsway. Very bad ideas here!!
In keeping with my preference for increasing population density, I favour stacked townhouses and rowhouses. These can be interspersed with single family dwellings.
additional density around schools, parks and main arterials - Who said the community requested density around schools, parks and main arterials?

<p>5. Optional Multi-Family Housing Locations Please share your comments on the proposed housing options. (Option 1: Maintain RS-1 Zoning; Option 2: Traditional Rowhouses; Option 3: 3-storey Low-rise Apartments (Stacked Townhouses))</p>
Prefer 2 & 3
Multi-units will fit the plan more - stacked townhouse will not be that boring look
Refer to above comment (<i>Answer to 3: Townhomes and row houses would be awesome, similar to those located at the south end of Commercial Street in the Cedar Cottage neighbourhood.</i>)
I'm against infill housing and courtyard concepts on areas of single-family - this will destroy our living conditions and in the 1st case, our privacy. This is like going back in time.
Rowhouses, everything else won't improve community sustainability and/or quality of living
Should allow rowhouse on shallow lots and stacked townhouses/ low rise apartments on deeper lots. Rowhouse not practical on most lots. Need to assemble 3 lots and then build 5 units (not workable) only.
OK - down the road.
Let the community decide.
I like 3 stores near Kingsway and along high traffic corridors- 2 for transition areas behind.
Transit, walking, cycling, community based on dense RS-1.
How is fire station #15 integrated into the plans?
New developments are a must, the area is stale.
Option 1
See above. (<i>Answer to 4: The only drawback I can see is one housing type taking over i.e. nothing but row housing. In a given area a % balance of housing types should be required.</i>)
Option 2 & 3 are both good. Some blocks are probably better suited to one than the other. Again increasing density in the area will help the viability of retail in the immediate area. The new units will also increase affordability and provide more rental units to maintain our diverse community.
See 4. Maintain RS-1 with smaller lots and common-walk houses 2.5 storey 17.2. (<i>Answer to 4: 4 is best option for livable family community. Build as lots become available for subdivision...retain fee-simple RS-01. Make alley a street, narrow the street, reduce the frontage.</i>)
More multi-family housing!
Close proximity is redundant.
Options 2 & 3 are nice.
No.
Individual units need access to outdoor amenity areas either in private or shared. Roof terraces would be great. Rowhouses and stacked townhouses ok.
We need low-rise apartments.
Supportive.
Preferable to have a higher density (affordable housing in this area).
I like option 2 the most.
Also housing for seniors.
Multi-family housing location needs to be increased to get type of density required to accomplish the plan.
multi-family should also be considered between Kingsway and skytrain
see first comments. (<i>Answer to 1: My neighbours and I thought all areas in Norquay village were supposed to be optional multi-family housing types--- especially on bus</i>

<i>routes (Clarendon St.). We strongly support multi family zoning.)</i>
Make all areas into optional multi family housing zoning.
see my first comment. <i>(Answer to 1: I live on a bus route (Clarendon St) and I strongly suggest that city should make all areas into optional multi family housing zoning. From Kingsway to 41st Ave. From Nanaimo St to Earles St)</i>
I like them all, particularly if they are focussed between Kingsway and the Expo Line Skytrain. This is the area where the majority of pedestrian trips are occurring. Density in this area will better promote walking, transit and cycling use.
I'm surprised this is located south of Kingsway, much more appropriate north of Kingsway to Expo line.
Please include area from Kingsway to 41st and Clarendon St (bus route) to Earles St in Multi- family housing.
The community has spoken. Listen to the Vision.
As identified in the Renfrew-Collingwood plan, we want senior's housing. Buildings built specifically for seniors 55+ and older.
Why do you always give a big pep talk for the option you want? As planners you should want genuine feedback from unbiased questions.
Densify, densify, densify!! See my previous comments. I think that the proposed plan contains a good mix of single and multi-family options. At the moment the multi-family options are limited, so provide zoning for more of them!!
Areas from Clarendon St to Wales St, 38th Ave to 41st Ave should be included in multi-family housing type.
Panel 17: Maintain the existing RS-1 zoning.

<p>6. Single Family Character Areas Please share your comments on the proposed housing options. (Option 1: Maintain Existing 'Single-Family' Zoning; Option 2: Consider Other Options Compatible with Single-Family Character)</p>
We are looking for flexibility on individual parcels and more housing options.
Option 2
We want for more flexibility, more option in future planning
I prefer option 2 with increased flexibility for housing
Townhomes/row houses would be ideal
"village centre remain
city open public space
2 - 3 storey in height
courtyard townhouse style"
You should not have new housing types along the corridor streets and arterial streets of the single family areas. Single family areas should fully stay that way with no new housing types along the perimeter of the RS1 areas.
Allow duplex and infill development
No need for more houses in small lots. Single family "means single family" not 3 families on single lot!
Double garage with housing above. Approx. 420".
Consider Option 2 - wk allow duplexes on single family zoning.
Both good depending on location vicinity to traffic areas.
Agreed.
Mix it up, let developers decides what people want.
See above. <i>(Answer to 4: The only drawback I can see is one housing type taking over i.e. nothing but row housing. In a given area a % balance of housing types should be required.)</i>
Prefer that our street remains single family dwellings as shown in the proposal.
I agree that some pockets should remain sfh at least at this stage. We can always revisit at a later stage but it will be impossible to revert back if changed now. With basement suites and laneway housing there are already options for homeowners. Perhaps consideration for sfhs w/o a lane to provide those homeowners with an additional option.
Same answer as 4 & 5 <i>(Answer to 4: 4 is best option for livable family community. Build as lots become available for subdivision...retain fee-simple RS-01. Make alley a street, narrow the street, reduce the frontage.)</i> ⁸⁰
More multi-family housing! Vancouver is too expensive for people - especially young families. Change the zoning - build more multi-family housing!
RS should be maintained for some areas to protect the traditional neighbourhood street for the higher end of the real estate market.
Only single family - no coach houses, no laneway houses.
More options needed. There are loads of illegal suites already in the "single family" lots. Need to make it legal so that quality housing of all types can be made and some standards and requirements can be made. Green space seems to be reduced should require for example, green roof on a garage, or other ways to make up greenspace.

<p>It doesn't make much sense to keep the area zoned as single family given the close proximity of the skytrain stations and the higher density proposals on Kingsway. At a minimum the area should be rezoned to multi-dwelling/duplex but to get the affordable housing in Vancouver, we should strive for the townhouse zoning extended further.</p>
<p>Should be changed from single family home to duplexes or multi-family zones specially the existing houses with big lots.</p>
<p>Supportive of greater flexibility - duplex with laneway housing...all strata.</p>
<p>Option 2 - consider other options.</p>
<p>Maybe a doggie park could go in there.</p>
<p>To accomplish goals of area have no choice but to create higher densities in adjacent blocks to Kingsway. Any other approach will not revitalize Kingsway.</p>
<p>Would like to see 2-unit duplexes allowed.</p>
<p>I think more options for areas north of Kingsway that are compatible with SFD in all RS-1 areas</p>
<p>All areas should be multi family zoned. thanks</p>
<p>See previous comment. From Nanaimo St to Earles St and Kingsway to 41st Ave --- change zoning to optional multi family housing.</p>
<p>Please see my first comment.</p>
<p>Yes, allow for additional housing options that would promote density increases while maintaining the residential character, particularly in the area between Kingsway and the expo line skytrain.</p>
<p>Yes, all Single Family areas require more options, particularly around busy road and pedestrian corridors. Would like to see more north of Kingsway.</p>
<p>Please re zone this area to be optional multi family housing--- especially entire Clarendon St as this is a transit route.</p>
<p>Definitely give the OPTION of having multi-family housing types for residents who are interested (in any area of Norquay village)</p>
<p>Let the community decide what and where flexibility should be allowed. Right now, Planning has given none, and stifled organic growth and remodelling.</p>
<p>The Renfrew Collingwood plan identified that the community wants to maintain the housing in our area to be primarily single family. There can already be up to four dwellings on a lot - main dwelling, 2 rental suites and a laneway housing. That is enough.</p>
<p>Residents in neighbourhoods are just as interested in having sunny backyards as they are in the street itself. What you are proposing will create a round of land assembly, lead to houses being run down while waiting for demolition and redevelopment. There will be almost no green space once any of these developments are built and adjacent houses and gardens will be ruined so that they will have no choice but to sell for redevelopment as well. There are always residents are want to develop a second house in their back yard if they think it will make them money but this will be very detrimental to the whole area and is a huge social experiment. It will certainly do nothing to keep single family character! Lane infill as is proposed in the rest of the city is perfect for this area as well. Must developers have the whole neighbourhood when they are already likely going to be given half of it for much higher density.</p>
<p>These areas are good to keep. Consider areas of Kits that are allowed a number of duplexes per city block. This is a great idea as it allows a margin of increased density, but does not remove the single-family character that everyone is so hell bent on - I do not understand why. I am not in favour of in-fill as cottages or alley housing.</p>
<p>Panel 18: Maintain existing "single-family" zoning.</p>
<p></p>

<p>7. Pedestrian Connections: 29th Avenue SkyTrain Station to Kingsway Please share your comments on the proposed improvements (Duchess pedestrian connection and Renfrew Ravine Linear Park/Greenway) and housing opportunities.</p>
Good
We need increased frequency of bus service on Kingsway and from Kingsway to Skytrain Station
Good
Sounds good
Thought this idea was not going forward ... environmental issues, don't believe City should go this route.
Individual property owners?? Housing?/ low rise 3 storeys in suitable, not crowded townhouses.
Looks good - I would include Nanaimo St. as well.
How about a community police station at Kingsway and Nanaimo? This would complement the Joyce Community Police Station.
Very curious to see more information about this as I live on Ravine. No objections to more pedestrian or bike traffic. I would have strong objections to move streetlights or those "bike route" lights that were added along Ontario near QE Park.
Use CAC money from the area to create the Renfrew Ravine connection to Kingsway. This feature will be a major selling feature to the community. Currently we are not badly served with our connections they just need cosmetic upgrades to make them more inviting.
Good pedestrian connector ideas
Improved pedestrian/bike access around the area is desirable.
More bike lanes, more street lighting.
Option 1 - improve the connection.
Supportive of new housing opportunities.
Concentrate on the Duchess route.
Also maybe a place to have a coffee
Please add between Kingsway and Nanaimo Station as well
Yes, but you need to incorporate Nanaimo Street between Kingsway and Nanaimo Skytrain station as a large number of pedestrians use this route. There is a parallel lane either side of Nanaimo that would make a good greenway.
I think you should include a linkage from Nanaimo Station to Kingsway, perhaps through the parallel lanes along Nanaimo Street.
This is rank BS. Again, this depends, and does not reflect current use patterns. You are acting like Soviet central planners here. You should LISTEN to the community about where they go and why.
We would welcome improvements to our transportation corridors. However adding more density to these areas does not mean that the development money would come back into the community. the community needs a guarantee that the transportation corridors would be improved BEFORE adding density. Otherwise we don't need improvements to the transportation corridors.
I love the ideas. Especially Duchess - I happen to live on it and quite enjoy watching the pedestrian traffic pass. And I previously espoused on the Renfrew Ravine linear park - I love it, but do not see it happening for many, many years. I do not support community gardens in this area. Everybody has a garden already. And only a few of them are properly and attractively maintained. I cannot see that a community garden would be maintained by the community. By all means, permanently landscape the green areas - but do NOT make them into a community garden.

8. Public Benefits and Amenities
Please give us your comments regarding these proposed preferred amenities (Provision of a community serving space and creation of the Renfrew Ravine Way).
Good
Sounds good
Program energy to community services (<i>indicated preference for provision of a community serving space</i>)
Don't ask for a priority to amenities - don't promise the amenities - instead put the amenities as a guarantee!
We have what the neighbourhood needs except the Ravine which is good.
Shops and services back to neighbourhood first. Senior housing w/assoc. businesses would be ideal.
Anything that brings Kingsway to pedestrian life in the evening is to be applauded. Slowing the traffic down and reducing its volume should also be a priority. The "arts" activities would be great if we had a provincial government that would fund them. The development should also include an endowment with the arts centre just like childcare.
Personally I prefer Renfrew Ravine connection as it would be usable and benefit everyone and not just a subset of the population. We are currently well served by centres in our immediate area. Myself I'd prefer to see the city close Collingwood library and build a much larger one with multiple uses in one of the nodes.
Focus on Renfrew.
More community centres!
These options are nice, but additional childcare and recreational facilities within Norquay would be nice. *The spots in the proposed Eldorado site (for childcare) will fill fast and aren't enough for all the young families choosing this area in the coming years.
No to neighbourhood space --> who will pay for it. Density is the answer and we don't want more density.
We need both.
Supportive on Renfrew Ravine Way.
Better option.
Good.
Yes!
Yes, provided density is increased to allow for customers to keep the community services vibrant.
Yes, more amenities would be a benefit, however, you must increase density to make it work so shops & services will come and stay in neighbourhood.
We welcome this but if it means high-rises along Kingsway, then only give us a fountain or a plaza.
You are proposing to add large numbers of people to an area that is very short of park space. You are proposing to add extra density around the few small parks that there are. You are not proposing to add any park space. How is this maintaining amenities. You also say that no funds can be collected for amenities unless the neighbourhood agree to over 2.5. How can there be no profit for developers that can be used for CAC's with this kind of added density. One reason is likely that the demand for single family houses is so high and the proposed increase in the supply of apartments in the city is so great that the economics is getting worse and worse. If this trend continues, the supply of single family will continue to go down as it is rezoned, the price of houses will continue to go up and become even more unaffordable. Developers will complain that they can't make money as they keep building more units to sell. How about the city deciding to value its families and the green space that single family

houses have and go back to increasing density at a pace that the city can comfortably absorb?

I think one follows the other. Put in Ravine Renfrew Way, it increases the attractiveness of the community. As housing density increases, people will want to move here, and then the money comes, which then provides funds for a community centre. As you so underhandedly (I say this nicely as I totally agree with your view) show the amenities of neighbouring community centres, we have plenty available. Community centres are expensive to build and operate. I think the money can be better spent elsewhere upfront.

Panel 20: See comments on Panel 6. Why doesn't Panel 20 say how much density is required to produce the various public amenities that the community says it wants, such as the arts centre and seniors centre at 2400 Kingsway and the Renfrew Ravine Linear Park/Greenway? This would allow the public to make better-informed decisions. *(Answer to 1: "Panel 6: Support new development with ... neighbourhood focused amenities." People at the working group meetings proposed an arts centre and seniors centre at the 2400 Kingsway site. This proposal receives some kind of indirect reference on Panel 20 which says "we need a community space that provides recreational activities including arts programming to meet the needs of residents including seniors and youth" and "focus on large sites within the neighbourhood centre (such as the 2400 motel site) to provide a key community meeting and public amenity space." This is vague – my description more concisely reflects what people were saying.)*

<p>9. Kingsway Street Design Improvements</p> <p>Please share your comments regarding the proposed street design improvements.</p>
<p>Good</p>
<p>The white picket fence in front of the café/restaurant (southeast corner of Kingsway & Baldwin - 2200 block) should be removed in the efforts of a safer/cleaner community. Whenever the restaurant is closed, pimps hide behind the fence while their prostitute deals drugs & sex from the corner. Often times they are still lingering in the morning (8am-9am) when children are walking to school. ***Any street infrastructure that can be used as a hiding place (i.e. sold fence/bushes) is not safe for our community considering the prevalence of the sex/drug industry.</p>
<p>No trees in middle, already issues with drain off, bushes, plants. Pedestrian friendly areas need to encourage residents out of their homes i.e. to Norquay Village.</p>
<p>DON'T DO what Kingsway & Knight has become!</p>
<p>Yes, like this very much. Would like to see residential parking only on Wales St. (near Kingsway) and speed bumps in back lane from Wales St. 5000 block.</p>
<p>Wider sidewalks would be a plus but as a starter maintaining sidewalks / medians would be a good start.</p>
<p>How is to be safer? Please elaborate in your panel. Is it lighting, traffic signals??</p>
<p>Trees may not be needed. You want people to stay around not just to pass through the neighbourhood.</p>
<p>Bike lane along Kingsway.</p>
<p>Same answer as No. 8.</p>
<p>I fully support wider sidewalks, more trees and a passive landscaped median along the stretch of Kingsway. Bulges along most side streets will also make a much more pleasant walking experience, as would the elimination of curb outs for driveways. Not sure if Kingsway is the proper route for a bike lane though as that would be better suited off of a major road.</p>
<p>Put your money into setbacks with wider sidewalk. Do not bother with centre road because then traffic is forced to sides. Force traffic to centre instead.</p>
<p>More trees! More bike paths!</p>
<p>I find the trees in the middle of the street to be a waste of money. They are difficult to maintain and don't offer more greenery because its in the middle of the street.</p>
<p>Supportive of improvement.</p>
<p>If buildings have to go a little higher 8-12 (mixture) for wider/safer sidewalks - so be it.</p>
<p>Good.</p>
<p>Use the adjacent few streets of Kingsway to accomplish this.</p>
<p>Keep new buildings open to the street instead of turned away</p>
<p>Keep new developments focussed on Kingsway to promote pedestrian usage along Kingsway. landscape medians and better maintenance of existing sidewalk and medians would assist.</p>
<p>keep new buildings open to the street, not turning their backs on the street similar to King Edward village</p>
<p>The cycling infrastructure is ludicrous. Sidewalks? Sidewalk/street transitions. You are crazy. Go talk to real cyclists, and the timid ones, and find out what works. Your plans are insane.</p>
<p>Street design is fine but doesn't need to be done by adding density to the area. Our area could use the streetscape design being given already to those in Shaughnessy and South Granville.</p>
<p>As previously mentioned, I approve of the improvements proposed. However, be careful about putting too many traffic lights in. Traffic lights increase congestion (thereby increasing greenhouse gases) - we want to keep away from congestion.</p>

10. Clarendon Extension Proposal
Please share your comments regarding the proposed Clarendon Extension Proposal.
Good
Sounds good
Clarendon extension, good.
Seems ok.
A long time coming.
Excellent idea to reduce traffic in residential area...can reduce accidents.
It seems that the impacts of traffic along Slokan are being ignored. Anything that improves access to 33rd here will impact this street which rapidly getting busier. How long before something goes horribly wrong at Slokan and 22nd because of this traffic volume I wonder.
Great idea and long overdue. The proposed should be implemented immediately. No real downside but lots of pros.
Good.
Great idea!
No, because of increased traffic. If you look at Earles Street, there is so much congestion, even with the roundabouts and bulges. Proposing the same to Clarendon will do nothing to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety. We need to make Clarendon a greater throughway for cars to ease the burden on Earles Street.
Supportive.
Good idea - in fact it's taking too long to complete.
Do not create anything to further slow down traffic in area.
Change 33rd Ave. to one-way street does not seem to make sense and will be very inconvenient
looks good!
I like it.
Looks Good!
Please have high density zoning on Clarendon St (from Kingsway to 41st) as this is a bus route. thanks
That would be useful.
I do like the idea of connecting Clarendon to 33rd. As for converting part of Slokan into a one way section - this idea is NOT good. Is the proposal to convert Slokan into a one-way northbound, completely one-way? Please do NOT do this. This is a major route for a lot of people. Closing this off would force everyone down Kingsway, south onto Nanaimo and then back onto 33rd. Not an appealing detour. Especially considering you want to make Kingsway more pedestrian friendly. Please do NOT do this. Perhaps some land adjacent to the intersections (such as part of where Church's Chicken is) could be used to improve pedestrian access. This place is not really used by cyclists.

<p>11. Other Comments Have we missed anything? What other comments do you have about the Norquay Neighbourhood Centre Plan?</p>
<p>Thank-you!</p>
<p>We need housing for people with physical, mental and developmental disabilities</p>
<p>I support City's plan</p>
<p>Thank you for taking an interest in our community. We look forward to seeing what you do with this feedback. Good luck!</p>
<p>"Recognize existing density ensure social amenities balance out. Our neighbourhood centre boundary by Kingsway, 33rd & Nanaimo. Ensure community input part of any final design other than open houses based on planner only vision or what they feel good for the area which they don't reside in - communication broken.</p>
<p>Additional comments sent in an e-mail: 1) Norquay Village did not endorse density around schools, parks and main arterial ... We endorsed a Norquay Village Centre... as having a single centre located at the triangle bounded by Kingsway, East 33rd, and Nanaimo. We endorsed the fact more social amenities are needed in the area for the current density. WHO SAID WE DID? 2) No, we did not endorse additional building heights above 4 stories along Kingsway other than on the corner of Earles and Kingsway. Why do we have to comply with what investors want? I repeatedly heard over and over "INVESTORS" will not invest unless they can build over 5 stories higher or more. WHO DO YOU SUPPORT? The opportunity spouted at me if they were able to build higher repeatedlywe could build roof top gardens, have wider sidewalks, etc. etc. at the peril of the resident owner who would be shrouded in shadow, who would have their sunlight blocked for their green space and their homes, more pollution, more traffic, more parking concerns, more garbage and yes and as an added benefit higher taxes, yes all for the greater good. 3) We know densification is coming but would this lead to DCL. Money is not necessary come back to the area. There is never any actual mention of specific amenities offered. No guarantees for the future. The economy is at low money the City needs money are we a means to end as we are thought of has having no voice?. 4) The survey first sent out reflected the resident's disapproval of densification. Why does the City Planner keep kicking the can repeatedly for densification? Norquay Village is one of one of the highest densified area with an unbalance of social amenities. Why did you not report this?</p>
<p>Yes --> we do not want to densify southeast Vancouver.</p>
<p>We want our area to stay a single family residential area so families who have lived here in the hard times and goods times who saved and sacrificed to do so aren't pushed out. They have worked several jobs to be here. "</p>
<p>Since multi-family development at Purdy's site is envisioned at rear with public plaza in front, the larger lots on Earles should be reclassified as Transition Area (Panel 15) instead of Arterial Area (Panel 16) to allow for more appropriate development for deeper lots since courtyard rowhouse not permitted. The lots on Earles behind Purdy's are 55 x 170 --> none of the options on Panel 16 are viable for these lots and given their size and the existing owners past willingness to sell --> good chance they could be redeveloped sooner but only if zoning is suitable.</p>
<p>Park plan excellent!</p>
<p>The focus here was to be population a return of shops and services to the areas. Kingsway is not a nice place to be but in the meantime, the City can make a large difference by improving maintenance of existing sidewalks and streetscapes. Overall, I strongly support controlled density. Particularly between Kingsway and Skytrain in a style that respects the residential character. Keep up the good work. The "Citizens"</p>

group does not speak for the neighbourhood - they are simply the vocal minority.
There is an obvious lack of security planning or consultation with Translink, VPD and community police stations. There are over 45 block watches in Renfrew-Collingwood area. Transit riders and neighbours must feel safe and secure in walking to/from Skytrain stations. What are the past city reports on security recommending? If residents do not feel safe, they are not likely to take transit. Increased security must come from Skytrain, turnstiles, better lighting, increased patrols (VPD/TransLink) outside the stations, signage, cameras, etc.
Additional comments sent in an e-mail: I attended the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Open House on February 2, 2010 and I would like to offer some comments relating to security. Firstly, CoV has obviously proposed significant changes to the Norquay Village Neighbourhood. With the increased density and population of the area, I have serious concerns regarding the security or lack thereof; it is notably absent or ill-defined on the presentation boards even though the term "safety" is scattered throughout the proposals.
With respect to the Norquay proposal, the city should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A purpose-built Norquay community police centre, say at the Nanaimo & Kingsway intersection • Increased police services and officers for South Command, Patrol Districts 3 and 4 • Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED)
Clearly, if residents do not feel safe in their neighbourhood, they are not likely to take transit nor would they likely support higher density without additional police services and/or security enhancements. "
Gotta run, hope all the forums lead to progress. PS Change the bylaws to not allow Purdy's loading dock to function 24 hours a day it's a joke! I can't sleep year round without having to call them to remind them I live next door. Thanks.
The city planning department has done a terrific job considering all the obstacles placed in form of them by a select few out to stop the process. My only concern is that the Planning dept. might have held back a touch on the density side to try and reach a compromise with that subset. While I would've liked to see a bit more proposed. I am content with what is being proposed and hope to see it approved by Council.
Comprehensive!
You'll never please everyone. Let's get on with redevelopment.
We are really concerned on our peaceful neighbourhood. We don't like to lose it. We like the way it is now. Please don't change.
Progress must go on! Please consider the retail space use. We walked down Kingsway last night and the retail space from Earles to Gladstone is not appealing. We use the beer store, butcher and bakery at Slocan only - what about fruit/vegetable stores - Starbucks...more ethnic diversity ...we go elsewhere for groceries/hair cuts/doctors.
The curved approach of creating a small narrow strip to increase community is flawed. Either increase the Kingsway facing and adjacent or leave as it.
focus density north of Kingsway between skytrain and Kingsway
please see previous comments. <i>(Answer to 1: My neighbours and I thought all areas in Norquay village were supposed to be optional multi-family housing types--- especially on bus routes (Clarendon St.). We strongly support multi family zoning)</i>
Make entire Norquay village into optional multi family housing zoning (why leave little bit to single family only) thanks
I think the major thing that is missed was the lack of improvements between Kingsway and the Expo Line Skytrain. Given close vicinity to both major transportation and transit routes, there is a significant opportunity in the entire area to densify within the residential character of the neighbourhood. In my view it will greatly improve the character of the area and promote a more varied and pleasant architectural environment. The addition of infill homes and townhouse would greatly improve

<p>affordability for families that want to stay in Vancouver but can't afford a single family home. Let's not give up this opportunity to pander to the vocal minority of the so called "citizens group" who do not represent the community.</p>
<p>I think density needs to be focussed between Skytrain and Kingsway... it makes the most sense with respect to pedestrian traffic</p>
<p>Have optional multi family housing from Kingsway to 41st Ave and from Earles St to Clarendon St.</p>
<p>Send it back to the community for REAL INPUT. You cannot listen, and your recurrent waves of half-baked planners are like soldiers at Gallipoli. The shooting will not stop until you stop your invasion.</p>
<p>Yes, no more high rises, nothing higher than 6 stories and only if we have the guarantee of added community amenities. Don't do to us what you did to King Edward Village - adding a lot of high density with only a 10 year lease on a library.</p>
<p>This is an unacceptable plan that is basically going to see the whole area redeveloped with no increases in park space or a real plan for any amenities to make up for it.</p>
<p>Like I said in response to Question 1, a great deal has been missed. The reporting at this Open House seems like a step backwards. The panels give very little of the community feedback that the City received at the five workshops and five working group meetings about Norquay. In particular, what is reported is unrepresentative of what citizens told the City about acceptable building heights along Kingsway, about where a "High Street" should be within Norquay, and the citizens' desire for an arts centre and seniors centre.</p>
<p>"Norquay Village" is, as I understand it, a term created by the City for the purposes of the Neighbourhood Centres Program. Citizens took on board on the idea of a centre to "Norquay Village" and put considerable thought and energy into the Norquay Citizen's Group Land Use Plan which contained a centre comprising a High Street off Kingsway (along 33rd between Kingsway and Nanaimo) and an arts centre and seniors centre at 2400 Kingsway. These proposals are barely reflected in the panels, as noted in my earlier answers.</p>
<p>As mentioned earlier, it would help the public to make better-informed decisions at such Open Houses if a panel explained how much density was required to produce the various public amenities that the community says it wants, such as the arts centre and seniors centre at 2400 Kingsway and the Renfrew Ravine Linear Park/Greenway."</p>
<p>"Over twenty Panels presented at an Open House was a lot of information for anyone to read and process. It was not reasonable to expect visitors to complete comment sheets in a few minutes. The Working Group spent many hours in meetings, perhaps a copy of the panels at some point would have been nice out of courtesy.</p>
<p>Comment Sheets were not handed to everyone who attended. Some options on panels presented were not based on input from previous meetings.</p>
<p>No Row housing - Too many floors/stairs for young children or for the elderly, not a kid or elderly type of housing."</p>