

Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centres Program
Open Houses: June 12, June 14 and June 16, 2010
Comment Sheets Responses

1. Plan Summary

What do you think of the community directions and the overall plan?

The map is in error. Moving east on E 38th Ave. @ Earles is a driving road to the back lane of Earles/Dundee. From this point and east of it is an empty city lot. I like to suggest extending E. 38th Ave. through above to Dundee for better access. North of E. 38th Ave. could be all for 4-storey low-rise. South of E. 38th be all row-house /stark house complex.
Not much - need better transportation and transport routes before increasing density.
Overall good plans, I like the 2400 Motel plan for village, the rezoning is ok as long as the south of Kingsway homes don't lose their mountain views entirely!
Really like the idea! It makes the area safer.
Good work and presentation.
It's great! It's about time. Kingsway is just dead. Need more life like supermarkets and cafes.
The plans proposed do not reflect the desires of the working group or the community and look very similar to the plans that were rejected by survey in 2007. The heights along Kingsway are too high and much too dense. Should be no more that 6 - 4 storeys.
It's a very good idea.
Good job.
Keeping some parking and the large trees on 30th would be a relief (even if the sidewalk does come closer to our yard) changes are inevitable. I wish the height of the new building would be a bit lower (a little concerned about losing the little sunlight we have now from the east (by the high-rise on the 2400 site). The shops will be convenient. Is there a plan for a seniors' centre?
I welcome the shops and services and increased density; however DO NOT WANT TOWNHOUSES IN MY NEIGHBOURHOOD, laneways and coach houses are bad enough.
The plan? Too many people in crowded houses. Whatever happened to single family houses? You want to put a house, a suite and back-house?? This is not Asia, we are still in Canada.
I am pleased and excited about it.
Overall plan looks good. To better improve access to transit, the original plan boundaries which included Nanaimo & 29th Skytrain Station should be rezoned as soon as possible.
I don't agree with all aspect of the density higher taxes.
I am very pleased with the overall plan. It's going to change the entire community to a much nicer mix of housing and services.
I think this is a great idea because it's becoming too expensive to live in Vancouver. High density can bring down housing prices. I hope there is good planning for retail and grocery stores so people do not have to travel for.
This plan is very good. We need more access to shops and transit and a safe neighbourhood.
I think it's a tax grab. No thought put into where people will park. No direction on how parking will change. Why?
I'm greatly in favor - this area of Kingsway is in dire need of commercial, business development. In addition to enhanced pedestrian and biking routes. All proposed changes look great to me!
I oppose the plan without adequate corresponding increase in amenities and security.
What will happen to school kids population with this plan? Classroom sizes are already an issue. Will more schools be built?
Condo, rowhouses should be closer to public transit (Skytrain). High density will cause more street parking chaos for residents and schools will be overfilled.
I like the concept of different building types that focus on a consistent architectural feel of the existing area. Plus local stores and encouraging pedestrian flow meets what I want in a neighbourhood.

Good. I want a community that I can walk to everything I need. Food, rec., banks, etc. The more that can be done to encourage Kingsway the better.
Anything which improves directs and encourages development in Norquay Village is most welcome. The flexibility and options detailed in the presentation...will do this! Good work!
Overall brilliant. Totally makes sense.
Development on Kingsway and other outer streets but the inner streets should remain single home zone. The inner streets are Duke St., Ward St., Harley St., for example.
Very supportive of the plan put forward today. The city staff and working group have done well to address issues facing Norquay.
No, I want single dwelling houses in my neighbourhood.
Too much emphasis on Kingsway which is not "central" to the communities north and south but a border. The "centre of the community" concept should occur at the 29th Ave. and Nanaimo Skytrain stations. Create 2 "villages" there!!
Great - we need higher density housing.
Love it. Kingsway needs a change. Wish it can happen sooner.
If there is a diversity of housing types, where is the single family housing?
I think most but not all of the proposals are ok.
Eventually everything will change.
Good. I like the mix proposed. The community will be more vibrant.
I do not agree with all aspects of the plan.
Excellent plan shows vision.
We realize Vancouver is growing city with changes continuously.
Like it - the area definitely needs to be revitalized.
Great idea - this part of the community needs something like this. Thanks it's a wonderful proposal for our neighbourhood.
Excellent proposal - long needed for this area.
Support the plan for redevelopments to occur as I have a property that I want to develop.
Support the plan for redevelopments to occur as I have a property that I want to develop.
Very good.
I am disgusted with this. This didn't happen at Knight & Kingsway - it is a faint hope clause to use it for Norquay.
I like it. Options in housing and rezoning is a great idea.
It is good, because the city population is increase.
I think of the community will be better and the developer more than.
Please see last page on other comments.
This is really needed in neighbourhood. Starts with Kingsway which is a mess. Transition to next blocks around Kingsway where you need more younger family to fix Kingsway by having more local younger families live in area.
See last page.
I mostly agree with the plan. Higher density is essential, and this is being considered. In addition, Kingsway is currently very run-down, redevelopment and bringing in more new people is essential to making it livable.
I don't believe the city has listened carefully to and taken direction from the residents of this neighborhood.
Yes.
If all these new housing is proposed. Will single residences be able to convert their single dwellings into duplexes on the existing lots.
I strongly disagree with the proposals because the "sacred" RS-1 zoning for single family home on an open lot has not all been retained in Norquay. Also the sudden and arbitrary deletion of the Skytrain area from the original Norquay planning sector is obviously unacceptable.
Where are the single family homes? This display shows densification to an extreme.
Very important comments
The generalities sound good. However, the following must be noted. A "neighbourhood centre" cannot be based on a stretched-out strip of truck route that takes 15 minutes to walk from end to

<p>end.</p> <p>Such a bloated "neighbourhood centre" was never intended by CityPlan, and the original tight core area should define the rezoning policy.</p> <p>A "diverse and vibrant Kingsway" requires a concentration of "locally-oriented shops and services" near the midpoint of the 1.35 km.</p> <p>"Higher-density development in locations" is ad hockery that allows pre-existing larger parcels of land to determine the future of the neighbourhood, negates the notion of "planning," and mainly serves the financial interests of developers who want to build and to profit and to get out as fast as possible.</p> <p>The "pedestrian-friendly neighbourhood" has gotten off to a terrible start with a huge gated community at 2300 Kingsway that puts a major traffic cut across the Kingsway sidewalk has a looming tower unmitigated by setback privatizes a large open space plaza in the interior of the development fails even to deliver a promised grocery store as a commercial asset.</p> <p>New neighbourhood-serving amenities" seems like an empty phrase when planners and politicians assure the community that there can be no significant capital injection the demonstrated pittance of CAC and DCL can never begin to compensate the neighbourhood for what developers would like to take in height and density Norquay itself is a demonstrated amenity vacuum</p> <p>The few definite scheduled improvements are limited to the dubious minor cosmetics of median creation and fancier lampposts and garbage cans.</p>
<p>I strongly support the community directions and overall plan. I hope the process could be expedited to see actual changes because of the plan. I also hope to see a Superstore, a library, a swimming pool and an exercise gym in the redevelopment of Motel 2400. Regarding the old houses within the neighbourhood, if the house owners have no plan to re-develop, City could actively approach them to inform them about the plan but of course, respect for the decision of the owner is important.</p>
<p>Current planning proposal very suitable in Vancouver. There is a lack of land to develop and population is too low to benefit economic advancement. Relax the options so that more residents can choose to develop what kind of housing option they prefer.</p>
<p>to have another community centre; provide space for children activity, a library</p>
<p>Highly appreciative of City's effort in revitalizing character of buildings within a neighbourhood. There are too many empty deserted lots which have great impact on the character and cleanliness is an issue.</p>
<p>More greening and transit services must accompany increased population</p>
<p>Good. Vancouver is getting more affluent. Kingsway is an arterial street. I support and have no further comments.</p>
<p>Good future.</p>
<p>I do not agree with the changes of character along Kingsway. Kingsway should be built with low-rise apartments.</p>

2. New Housing in Neighbourhoods (refer to panels 6-10)

A. Duplex and Infill Housing (refer to panel 7)

OK, just ensure current housing can be rebuilt as single dwelling if wanted.
It's a good way to promote affordable housing for young workers who are not making much money but need a place to live.
Is this going to allow slacktown homes or rowhouses on bigger lots.
No comment.
This new housing type will put more redevelopment pressure on existing affordable houses that mostly are already converted to include secondary suites. This housing will not increase density, will displace existing affordable rental units housing low income people. This are should just remain single family RS zoning as the community supports. RS zones already allow secondary suites and laneway houses that provide affordable rentals.
Allow stack townhouse or rowhouse on bigger lots (50').
Allow stacked townhouses as well as rowhouses on big lots.
Allow stack townhomes or rowhouse in this zone if lots are 40' or larger or combined.
Where's the parking? There is no way that new housing can also add enough parking on each lot. This causes the streets to be full of cars with people fighting for spots and putting milk crates to reserve spots.
I would like the block my house is on to also have the option of building a stacked townhouse, since the surrounding area that is also close to the park and school are planned to have that option. I do not want my house to be overshadowed by buildings that will be bigger than mine, if this plan stays the same. To me the current plan just doesn't look right.
Isn't duplex enough? You want to add infill too? How many people with that accommodate? 6 up 6 down and 6 in infill. That's 18 people on one 33 ft. lot? Give me a break. That's what will happen - 18 people on 33 ft. lot.
We should have the option for building a stacked townhouse instead of just duplex and infill housing. It seems like the section our house is on has been overlooked for the townhouse building option, since areas also around Norquay school and close to Slocan Park are given that option.
No comment.
These new housing are not necessarily afforded by a common family, putting duplex in this area will not enable a family to purchase.
Good direction since housing is so expensive now. It gives homeowners a lot of choices. Very pleased with the proposal.
Duplex and infill housing is the way to go because people can live closer together. This way we can go greener because people won't have to travel too far.
I agree with the rental options. Especially for low-income people such as social assistance, disability pensions and seniors.
Housing types should be uniform...not a guessing game.
Higher density - will that lead to a higher crime rate? Is there a correlation?
We live in this area and I agree not having other zoning options. It would change the feel of the neighbourhood too much.
To me, this looks better then our current mess-house model. As long as the building(s) fit on the lot, I'm good with density.
I like this. Encourage rental units being built in current dwellings that meet good building and aesthetic standards be included and referenced in the zoning.
With infill housing and duplexes there should be more garages being built with it. We already have problems parking in front of our own house. I am actually against it.
Great.
Houses should remain single-housed.
I am supportive of providing as many options as possible to existing residents. The only concern I have is I'd prefer not to see locked off suites into the new units. These mortgage helpers ultimately only push up real estate prices further thus neglecting the original purposes.
No, I want single dwelling houses only.

Housing is good but I would discourage retail along the Kingsway except for "King Edward Village" concept at Knight and Kingsway.
Even triplexes would be acceptable. The time has come where Vancouver is too expensive for only single family dwellings. As long as it is a mixture of different types of homes it will be acceptable.
This is needed. No-one can afford Vancouver and variety in terms of smaller, affordable housing is necessary to prevent stagnancy and the loss of the young to the suburbs.
Respect established character - well, most of the rezoning you want to do in Norquay (outside of the Kingsway area within a block or two). Will get rid of all single family houses - how does doing this respect established character?
Kingsway and the upgrades to it are the main concerns for anybody in this area. Kingsway itself will reflect on the neighbourhood.
Maybe duplex will be ok but I don't know.
I like this idea because each lot can have a flexible option to choose for future development to meet future needs.
If these houses will be affordable ...alright.
Looks good - still maintains reasonable low to moderate density.
OK.
Good idea - good that the City is moving forward with this - all residents have a say and can plan and make decisions at their own pace.
Thank you for listening. We need to move forward while allowing residents to do so at own pace.
Own property in this zone and I am waiting to develop.
Own property in this zone and I am waiting to develop.
Should be a standard in the entire area.
I think the proposed duplex and infill housing in the proposed areas are good.
I want the proposed for duplex.
Duplex zoning allows people to afford a place which can be theirs and brings down cost partially to make more affordable to some. It is part of solution to get more families back in neighbourhood.
On a standard 33 ft. lot, you can potentially get more than two units on the lot. I would consider lots in the back to increase density and make housing more affordable.
Some spot rezoning of the RS-1 area along prime arterials (along Nanaimo St. for example) might be considered subject of course to the 100% approval of the neighbourhood residents for duplex and infill housing.
Duplex and infill housing must include parking on their lots. Overload of cars that take away parking spaces from current residents are an issue. Trees on these lots should be maintained as much as possible. Please do not allow clear-cutting of lots to build duplexes. Frontals space should be a reasonable distance from the sidewalk to allow for green space.
The .85 density granted to duplex should be scaled back to the .8125 available to single family dwelling plus laneway house, or perhaps both options should be set at .825 Using infill on 33 foot lots only to reward character house retention is a very good idea. The cottages/small houses on shared lots should never be allowed to create a paved "central garden court" whose primary purpose is automobile traffic. The area bounded by Horley, Slocan, Euclid, and Earles should be designated for duplex/infill rather than stacked townhouse, except for the properties fronting on Earles. Justifications: Neighbourhood continuity parallel to Kingsway Recognition that the bulk of new commercial development will occur on the south side of Kingsway, which will always remain a neighbourhood divider Equidistance from Kingsway and SkyTrain.
My house is located adjacent to Norquay School. Why is my house only allowed for duplex/infill and not stacked townhouse. If you look at the map of Norquay, it does not make sense. Norquay Park is surrounded by proposed stacked townhouse zone except my small block. It just does not look right to me. Please consider changing my small block for stacked townhouse. Thank you!
I support City's planning. If only assembly of 3 lots could work out the development, this could delay or restrict the timing for real change in Norquay. I suggest allowing development on single lot by providing underground parking.
We agree this proposal for duplex and infill

Higher buildings are acceptable.
Good. Good ideas and I support.
Good idea and good for implementation.
I do not agree. This would increase the residential density, worsen safety, and create traffic jams.
My house is located next to Norquay School. From the viewpoint of city planning, the building structure adjacent to the school should be the same, should be changed to stacked townhouses. This would look much more pleasant. Thank you!

2. New Housing in Neighbourhoods (refer to panels 6-10)

B. Traditional Rowhouses (refer to panel 8)

What happens with increase cars - no parking.
Same as answer A.
The community does not support rezoning as proposed. Keep this area single family RS zoned as existing zoning.
Rowhousing is hard to warm up to, but if the neighbourhood was well maintained (and will good reachable amenities)...it would still be hard to get used to.
No!
Too many rowhouses.
Would prefer to see this more as small houses duplex etc. feel the introduction of 4-storey buildings in these areas. Make it too busy.
Okay.
Same as 2A.
Again I agree with the rental options for the same reason.
If produced and tastefully done not hodgepodge.
Are they submitted to strata laws?
No real objections.
As long as developments maintenance green space in their front or back, I'm good.
As long as they "fit" and are attractive. No cheap construction or unsightly "modern" designs. Thanks.
Love it.
Houses should remain single housed.
Very supportive of rowhouses, they are probably the most desirable units today for younger families. If they need to be strata it's still an improvement but we should keep pushing to allow fee simple.
No.
OK but as part of a tower or podium development.
Goes with the neighbourhood.
Same comment as A.
No.
No rowhouse - I don't like them.
Same as 2A
OK.
Looks good. Provides affordable housing options close to transit.
OK.
Yes - great idea.
See A.
Perfect for areas along major transportation corridors or low lying areas of the neighbourhood (so views aren't blocked).
Yes, this starts to bring into range of affordability in Vancouver to get mid range families into neighbourhood. Need to develop facilities in area to make this an attractive for the range of families.
I agree with the plan proposed. The more side-by-size units you can fit in there the better, more affordable housing will be.
Some spot rezoning one block adjacent to the 2400 Motel site might be reasonable for traditional rowhouses but only if approved by the majority of the neighbourhood residents.
Pictures shows very little frontage. Potential slums like in American big cities.
The current proportion of allocation fails to respect the priority that the Norquay Working Group gave to this fee simple housing type. The present unwillingness of the provincial government to facilitate this type in full should not result in tokenism. The similar lot characteristics of the area bounded by Clarendon, East 34th to Slocan, Slocan to East 37th, East 37th to Wales, Wales to East

38th, and East 38th back to Clarendon should be designated for traditional rowhouse rather than stacked townhouse. Rationale: a greater balance among new housing types and a critical mass of that particular type.

Good. Good ideas and I support.

Not necessary.

2. New Housing in Neighbourhoods (refer to panels 6-10)

C. Stacked Townhouses (refer to panel 9)

OK. Current plan has these within 1 block of Kingsway which is good.
The community does not support rezoning as proposed. Keep this area single family RS zoned as existing zoning.
No!
Don't like stacked townhouses.
Yes, this is needed to get more people into the neighbourhood and to get more affordable types of housing as well.
People should be able to choose where they want to live i.e. if they like these types of homes able to afford it. Again, think about the cost of living going up with all immigration.
Same as 2A.
Again I agree with the rental suite for the same reason.
As long as they don't stack both side and shut out sunlight.
Lack parking spaces.
Lack parking spaces.
No real objections.
Good concept.
No - houses should stay as they are now - no stacked townhouses.
Awesome.
I do not support having stacked townhouses on Ward St. and nearby streets.
Good option to increase density while keeping neighbourly feel.
No.
Do not tear down any single family homes. Families are important.
Make it family friendly.
No.
No stacked townhouses - I don't like them.
Same as 2A.
Disagree.
Looks good. Again, affordable housing options close to transit.
OK.
Absolutely - going up instead of out!
See A.
Closer to Kingsway or Skytrain stations would be ideal.
This is the most likely key to get younger start couples with young families into this neighbourhood. If this is not done with high rises on Kingsway, this project will fail to provide people to support fixing Kingsway.
The stacked townhouse proposal mentions the number (3) of units on a 33 ft. lot. If the lot is wider, i.e. 40 ft. which is common in the area described, you should be able to get more than 3 units. You should be able to fit 4 units which should be mentioned.
Yes.
Some spot rezoning along the intersection of prime arterials with Kingsway or the Skytrain may make some sense, again subject to the majority of the neighbourhood residents approving stacked townhouses.
Serious uncertainties surround this option. Therefore, a limited number of allowed instances should be followed by thorough review (and likely revision) before any more are allowed. Crawlspace basements should be entirely below grade, with no windows, and with structural constraints to make illegal conversion to living space very difficult. Too much area has been allocated to this option. See A & B above for reallocations.
I do not agree that a 33 ft lot could be redeveloped into 3 strata-titled units. Density is too high and could cause fire hazards. I prefer duplex. It is more healthy to have front and back yards for

outdoor living and parking could be a problem.
--

ok

Good. Good ideas and I support.

Not necessary.

2. New Housing in Neighbourhoods (refer to panels 6-10)

D. Transition to Kingsway (Four-storey Low-rise) (refer to panel 10)

Fine.
OK. Same as C above.
The community does not support rezoning as proposed. Keep this area single family RS zoned as existing zoning.
It is very hard to picture our home changed in this way (we are located between 2400 and Eldorado on 30th). In future - should the three lots of which we are part ever be sold, I would be very concerned for the trees and our wildlife in the yard. Please note that we also have a registered dogwood tree in the backyard.
OK.
That's ok - low-rise.
I like it as I would like to see more amenities in the area i.e. coffee shops, grocery stores, small drug store so that I can walk instead of driving out of the neighbourhood. The 2400 motel site is perfect for the proposed plan and wider sidewalks on Kingsway would be great.
See above.
Same as 2A.
I think a multi-family housing and rental suites are a very good proposal.
OK as long as limited to 4-storey not taller. "We aren't the West End".
A - OK. Commercialization of area, turning it into a main hub --> see benefits to area. Concerned w/noise level however. Also concerned with crime rate.
No real objections.
Supporting the concept. Prefer some flexibility and discretion in heights. Some locations may support as much as 6-storeys (bottom being commercial). Some may only support 2-3.
I like it. My only concern is the shadow issue. Having lived on the ground floor in Yaletown, I know what an impact the shadows of tall buildings can be - especially the long shadows in winter.
Houses should remain single housed.
Great idea to provide many more affordably units into the area while providing a more natural transition from the higher buildings along Kingsway. Perhaps in areas where taller buildings occur along Kingsway, the transition building should rise to 5 maybe even 6 floors if the upper floors are setback.
No.
Not if you have to eliminate single family homes.
6-10 storeys would even be acceptable.
Same comment as A.
No - definitely no.
Commercial - below.
My concern is the air quality in this area after fully developed with higher buildings along Kingsway and 4-storeys behind may ?? the heat in the area.
Disagree.
Even more affordable housing options close to shops and services and bus routes.
Would like this!
OK.
Yes - needed; lots of opportunity here. A great asset to this area.
Strong asset to this area. - fully approve.
Would recommend these be limited to where shadowing from buildings on Kingsway is a concern.
Transition area needs to be expanded so that can include more of similar types of demographics. This allows the community to be off Kingsway to include adjacent 3-4 blocks.
If you are going to have high-rise on parts of Kingsway, then I think you should not limit this to four-storey. I would go as far as 8-storey.
Some spot rezoning (repetition gets across point hopefully) one block adjacent to both sides of Kingsway might be suitable for 4-storey wood frame low-rises if the majority of the neighbourhood residents and commercial owners agree to them.

Full four-storey will provide a harsh and overwhelming transition to residential properties across the street. Walk Duke Street and use your imagination. This type should be reduced to a softer three and a half storey. Rationales: The relatively small area allocated to this type. The minimal resulting lose of livable square footage on the upper floor. Mitigation of the canyon effect toward the lane on the Kingsway side. The ongoing side-by-side future with existing single-family houses.

Good. Good ideas and I support.

2. New Housing in Neighbourhoods (refer to panels 6-10)

E. More Housing Flexibility in General (refer to panels 6-10)

Yes, increased flexibility is good, again as long as zoning is flexible. If rezoned to stocked townhouse lot will not prevent owner of rebuilding a single family home.
I strongly agree!
I agree.
No, this is not supported by the community. The single family RS zones should stay as they are. Zoning along Kingsway should be 4-6 storeys as it is not zoned.
We agree.
Yes, we agree to it.
Agree with concept.
Yes, laneway or coach only.
In general too many people in small spaces or on small lots.
Okay with me.
I do not agree. There are a lot of BC that can be developed where there is a lot of land available to develop why disrupt the beauty of Vancouver??
Very much so, flexibility is very important.
Increase in flexibility in housing types is necessary because of increase in population in Vancouver. I have lived here for 30 years. There is no better place than Vancouver.
Yes, I agree with this principle. Everyone would be able to afford housing.
No.
Yes.
Agree w/ different housing types, will give the area character. I enjoy a nature-esque view. HATE the idea of opening my curtains and seeing another building. I like natural light!
No, I think this will increase crime and noise to a nice area.
I'm all for providing options as the quality stays priority. I would not want to see the community lose it's charm. My biggest concern is keeping a lot of green space.
I like this. Providing more flexibility (wit required aesthetic / design) and options provides more diversity. This more appealing to more people.
I do. If a house gets sold now a "monster house" usually goes up. These ideas offer better planning overall.
I do not agree there are already townhouses on Duchess St. (close to Kingsway). There has been enough development. Redevelopment on Kingsway is fine but not the inner streets.
Agree that more options will result in a more natural growth, hopefully design standard prevent a hodgepodge and keep all the different elements looking complimentary instead of clashing.
No.
"Norquay" is not a community, but 2 distinct neighbourhoods divided by the Kingsway.
1 do support this.
Yes, I agree. Variety is the spice of life. I do not want to see the same boring houses / buildings.
No.
Kingsway is the concern surrounding areas are fine.
Where is everyone going to park? We already have problems with parking.
I support this proposal.
Different housing types should theoretically come with different prices i.e. more expensive, more affordable.
I agree. Good diversity in housing style and options are provided.
Definitely agree - we need all options to accommodate all levels of income and to provide variety.
Yes - good for single families. Flexibility in types of housing allows something for everyone.
See A.
Agree and want to have duplex and infill to support this flexibility.
Agree and want to have duplex and infill to support this flexibility.

Fully agree! Options are a must and if the City expects any development mass rezoning is a must as individual home owners are unlikely to apply to rezone. Fantastic!
I agree with this principle because it gives us more choices of our own living places and it is more appropriate to the improvement to the modern city/
Yes, I want more housing flexibility in general.
YES. Kingsway is a mess, we are afraid to walk down from our house 4 blocks off Kingsway. Only fix is get more younger families into neighbourhood, which starts by making more affordable (i.e. higher density).
I'm not sure about flexibility but higher density is essential. If that means more high-dense units with less flexibility, then so be it.
This all depends how it will affect future residences and what about parking?
Optimized spot rezoning might occur (very slowly) in Norquay under the strict conditions indicated in A - D above. One would hope these types would all be high-quality architect designed with heavy use of trees and landscaping (that is so outstanding south of Canada Way in Burnaby in a specific site there).
This is a global principle that communicates nothing. It is rhetoric only. To single out Norquay when other areas of East Vancouver are less dense seems to be a deliberate plan. This "principle" of "flexibility of housing" is misleading and invites a "yes" statement. Flexibility is desirable to developers and opens the door to profit for a few. It goes beyond duplexes and townhouses with space for children and pets.
As a generality, I favor flexibility, provided that it is accompanied by serious design constraints and true respect for neighbourhood and context. If some more generalized "flexibility" is being sought by the city here, that flexibility should apply not only to Norquay but to all residential areas of the city. This principle ensures that planners and politicians are not trying to pick on the vulnerability of our single small area.
Very supportive of this. I appreciate the City is thinking for the neighbourhood's individual owner and resident.
Good. Good ideas and I support.

3. New Development on Kingsway (refer to panels 11-14)

A. The proposed Neighbourhood Centre Plan focuses on Kingsway as the main commercial and higher-density area of Norquay Village.

Fine.
I think this is great. An increase in commercial and public areas would be good, especially if bike/pedestrian friendly. 2400 would be great location for heart of village, it wouldn't destroy / take away from existing parks, but add some nice sitting areas and community spots.
I like the proposal. Currently this area is perceived to be "unsafe". It would make the area friendlier and safe if commercial shops are added.
The current idea is a great idea. 2400 Motel land is underutilized and there is nothing really significant about it. Beautify Kingsway and 2400 Motel to make it feel safe and not just a simple road to connect between downtown and Burnaby.
The additional height and density proposed gives no significant amenities and it would be better to keep the height along Kingsway to 4-6 storeys as it is now zoned. The 2400 Motel site, which is City owned, should be used for amenities for this community which has too little existing amenities for the existing population, and the City should keep the height the same as the existing zoning.
Hard to speculate because these changes are huge - compared to how our neighbourhood has been for many years. I am obviously concerned about parking and access through the back lane to our one existing parking spot on the property. Also the foot traffic on the street but that's not too much of a worry. We are all wondering about how the increased density will affect our sewer system, which is already a bit shaky.
This is acceptable.
Kingsway is a MAIN traffic street. It's going to be difficult to make it a quieter area. You're putting too many people into a busy area.
Okay with it if only 5 sites, wouldn't like to see a lot of 12-storey.
This is key to building a more active community. Walkability is linked to greater walking levels for short trips.
Again why change into high density by taking away from the beauty of this city, taking away from the beauty of communities to put in monstrosities of buildings?
High density is good idea, because businesses need people to flow in order to survive. The more people in the area mean more chances of sales.
The basic approach proposal is very good. ?? Need more retail and grocery store businesses.
OK....but not surrounding streets....
Need public health centre. Need educational performing arts options for low income children/youth.
All for it as long as crime rate is minimized.
Like the King Edward Village, a high-rise near the main road casts a shadow on the road. It also ruins the skyline from Kensington Park.
I like it. I want a neighbourhood that feels like a community and the proposed plans provides the opportunity.
The plan is fine. The commercial core is needed for the 'hood.
It is a good idea. Right now it is called Norquay Village - why? Who cares? There is not real identity. The X-Zone being redeveloped as the neighbourhood "heart" will provide the focus for identity as a community. Do it!! It is rational and good for the area.
No mid-rise or higher on Kingsway!! 4-storey is plenty high. I absolutely do not like your proposed neighbourhood centre plan for the 2400 Motel. Also make sure that there is parking underneath the low-rise buildings on Kingsway.
Great. I'd like to see a dedicated bike lane down (and up) Kingsway which might be difficult to come up with the planned medians.
Very supportive of the ideas presented. A little hesitant on the proposed width of the sidewalks in certain areas. If they are too large they can make the areas look more barren than it is. Perhaps a medium sized sidewalk would be a better solution. Everything else looks great.
No.

Nonsense.
I think it is a very sound use of land. Please keep this affordable. Nice to clean up area and ensure no large box stores take up all the commercial space.
This basic approach is exactly how I want it to go. The 2400 Motel needs to go. As the largest piece of land that is not a park and can be redeveloped it is the perfect spot to be the centre focus. Kingsway should be pedestrian and shopper friendly - not the unattractive street that its now. I want to be proud of my neighbourhood and not cringe at the ugliness of it.
Hopefully a major improvement.
A little bit too much.
I like the proposed development on the 2400 Motel site.
I do not agree with the development taking place at Kingsway and Nanaimo but it is happening anyhow - as far the rest of the proposal of Norquay Village - disagree.
Brilliant proposal. The "urban communities" concept should be embraced.
This makes sense.
A great proposal - provides a sense of "community" - much needed.
We need a community centre at this location - this is a good proposal.
Support approach as my property value will increase
Support approach as my property value will increase
How can Kingsway be made "pedestrian friendly" with fumes from trucks and buses and streams of cards. It is like telling your children "go play on the freeway".
I like it provided view corridors of shading is looked at. Development should be open to traffic on Kingsway to promote desirability for retailers not like King Edward Village.
YES to approach to make more friendly walking area. The center of Kingsway street being tree lined is better served to allow maximum lanes for vehicles. Best work on the frontage of Kingsway and leave the street as throughway.
Yes, this should make Kingsway more livable. It will increase the number of quality, retail stores which would make it more livable for the surrounding area.
Yes.
I agree to some densification along Kingsway as long as it doesn't create a depressing "canyon" and if high-quality architecture and landscaping replace the current drab nature of the street. Use of the 2400 Motel site as the Norquay CC is essential to regenerating the neighbourhood and to ameliorate the effect of the 22 storey Eldorado site tower that was not sanctioned by the majority of Norquay residents.
See comments under 1 above.
Supportive. Please speed up the revitalization.
A community centre with activities and a small shopping mall
After the development of 2400 Motel, other than stores, shop centre, and housing units, please allow postal office, library, and community centre. This would be great!
I like to suggest special attention to the pedestrian walk path at Slocan/Kingsway and Earles/Kingsway including the possibility of overhead pathways.
Good. Good ideas and I support.
Good suggestions. I strongly support.
Low density commercial buildings could be considered for Kingsway.

3. New Development on Kingsway (refer to panels 11-14)
 B. Kingsway Building Typology: 6 to 8 storeys (refer to panel 12)

OK.
6-8 is good within 1 block of Kingsway. Would rather have higher storeys along Kingsway and lower behind. Would reduce blocking views of neighbouring houses.
Go for it!
6-8 storeys is too high. It should be kept at 4 storeys and only under special circumstances increase to 6-storeys.
The lower the better. The commercial facelift will be welcome.
Good.
Works for me.
Take this type of planning and move to an area that is in need of development. That way it can accommodate for the people that are expected to move there.
Good.
This idea is good because we need the setback because our population has a steady growth. Whereas in Asia the population is so great they couldn't keep up with the housing market.
I think this is a good proposal.
Keep to six storeys. Make parking below all buildings.
OK.
No.
New buildings on King Edward (and Kingscrest Park) is darker because these buildings are blocking light. Cause for concern since it obstructs views and worrisome for pedestrians who might walk on sidewalk in fear of attackers.
I like that it won't be high-rises that will make it feel dwarfing. Lower buildings will provide a nicer skyline.
So long as it doesn't create jungle. Again - the appearance of what is built is critical. No ugliness allowed.
No.
See 2D.
Yes, the height is very suitable and will greatly help increase density which is needed to attract retail back to Norquay. Preferably we would see retail along the street level with any office space on the second floor to liven the area. Limit commercial use to only the first 2 floors so that we don't end up with dead spots in the evenings.
No.
But not at the expense of single family homes within 2 blocks north or south of the Kingsway.
Very nice idea.
I support this.
OK.
Develop along Kingsway is always good to the economy and community convenience.
6-8 storeys - why is the development at Kingsway and Nanaimo more than 8-storeys?
I'm okay with this. Will go a long way in providing affordable housing, centrally located close to services and bus routes. Keeps cars off the road.
OK.
6-storeys sound just right - too high blocks
Glad they aren't higher - thanks!
You use Paris in your pictorial example. Those apts. were built 150 years ago - why use it today?
Good idea. Promote redevelopment of corridor or improvement of streetscape.
YES support typology. We need to fix Kingsway to make it safe and people friendly, so higher density of local starts this. We should not decrease the lanes on Kingsway for through traffic. Environments affected by cars idle.
Looks good to me.
What about the school? Is it going to be able to accommodate the increase in the area?

I am in favour of the use of up to 8-storeys only as long as there is setbacks and gateways for abundant light flowing onto Kingsway and with every green and lush landscaping to be decreed in the required spot rezoning. The stepped architecture on the NW corner of Cypress at 4th Ave. W. is a good example for 3-storeys.

The apartments shown are boxes. Creating a canyon along Kingsway is not an improvement. Build apartments like the ones by Nanaimo stations with park-like landscaping and frontage away from the sidewalk.

"Mid-rise building form" should start from the existing allowance of four storeys, which already appears quite massive, especially when viewed from land that slopes downward. The International Building Code (section 202) defines "high-rise building" as "a building with an occupied floor located more than 75 feet (23 m) above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access." (Various local jurisdictions alter 75 feet to 55 feet.) City of Vancouver Planning Department has notoriously and inexcusably waffled over the upper limit definition of "mid-rise." The argument that current allowance for four-storey (five from the back) building will not bring development is given the lie by the current large building underway at 2239 Kingsway. Six stories seems to be a general critical extreme upper boundary in the definition of human scale. I have heard this from more than one architecture/design professional, and my own streetscape experience bears this out. This fundamental principal and proportion should not be violated in Norquay simply to get a bit of CAC and DCL that the community would just as soon forego to have a lower height. The first and overriding consideration in any increase over four storeys should be to obtain additional setback for Kingsway sidewalk. The shadow effects of eight storeys on adjoining residential neighbourhoods are unacceptable.

Improve daycare and facilities for seniors from developments.

Good and no further ideas. Like to see positive changes in Vancouver and so it becomes more affluent. Convenience and more greening are important.

6 to 8 storey could be considered.

3. New Development on Kingsway (refer to panels 11-14)
C. Kingsway Building Typology: Special Sites (refer to panel 12)

Max. 10 would prefer only up to 8-storeys.
Go for it!
"Special" sites should not be designed outside of the neighbourhood planning process. These sites should be developed under the existing zoning of 4-storeys as per above. Towers are the least environmentally and the least energy efficient form of development and should not be implemented outside of downtown.
The lower the better.
No!
Don't like the 10-12 storeys - no more than 6-8.
Glad to see more childcare and improvements to our local parks.
Again, read the above.
Good.
The limited sites to create plazas and pedestrian connections are a very good proposal.
Fair, but needs tweaking. Again parking has to be addressed not only for customers but also owners and workers manning the streets.
OK.
No.
Height is too high for the neighbourhood.
Disrupts the view of mountains and other natural things. Too modern. Don't like the idea of the neighbourhood obtaining a "concrete jungle" (or "glass jungle") identity.
High-rises need to have green space on rooftops.
Based on the existing restrictions I'm okay with this.
As noted earlier - good, well-thought out design that delivers what is promised would provide some identity. Include some parks/recreation to add to this.
No.
See 2D.
Ensure that any plaza or connection be public though either via land ownership or legal agreements. No trade off for height if the private owners remain in control of the public space. Also no need to limit it only to 5 sites; if more come along they weigh the options.
No.
2400 Kingsway site is the best site in East Van. For a special development: 1. Closest site on Kingsway to Skytrain, also highest point (for views) on Kingsway. Includes Church's Chicken, but only 2 towers and go higher to have more green spaces.
Very nice.
Neutral.
No.
Variety is good.
Disagree.
Again, okay with this. As above.
OK.
Yes - sense of community is needed in our area.
Yes - we need community area to gather.
Do you have a plan to heritage the tree on Purdy's site and the trees on the east of 2400?
Like it, particularly at intersections.
Yes. The only way this whole proposal works is getting more people with younger demographics living in area. To do this higher density with walkable from other in adjacent will make work.
I like the idea.
Yes.
Not sure about 12-storeys building.
"5 sites in total" for 10-12 storeys would be past the desirable the human scale for the area, we

would be talking the West End here. A couple of sites similar to that on the corner of Boundary Rd. & E. Hastings in Burnaby might work because of the splendid setbacks and greenery also ancient Babylon.
The building of 10-storey apartments in 5 sites along Kingsway is an idea that could work if it revitalizes those sections of Kingsway. Would these be rental units or condominiums to buy? Amenities such as moving the tiny Collingwood library into this area should be part of the plan.
The graphics employed in panel 12 were blatantly dishonest. Vague reference to an unspecified 5 sites is not adequate to establish any loose blanket prior approval for a fuzzy allowance of "10 to 12 storeys." Special sites should be dealt with specifically and must involve a full and honest process (unlike 2300 Kingsway). Any height over six storeys must bring clear public space benefits in the form of pedestrian connection or public plaza (the large private plaza scheduled for 2300 Kingsway leaves a legacy of strong suspicion). A developer desire to sell views must not be traded off to the detriment of the existing neighbourhood's livability and human scale.
Special 'mid block' sites most appropriate
Good. Good ideas and I support.
Only along Kingsway with low density.

3. New Development on Kingsway (refer to panels 11-14)

D. 2400 Motel Site (refer to panel 14)

The term "community gathering spaces" is misleading. You are not proposing a community centre, ice rink or pool!!
Heights - no mention on panels. Again max. 8-10 proposed strategy is good.
I support.
Go for it! Totally agree! 2400 Motel has not historical significance.
This proposal for the 2400 Motel site is not a neighbourhood centre that the community supports. This site should be kept for community amenities as proposed by the community.
16 storeys is high - 12 would be better - a little less density and shadow. Hopefully the community gathering areas would be 'senior-friendly'. Love the grocery store idea.
Do not agree with the densities. This will eliminate single family dwellings -- reduce families --> reduce enrolment in schools --> close schools.
Grocery store? Not a supermarket. Need a large supermarket.
These changes will make it more scenic and hopefully slow down the traffic.
This motel is considered a heritage building, it is something the community are proud of
Love the idea.
Yes, we need local business because a good community requires good, convenient retail stores
We need active retail frontages along Kingsway especially more Canadian restaurants and grocery stores.
Fair, but again parking, parking.
No.
Too high. What will this do to traffic and congestion?
Will big grocery stores move in and take business from the family owned small stores.
I like the concept especially a grocery store. I would like to see a pool put in.
I support a public space that can offer the same type of services that the Collingwood Neighbourhood House. This seems like a great space for it.
There are good but could be added to e.g. play space, fitness facility, good seating / picnic tables - well looked after and maintained.
I do not like your plan for the 2400 Motel site - it looks as ugly as can be. The Norquay Neighbourhood plan looks much better.
Great.
Height is fine, it can even be increased a touch to tie in with the 22-storey tower on the same block. Perhaps 18 and 14 might be more suitable. Also would not be against more density on this site then along the rest of Kingsway. This will be the heart and should be treated special. By increasing density on this one site it would help pay to make the outside amenities even better.
No.
Very nice. Would be nice if a daycare is in the area.
This is overdue. I want these changes to happen before I die.
Yes.
I'm not sure.
Maybe more public meeting facilities should be added.
OK - for 2400 Motel site.
Missed this.
OK - we could use a good produce store and a post office.
Good idea - community and a sense of belonging caring for each other is needed.
See A. Thanks for this proposal.
You are completely deaf to what has been asked re: this site so why are you asking again?
Be limited to 10-12 storeys as above. With improved market area, retailer will come back (grocery store) on their own.
YES, need to get high density on Kingsway ONLY if can get adjacent transitions.
The motel needs to go in order to revitalize the area. Without removing the hotel all other plans

won't have the intended results.
Yes.
We need a large grocery store - possibly a London Drugs. Not too many squished storefronts that ends up being an eyesore and not well maintained.
16-storeys would not be human scale on the 2400 Motel site. If pushed through by Council, then a huge amenity such as a public theatre spaces under the tower would be required. The rear open space also has to be larger, even King Edward Village at least has nearby Kingcrest Park to offset the tower fortress. Use stepped setbacks from ground level all along Kingsway to set an example for the whole area.
Granville Island types of density, attractiveness, vitality and community focus is what I would like to see on this site. Most little malls do not add much value to neighbourhoods other than quick shopping places. With open spaces greenery and effective planning, this site could be a little model for other cities to look at.
The first amenity for this site should be maintenance of a human scale, even at the cost of other supposed amenities. Our region of East Vancouver has already suffered the failures and indignities of King Edward Village and 2300 Kingsway, which our current planners freely admit. Their predecessors did this to us. This pattern must be broken with further developments in Norquay, especially at the 2400 Motel site, where reparations are deserved. Norquay requires significant capital injection at this site. Maximum exploitation of the three acres cannot be expected to produce all amenities. If now is not the time, wait. We are every bit as special as Woodwards, the Olympic Village and 1 Kingsway. Do not blow this opportunity. The blockbusting arrogance of 2300 Kingsway should not be used to push a further height agenda with sick cynical phrases like "reflects the precedent" and "completes the block" and "reduces the height". That last quotation is pure newspeak (term courtesy of George Orwell), 2300 Kingsway sits at the foot of the rise of land, and the topography alone provides all necessary "completion" to the northeast. Indications that the 2400 Motel site will remain public land may be the best news that Norquay has had in five years.
Apartments, a shopping mall where a grocery store is located and a library.
Agree with the building of a community place, best with swimming and exercise gym and a grocery store
This is a very good re-development plan. It will convenient for people to shop, and have activity space. Please add an area for seniors activities.
Add a library and a swimming pool for this area.
Good. Good ideas and I support.
Should stay with the maximum height suggested here and do not allow higher heights for other sites.
Should not allow 22 storey - too high and too dense.

4. Community Amenities (refer to panels 17-21)

A. Proposed Community Amenities (refer to panel 18)

Pool are already over subscribed. Need these type of amenities or need to expand Killarney C.C.
Good.
I support this proposal. It will be a very good improvement to our area.
We can also use a supermarket, cafes even a Tim Horton's or Starbucks. Of course you need the nice building for it. Besides that all looks great.
There are not enough community amenities to justify the increases in density. This increased density should not be approved. Amenities need to be financed from other City sources than development.
We have very few amenities now. Most would be an improvement.
Community amenities are a must with added population.
Overdue.
All of these features will help to build a healthier community. Active living will create a more balanced lifestyle.
In today, news on global there is a lot of art back in school programs and community services. You tell me where the money will come from to accommodate.
Very supportive to these proposals.
Green space is a must have, because that is why Vancouver is so unique from other big cities. As community grows we need to improve our community amenities.
I feel that all the community amenities are necessary especially transit improvements, affordable housing and childcare. Not every person can afford to buy a new home or pay high rent or mortgage rates.
OK.
See 3.
How will the parks be improved?
All planned amenities meet my needs.
As a parent to be, I'm looking forward to the park improvements. The new playground to water park will be enjoyed.
It is a major thoroughfare isn't it? Don't lose or restrict this without providing other transportation solutions that integrate with overall transportation plans for the GVRD.
Bring them on!!
I am not supportive of amenities that are not limited to any subset of population but those that can be used equally by all.
No.
Will people north of Kingsway use Norquay Park when Slocan Park is bigger and better?
Very nice.
Slocan and general Brock parks should be expanded to Slocan St. and Gladstone respectively. Every workshop mentioned slowing traffic on 29th Ave. between Slocan St. and Nanaimo - why is this being dropped as a topic??
No.
Sounds good.
Good.
What about the schools? I think instead of all this nonsense allow multiple family zoning in detached row housing.
Missed this.
Most people need more amenities...poll, exercise gym and arts centre. We could use a pool that is warm for seniors and toddlers. Killarney is too busy and Renfrew doesn't have a warm pool. Already both pools have waiting lists for lessons. We also need an arts and performance centre badly. Also an exercise gym. I know pools are expensive but so is vandalism and kids with nothing to do. Hopefully tax revenue from increased density will pay for pool, gym, and arts centre.
Yes- keep green friendly to pedestrians likes etc. Young families will move into this area if these are provided.

Please make this foot/bike traffic friendly.
You ignore the 4-year request from the city volunteers for an arts umbrella and viable community centre. A "Gathering Place" is not a substitute. It is vague and undefined - a cop out that will be a cheap city solution.
#20 - street from Clarendon to 34th Ave. needed. This is an excellent idea.
Senior housing is also a must.
YES. We need to develop walkway and biking from adjacent where people would come to Kingsway. Driving then will not work.
Community centres and public places are important to this plan. It makes the area more habitual.
Yes
A gathering place would be great as the density increases.
Affordable housing and seniors' apartments should be suitable placed at strategic locations in Norquay. Norquay Park has to be extensively upgraded and a greened public sidewalk up Kingsway should link it and a pedestrian bridge (damn the cost) across Kingsway to the Ravine Linear Park.
Baseball fields and other sports spaces are needed somewhere. Enhance Norquay Park. Please take into account that Trout Lake is a lovely green space used by many local and Norquay residents and is not enough park to support the redevelopment planned. I support green space, cultural / music / movie theatre / community centre for yoga and other classes. A children's play area with amenities such as a trendy coffee shop which parents can watch their kids while sitting on outdoor tables (weather-permitting).
Amenities are good things. But existing human scale and livability should never be sacrificed for other paybacks. To say "the specific type and timing of amenities will depend on future population growth" reminds us how much Norquay has already grown and how little payback it has enjoyed especially in the realm of commercial retail. It does not help to tie separate issues like Clarendon Extension and Ravine Linear Park into promotion of current planning objectives. That fuzzy drag-it-all-in approach only generates suspicion. Additional pedestrian connections across the long stretches of Kingsway are a pre-condition to current plans and they should be implemented as soon as possible. Additions to park space and creation of other outdoor and indoor spaces must be given high priority and coordinated with increase in population. With the existing childcare on Duke Street and the one coming at 2300 Kingsway, that particular form of amenity has had its turn and should drop down the priority list in Norquay.
Improve community environment and add greening.
Good Planning proposal
I generally agree with the amenities proposal. Don't know whether the City would consider swimming pool facility to benefit residents living along Kingsway
Norquay park covers a lot of land. Please add features and use it properly. Currently there is not enough usage.
Good. Good ideas and I support.
Cleanliness should get attention.
Improve appropriately.

4. Community Amenities (refer to panels 17-21)

B. Kingsway Street Design Changes (refer to panel 19)

As long as it doesn't come out of the C.A.C. money!
I support this proposal!
It's ok but you don't really see too many people walking on Kingsway. Worry about it when 2400 Motel is redeveloped.
Kingsway is a highway and is not a neighbourhood centre.
Love the trees!
It's about time. Kingsway needs a facelift.
A pedestrian / cyclist crossing increases safety.
This is already needed without putting up more buildings.
Excellent.
Cyclist crossings and pedestrian crossings must be visible to drivers most of the time don't see them. I think lower flashing light is good. Most of the time driver's don't see the light too high.
I agree with a pedestrian/cyclist crossing/landscapes/ street trees/ and especially benches and litter bins. For safety, beauty, people can take a rest.
Nice but what plans do you have for traffic? Kingsway is a main thoroughfare. Are you closing it down?
No, increase in security or community police centre.
I like the idea of trash cans on sidewalks to maintain and encourage cleanliness of area! Preferably more colourful than the one shown in picture. Bike parking also ok.
Litter bins should be bright in colour to attract usage and recycling bin would be a bonus.
Yay! Make my neighbourhood pretty.
Anything to encourage foot traffic and shopping locally.
This is needed.
This is all nice but what about the traffic and who wants to sit on a bench on Kingsway with all this traffic.
It's about time - particularly the crossing at Norquay Park - drivers never see pedestrians there!
It looks much better than the current situation. Love the freed median in certain sections. Not digging the cement median in others. It doesn't add anything to the area even just having low maintenance shrubs in the other medians would add vibrancy and probably effect drivers to slow down a tad.
No.
No more retail on the street and ban parking so traffic moves better.
Very nice.
Don't slow Kingsway down.
This is a good idea.
Good.
Agree.
Would go a long way in revitalizing the look and appeal of the corridor. Could be very attractive.
Agree.
Yes - great designs - keep trees, places to sit and have coffee.
See A.
You can buy all the street furniture and beautification you want but Kingsway is a TRUCK ROUTE and it cuts Norquay in half - just as the freeways cut cities in half.
Anything to make the corridor more pedestrian friendly --> similar to W. 4th Ave. or E. Hastings in Burnaby. Restrict left turns mid block works also helps flow of traffic. Need also pedestrian crossing between Slokan and Earles.
It's good. It makes the city green, clean and convenient to local residents. I like the beauty of a modern city.
It's good.
Yes to changes except for trees down middle which decrease lane for through traffic. Concentrate on

expanding sidewalk and edges, leave throughway alone.
I don't like the median greenspace. Please focus the landscape on the edges and try to keep Kingsway at 6 lanes for less traffic.
Yes.
Wider sidewalks without interruptions especially for scooter and baby buggies etc. Spare trees further apart...they are like children that grow up.
If the City is going to attract quality developers into Norquay to create a charming neighbourhood such that "you want to be there". The City needs to invest much more than the one million dollars allotted for Kingsway in Norquay.
Public plaza and outdoor spaces - yes.
For the most part, these changes are nice, but amount to minor cosmetics. As a capital injection by the City, they do not really amount to much, and certainly do not begin to compensate even for the unwanted blockbusting of the neighbourhood by 2300 Kingsway. Shrubbery on new medians further west on Kingsway is starting to present visibility hazards for drivers trying to turn left onto Kingsway. Median space would be better allocated to a bicycle lane or to wider sidewalks than to planters.
I object to placing a large garbage can near Kingsway. No only does it have an impact to where I live , the garbage can has attracted neighbours to leave a lot extra garbage and abandoned furniture around it. This has a lot impact to the environment of Kingsway. I suggest the removal of the garbage can. The maintenance of a clean image of Kingsway is important.
Agree.
This is a very good idea to calm the traffic along Slokan.
Good. Good ideas and I support.
These suggestions would help residents to have a better community environment.
Gradually improve.

4. Community Amenities (refer to panels 17-21)

C. Clarendon Street Changes (refer to panel 20)

Great. Would be awesome to reduce traffic through 34th & Nanaimo as it is very dangerous intersection. Nanaimo from 34th to 38th is a school zone, yet traffic is very fast through this area, even with the little speed bumps.
I support this proposal!
On this street please allow high density because this is bus route as well.
No problem.
Allow medium to high density (bus route) to Skytrain stations.
Allow high/medium density on this street (bus route)
I like this one!
NO CORNER BULGES. Waste of tax dollars, speed bumps are better, cars hitting bulges.
That's a good idea!
Good.
I think if Clarendon can be connected to Kingsway street that would take care of this problem.
I agree with the new traffic signal. 33rd Ave. is a busy area especially now 33rd Ave. bus route which is in operation now.
It will clear up the vacant lots!!!
Like these ideas. Make sure crossing lights are timed long enough for elders to cross.
Nanaimo (south of 33rd) already narrow enough.
No one-way! Turn signal from Slocan to Kingsway.
I live near this corner. I would like to see these changes to improve the existing traffic issues.
Don't drive much, so it won't affect me either way.
A masterful presentation - much more than I could think of. Good work everybody.
I like it. Clarendon's "t-section" is an odd one as it is now.
Very good idea and long overdue, only complaint about it is that it won't be done until 2012.
No.
Why did you not just Slocan south of 33rd Ave.? Much better traffic connection to Kingsway.
Very nice.
No.
Really good arrangement.
Agree with traffic light at 34th and Nanaimo. Disagree with connecting Clarendon St. to 33rd.
Missed this.
Agree.
Yes - connect these - need lots of trees and places where people and families can walk, meet, etc.
See A.
Yes. Needed!
Finally.
I think more convenient for traffic.
Sounds good. I think principally keep traffic moving and create bike lane on side streets works best.
I agree with joining Clarendon with 33rd but DO NOT make Slocan one-way. We need to keep our current throughways. Actually after clarifications, if you are making only the small stretch of Slocan one-way it's fine.
Yes.
Don't know too much about this street. I did wonder why the bus turned on it from 41st Ave.
Whatever you do for Clarendon Street make very sure enough design manpower and dollars are put in Kingsway so that its streaming traffic both ways can decide within any given block to circle around and cross Kingsway to the desired other side to find easy parking and then shop until you drop.
Yes, this seems to be a good plan.
Good. Do it.
Supportive.
During the construction, through Earles from Kingsway to 41st, I suggest no parking because the

street is too narrow until construction is done.
Good. Good ideas and I support.
This would work after the implementation.
Could be considered.

5. Other Comments

Yes. See Q.1.
No.
No.
The Planning Department is not listening, to the community and the proposed plans are not supported. Vision Direction to "Maintain most single family areas" in both Renfrew/Collingwood and KCC visions was highly supported and is not reflected in the present plans.
Allow medium to high density it's already a existing bus route.
We are enjoying a 'cleaner' back lane - with the drug problems having moved elsewhere and we are crossing our fingers that will stay an "addict-free" area. Also happy to see the Edorado closed.
Thousands of people added in this area, need a community centre. The centres now are over-used.
I do not support this plan.
By including the original boundaries for future development more people will live around the main bus routes and skytrains.
Just leave our City as is and develop cities that need to be and have the land available.
Our lot is less than 5500 sq. ft. Is it possible to build a smaller duplex at the front and an infill at the back?
No.
Make more affordable housing for seniors, low-income people, people on disability pensions, the poor and social assistance income. We need more retail businesses, restaurants and grocery stores and banks.
With these changes it will make my comfort stop. If I end up with a 35 ft. townhouse on each side of me I will never see daylight again!! Great on paper but not for current homeowners!!
Skateboarding area -- teenagers need something to do too! Greenway --> good lighting important for safety. Commercial developments around Skytrain.
I do not support this plan because I want the entire present single family zoned (RS-1) area to remain under the zoning.
I like lawns on my own property. Overall, disagree with rezoning. Lacking city reps, little /no presence!
Street parking needs to be addressed in detail.
I'm looking forward to seeing this plan move forward. As an expecting mother it offers a lot of conveniences the neighbourhood is missing.
I do not like your plan - keep the housing as it is now.
Plans for 29th Ave. station - way too many crimes because of the too quiet streets and lanes. Better bike route transitions i.e. Nanaimo Station, Vanness from Earles to Rupert; otherwise keep up the good work!
Object to the ravine linear park as the greenway is adequate.
Have the City invest some money but more importantly some attention to Norquay. There is so much potential to be something more than it is today.
No.
Kingsway is not "central". It is a border Skytrain stations are "central". Improve retail at 29th Ave. and Nanaimo Skytrains.
Where are the single family houses?
I believe with improvement to Kingsway alone with housing and stores, restaurants (upgrades) will change everything.
When will it happen?
I do not support this plan. I want the entire present single family zoned.
Maybe telling us the time frame of the whole process that we can plan our own.
This proposal should be implemented and duplicated throughout the City in the many various neighbourhood. To not do this would be the most unfortunate and a deterioration of neighbourhood appeal over the years would ensue.
Would like more trees.
Plant as many trees as possible wherever there is space to do so.

Please move on this soon - Vancouver is a next city - let's capture some of the 2010 Olympic spirit!
Lets get going - the economy needs this support to continue to gather strength.
I strongly object to MASS REZONING of Norquay. I think that is a cavalier move to kill off a community.
I think mass rezoning including provision for single family is a must. Without it, the housing options will not come to be as individual home owners will not apply for rezoning.
I do not agree with these plans
"I wish there is some improvements in the Earles Park, such as small pool in the park for the kids".
Make this plan come as soon as possible, more community centre, pool, library.
I do not support this plan because I want the entire present single family zoned (Rs-1) area to remain under that zoning
If the intent is to make area livable then has to increase density and demographics in whole area. Status quo will make Kingsway area even more unlivable. No change make this happen.
I do not support this plan.
I have mentioned higher density multiple times, but I'll repeat it here. It is essential. It's the only way to get newer people into the neighbourhood which will turn it from a run-down community into a vibrant one.
At this time I am not to say anything, regarding the proposal. I am interested and would like to get additional info in the future. Thanks.
I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS PLAN!
I do not agree with the above plan.
I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS PLAN. I WANT IT TO REMAIN RS1
I do NOT support this plan
I like the proposal to improving the walking space to the Skytrain. Safety is the most important issue.
All of the changes on Kingsway would be spot-rezoned and subject to majority neighbourhood approval. However any new rezoning (and even current zoning) should have sustainability (with all of its least 12 components) and should meet LEED silver accreditation or better. In closing it is my opinion that no rezoning will be more sustainable (or survivable) than the present RS-1!
The sudden densification is a big concern to me. The Norquay Neighbourhood Centre Plan is positive direction.
The principle and proportion of a human-scale general four to six-storey maximum building height (up from four only to achieve additional sidewalk setback) along Kingsway is of utmost importance. The Renfrew Collingwood Community Vision did not even address buildings higher than four storeys, yet the Draft Plan groundlessly proposes to rezone most of Kingsway for mid-rise and high-rise buildings. Members of the Kensington Cedar Cottage Vision Committee have been told by city planners "You've had your turn and it will be years before we can look again at anything to do with your situation". Norquay must never face this type of treatment: Done up and then shunned. The typical allocation of two off-street parking spaces to each new housing type on a single lot will not be enough to address this ever-growing problem. Far too often property owners use garage as storage space and then park on the street. With a readily possibly four dwelling units or more per lot, a corresponding four automobiles will render local streets impassable. The only effective solution is to charge for the use of curbside space across Vancouver, with an allowance of one free (and transferable to visitor at residence) citywide permit per homeowner grant. The Renfrew Collingwood Community Vision gives 76% approval to "maintain most single-family areas" (item 11.1). Even with a provision to allow development under current RS-1 requirements, the proposal mass rezoning clearly fails to respect this element of the community vision. These proposals for Norquay Village seems likely to reduce the existing 32% proportion of low income families and to shift the neighbourhood away from its longstanding family-oriented character. Families want yards, and higher FSR's reduce and remove yard space. This social factor has not been given appropriate weight. Affordability in the Norquay area will only be damaged by seeking a doubling in the rate of redevelopment. Newer housing is more expensive housing. (The market affordability of gentrification cannot be compared with current affordability). Potential residential property tax impacts need to be studied far more carefully. The longitudinal data on the rezoned properties at

<p>Kingsway and Knight needs to be analyzed and publicly reported on. Mitigations should be sought for. Norquay should not be singled out for measures that could be applied across the city of Vancouver. To do this redlines our small area rather than scattering the effects. Political opportunism offers no excuse for exploitation of our vulnerability. Bryant Urstadt, "Vancouver Real Estate Bubble Trouble", Bloomberg BusinessWeek (24 June 2010) - Norquay should not become a profit centre for developers. There is new hope that external conditions may moderate their interest in our neighbourhood. We do not owe anything to speculative offshore money.</p>
<p>I am writing to express my concerns about the process, right from the time of the Norquay survey in 2007. As a result of those concerns (listed below), I am unable to accept the plan offered for Norquay at the June 2010 Open Houses.</p>
<p>Personally, I really like the City's plans for the neighbourhood and I hope they come about. I believe that an increase in density will bring more amenities and more young families to the area, while reducing its carbon footprint. As it stands, my husband and I have to drive our car or take the Skytrain out of the neighbourhood to go shopping, out for dinner or even just to go for coffee. An increase in population in this area would give business the incentive to bring in commercial services and the other amenities we need here. I think that the Planning Department's ideas are progressive and creative and, with their emphasis on duplexes, townhouses, infill housing, and medium storey towers along Kingsway, would increase density without turning this part of East Van into a cluster of condo developments as is seen around Joyce Station.</p>
<p>I understand that the majority of the active Norquay Working Group (the City's official planning link with the community) feel that they have been shut out of effective participation in the formulation of the plans proposed for their neighbourhood. On that basis alone I do not support the planning for Norquay that is presented at the June Open Houses.</p>
<p>I understand that the majority of the active Norquay Working Group (the City's official planning link with the community) feel that they have been shut out of effective participation in the formulation of the plans proposed for their neighbourhood. On that basis alone I do not support the planning for Norquay that is presented at the June Open Houses.</p>
<p>Please pay attention to cleanliness and transit capacity.</p>
<p>Improve facilities in Norquay elementary including greening. Combine elementary and high school in the district.</p>
<p>Six of my neighbours at #202, #203, #204#206, #208 and #309 have asked me to express their support of the draft plan.</p>
<p>Density in Norquay Village is already high and therefore should not be increased. Character of single family area should not be changed. It is not fair to just consider density changes in this area not in others.</p>