

Southeast False Creek – Official Development Plan Supplement Feb 2004
Summary of Comment Sheets – February 28, 2004
Playhouse Rehearsal Space
46 comment sheets submitted

Sustainability Measures:

1. In the previous stage of consultation, the public supported all proposed environmental, social, and economic sustainability measures, but also wanted further measures, particularly in the area of energy use and the transportation network.

The proposal suggests further investigation of energy supply options, such as geothermal heat applications and also fuel cell applications for emergency power generation in the Village Centre (also site of the Athlete's Village for the 2010 Olympics). The proposal also adds more pedestrian focused lanes to increase connectivity through the site.

Do you support the "New Base Case Sustainability Package" (see Proposed Sustainability Package Board and handout) proposed for the SEFC ODP?

YES: 59% **NO: 15%** **blank: 26%**

YES: Why/Why Not?

- Support for the general concepts of the proposed base case sustainability package, recognizing the need to further explore LEED, use of composting toilets, and alternative energy sources
- Support for increased density to make the other amenities affordable.

NO: Why/Why Not?

- Ensure that green space and park space is useable.
- Need to be more social sustainable, i.e. aging in place, live/work, local economic development, specific green building requirements, and should include the items listed under "additional measures"
- Concern that there are too many 10 storey plus buildings.
- Need to have LEED Gold standard as a minimum.
- Concern that the community will not be sustainable if housing affordability is such that only core needy and upper income are satisfied.
- Concern about sewage/water outflow with an increase of population in this area.

Development Parcel Pattern:

2. The public supported smaller parcel sizes and site "permeability" through lanes and pedestrian walkways.

The proposal introduces smaller development parcels, more pedestrian focused lanes, mews, and interior courtyards.

Do you support the Revised ODP development parcel pattern?

YES: 76%

NO: 7%

blank: 17%

YES – Why/Why Not?

- Support for density as proposed in the plan.
- Support for high quality streetscapes, and pedestrian oriented lanes, mews, and courtyards to encourage walking, social interaction, street life, and overall livability.
- Support to further pursue smaller development parcels to allow greater diversity of development
- Support for pedestrian oriented amenities such as sidewalk cafés.
- Need to ensure that there is separation of wheeled traffic from pedestrians.

NO – Why/Why Not?

- Strong concern about the building heights around False Creek.
- Need to encourage more townhouse development which fit the character of the False Creek Flats & Mt. Pleasant.
- Should explore taller buildings with a smaller footprint to increase amount of green space.

Recognizing History & Character

3. The public wanted to further recognize and retain the history and character of the site.

The proposal retains and relocates the Salt Building, and additionally relocates the “Sawtooth” building (City Works Yard machine shop) to the community gardens for re-use, the Wilkinson steel building structural and façade components to the Village Centre, marks the Canron building footprint, and suggests boardwalks, decks, and piers which recall the character of the site.

Do you support the Revised Proposal’s approach to remembering the history of the site?

YES: 70%

NO: 9%

blank: 21%

YES – Why/Why Not?

- Strong support for the historical continuity to make this site successful and unique in character while reflecting its industrial past.

NO – Why/Why Not?

- Concern for moving all the heritage buildings to one area of the site as their place in the site refers of historical context.

Waterfront:

4. The public wanted a more varied, more animated waterfront.

This proposal has piers, a dock for boat launch, a boardwalk, a small ferry terminal, many viewpoints, and a variety of landscaping along the water, also numerous commercial and community uses in the Village Centre directly adjacent to the Seawall bicycle and pedestrian route. * These proposals will be subject to federal approvals which are pre-requisite for re-development of the Public Lands site.

Do you support the Revised ODP waterfront proposals?

YES: 75% **NO: 9%** **blank: 15%** **maybe: 1%**

YES – Why/Why Not?

- Support for improvements made to the water's edge to provide a more accessible, active and animated waterfront, with no marina
- Support for the varied commercial uses.

NO – Why/Why Not?

- Concern for the lack of recreational facilities.
- Concern for commercial uses along the waterfront, need for emphasis on the natural habitat.
- Concern that the commercial area will be too congested for comfortable cycling, and is disjointed through the site.

Park:

5. The public was strongly in favour of a large park along the water, but also wanted the park to extend into the neighbourhood more and also wanted to see some smaller parks in the development. .

The Proposal keeps that large park, but also introduces "green fingers" and suggests opportunities for private green spaces within development parcels.

Do you support the Revised ODP park location?

YES: 67% **NO: 15%** **blank: 18%**

YES – Why/Why Not?

- Strong support for the large waterfront park with recreational uses, smaller pocket parks within the development parcels, and green fingers.
- Support for courts under and near the Cambie Bridge.
- Consider more recreational areas such as a roller-hockey rink, lacrosse rink, a "covered/hooded" kiddies play area, a small BMX track, a covered skateboard park.

NO – Why/Why Not?

- Concern that the proposal negates the opportunity to add much needed sports fields.
- Concern for the large amount of park and that passive space will go unused.
- Support for an increase in park allocation, particularly in the east.

- Concern that parcel parks in neighbourhood need to be more public and have programming - playgrounds, community gardens, community picnic/barbeque areas.
- Support for reducing car traffic on the Ontario St. greenway & establishing a "hub" where the cyclist paths intersect.

Overall Design:

6. Considering the above, do you support the overall ODP concept design for the SEFC Public Lands?

YES: 52%

NO: 15%

blank: 33%

YES – Why/Why Not?

- General support for the overall ODP concept design for the SEFC Public Lands.

NO – Why/Why Not?

- Strong concern with towers around False Creek.
- Would like to see the plan go further in terms of considering future needs for recreational facilities.
- A suggestion that buildings should be taller with small footprint to allow for more park.

7. Do you have any further suggestions for improvement/modification?

Sustainability Measures:

- Overall support for the proposed base case sustainability package, consider the "additional measures" as part of the package.
- Concern that the non-market housing should be more mixed within the site to prevent ghettoisation.
- Need to go further with the green energy.
- Concern that "sustainability", particularly economic, is based on short-term ability to sell units rather than long-term, multi-generational sustainability & livability.
- Concern that this site will not have affordable housing, and will lose potential vibrancy in having a cultural & social economic mix. Consider the low-mid income families as well.
- Ensure elementary school and community centre use the same space.
- Ensure that we have a more family friendly focus in order to keep families in the City.

Development Parcel Pattern:

- Overall, this community should be more human in scale.
- Would like to see smaller, narrower streets to increase buildable area without compromising the park.

Waterfront:

- Support for proposed non-motorized boat facility.

Park:

- Would like to see more space for structural recreation; beach volleyball, courts on the beach, more than one playing field, and a public swimming pool.

Connections

- Concern that the bike/rollerblade paths should be paved with smooth asphalt throughout.
- Concern that the Ontario Bikeway/Greenway is between high-rise towers and only has a 5' setback from the property line, which does not allow enough room for both a greenway and a bikeway. Suggestion close Ontario to allow bike traffic only
- Suggestions for the bikeway design on this site:
 1. priority should be given to cyclists in all road development.
 2. bike lanes should be painted on all streets.
 3. bikes should not be forced beside parked cars.
 4. Ontario St. should have NO cars.
- Support for the streetcar to connect to downtown and Granville Island.
- Concern that the pedestrian/cycling route seems discontinuous along the waterfront.

Height/Density

- Strong concern with the height of the buildings in the east portion of the site.
- Further integrate the heights of the west portion of the site with the adjacent neighbourhood of False Creek South
- Increase density/high-rise adjacent to Cambie Bridge to act as buffer between and provide density for the proposed light rail station that will be located at foot of bridge.

Overall Design:

- Overall support for the direction that the ODP Submission is going, but needs to go further.
- Encourage more varied street level usage along walkways.
- Concern about the building design as there should be a variety of building designs to avoid monotony across the site.

Miscellaneous:

- Further participation with this process from post secondary schools to provide opportunity for university students to provide input and community outreach.
- Would like to see more covered play areas for all activities.
- Concern that the Olympic village does not seem to stand out much; this could be a tremendous opportunity to establish a strong distinct community identity.
- Would like to see the entranceways into the community enhanced.
- Further reduce parking ratio and make it easier to unbundle parking from units.