

SUMMARY OF COMMENT SHEETS FROM OCTOBER 19th and 23rd 2004 OPEN HOUSES

SEFC Public Consultation

October 2004

Comment Sheet Summary

94 comment sheets received

1. In the previous consultation, the public supported environmental, social, and economic sustainability measures, but some advocated further 'social' sustainability measures, for example a larger community centre and non-motorized boating facility, more affordable housing, and increased childcare facilities .

Do you support the sustainability directions proposed for the SEFC ODP (see: Sustainability Boards)?

Yes – 85%

No – 6%

Blank – 9%

YES:

- Strong support for sustainability directions, in particular, ped/bike and transit, larger community centre and provision of a boat facility, preservation of heritage buildings, principles of universal design, increased affordable housing, increased childcare facilities, strategies to reduce energy consumption, green spaces, and green fingers.
- Consider going further by including composting toilets, and greywater/blackwater treatment in all buildings on the site.
- Go further in terms of social sustainability.

NO:

- Pursue more green space and water accessibility.
- Should explore the creation of a car-less community in SEFC to encourage more pedestrian movement.
- Land division should be strategized such that it could lead to smaller grain, yet dense development.

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

This proposal suggests a more active waterfront in the centre, creating opportunity for restaurants, cafes, shops, a community centre, and non-motorized boating facility etc. The other two-thirds of the waterfront will have a more natural treatment. * These proposals will be subject to provincial and federal environmental approvals.

Do you support the Revised ODP waterfront proposals?

Yes – 85%

No – 10%

Blank – 5%

YES:

- Strong support for the more animated waterfront shown in the proposal - natural shoreline in the west, and more activity in the east.
- Strong support for the idea of a community centre, restaurants, cafes & shops to create a vibrant community and destination.
- Ensure non-motorized boat access to the water.
- Green space should be programmed so that it is usable and the plan should include places for natural habitat, i.e. marshes for birds.
- Ensure there is a ped/bike path along the waterfront and that the waterfront is accessible to the public.

NO:

- Should pursue a more naturalized water's edge along the entire shoreline.
- Some preference for the water's edge design in the original ODP proposal.
- Concern that there is no large open-space park for the east portion of the site - a series of smaller parks will not be used as a park space for the residents in this area.
- Concern that retail will bring car traffic to the area and the waterfront ambience will be lost.

3. The public wanted a high density and well designed neighbourhood that integrated well with its surroundings.

This proposal has about the same density as the previous design, but in low (2 to 4 storeys) to mid-rise (6-12 storeys) forms. Higher buildings are only allowed to accent entrances to the neighbourhood, and on the eastern end of the site to transition from City Gate tower forms to the lower heights of Mt. Pleasant.

Do you support the ODP development form proposed for SEFC Public Lands?

Yes – 73%

No – 10%

Blank – 17%

YES:

- Support for low/mid-rise form of development and variety of development parcels.
- Support for a different building typology than downtown, one that is more human scale, integrated with the surrounding communities, and appealing to families.
- Higher buildings should be located closer to Main Street to integrate with City Gate development.
- Some suggest that higher elements should be explored to allow for more green space and less massing at the ground plane, and possibly some signature high rise buildings.

NO:

- Concern that 12+ storey heights will set a precedent for this area. The buildings should be lower in height to integrate with neighbourhood south of 2nd Avenue.
- Concern that the neighbourhood will be too monotonous – higher point towers should be included to absorb some density and create more green space.
- Should consider even lower building heights than what is proposed and increase public park space.

- Ensure that architecture in SEFC is unique and different from False Creek North.

4. The public wanted more park in the east and smaller parks.

The Proposal keeps significant park space along the waterfront, but also introduces “green fingers” that extend into the neighbourhood, and distributes some smaller public parks throughout the development and provides opportunity for private green spaces within development parcels.

Do you support the Revised ODP park locations?

Yes – 78%

No – 15%

Blank – 7%

YES:

- Support for green fingers and smaller parks.
- Ensure that paver used for the seawall is appropriate for bikes and roller bladders.
- Provide space for community gardens.

NO:

- Strong concern that the designated park areas are too small for outdoor recreation and that smaller park spaces will be misused and underutilized.
- Consider more public park space, and more variety between urban and natural parks.
- Concern that basketball courts under the Cambie Bridge will be noisy for residents living adjacent to the bridge.
- Consider a large waterfront park that extends along the entire edge of False Creek.

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

The proposal retains heritage buildings in their existing locations and uses them to shape the development pattern. It also marks the Cannon 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 – 82%

No – 8%

Blank – 10%

YES:

- Support for the approach to making SEFC unique and remembering the history of the site, in particular, the Domtar building proposal as a market at the heart of the community.
- Look beyond the retention of the heritage buildings, and further reflect the history of the site.
- Retain historical artifacts on site and integrate within the community.

- Need to ensure that upgrades of the heritage buildings are economically viable.

NO:

- Heritage places should be planned to create more memorable spaces – heritage sites should be more prominent.

6. Do you support the overall ODP concept design for the SEFC Public Lands?

Yes – 74%

No – 16%

Blank – 10%

YES:

- Support for overall concepts presented in this iteration of the SEFC ODP proposal as it meets the needs of the community in a balanced way.
- Ensure that there will be public transit servicing the residents of this neighbourhood.

NO:

- Explore a car-free community and streets designed for ped/bike traffic first.
- Need to further explore the solar energy potential in this area.
- Concern that this plan has no imagination in terms of the street grid.
- Concern that the recreation areas are too small and unusable.

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

Building Form

- Some suggest that the plan should explore even lower building heights than what is currently being proposed, and some suggest that the plan explore higher building heights to increase the opportunity for more open space and views.
- Recognize opportunity for Vancouver to be a leader in urban design & development.

Structure

- Street design should consider more curves, less rigidity. This would assist in traffic calming and provide shadow variety.

Land Use

- Support for residential & related commercial area with shops, etc, and flexible spaces for community to evolve into, i.e. small squares for neighbourhood activities.

Transportation

- Strong support for the plan to explore further reducing the dependence on the car in this community by improving the ped/bike paths (in particular, provision of a fast bike lanes along 0 Avenue or 1st Avenue) and connections through the site and to adjacent neighbourhoods. Some suggest exploring a “car-less” community.
- Ensure that cyclists have priority over cars on the Ontario Street greenway, should consider making Ontario Street completely car-free.
- Strong support for the streetcar presence in SEFC, with a grass ROW.
- Support for a 2nd Avenue RAV Station to serve the residents and provide linkage to downtown.
- The water should be used as a way for public transportation (i.e. aqua-buses).
- Need for stronger pedestrian links by way of better sidewalks and tree lined streets.

Waterfront

- Support for more park along the water’s edge
- More access to the water and longer docks non-motorized boats.
- Strongly agree with motor boat free waterfront area.
- Support for waterfront with shops, restaurants and cafes.

Green Space/Park/Recreation

- Support for rooftop gardening and community garden spaces to create more green spaces, and encourage urban agriculture.
- Concern that park areas do not offer adequate parking.
- Should include a covered skate park for beginner to intermediate users.

Environmental Sustainability

- Strong support for sustainable approaches in the proposal, but the plan should address the environmental benefits of the sustainability concepts.
- Sustainability should be equated with economic diversity in the investment sector.
- The energy portion of the plan needs to go further in terms of energy efficiency and strategies to reduce non-renewable energy use, i.e. PV, solar energy, geothermal, etc.

Community Facilities

- Consider a secondary school, swimming pool with the community centre, and more daycare space connected to (or close to) community centre, school, and park space.

Non-market Housing

- Non-market housing sites should be spread throughout SEFC and not all in one area.
- Concern that the 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 housing policy will decrease value of the market housing.

Universal Design

- Ensure that the physically challenged are kept in mind when building the residential units.

Interfaith Centre

- Support for the inclusion of an inter-faith centre as an example of how different faiths can come together.

Other

- More info re: home based businesses
- Thank you for listening to Public & revising plan.
- I'm amazed how far this been evolved --- well done!
- I think that the plans have improved since the last open-day. Good work!
- There seems to be a complete absence of the tourism aspects of this part of the city, in this place a tourism element should be considered.
- Congratulations on public input opportunities and incorporation of those suggestions.
- Comment sheet should ask for feedback about the process of consultation itself.
- Continue holding "open house" sessions
- Your plan makes me proud to live in a city that is forward-thinking, person-centered & concerned about the environment. Good work!
- Overall a very commendable effort which has my support.
- More info re: home based businesses