

## Feedback from January 2012 Open Houses

Presentation to  
Little Mountain  
Community Advisory  
Group




## Open house attendance

- 409 signed in
- 600+ total

## Comment forms submitted

- 326 paper (39 former residents)
- 143 on-line (4 former residents)
- Total: 469 responses
- July 2011: 236 forms total

# Who Responded?



# Guiding Principles

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES


The following questions are based on Guiding Principles for Little Mountain that were developed through the consultation process. Please tell us how well you feel the Holborn concept performs against the following Guiding Principles.

**1. Relationship to Neighbourhood** A respectful relationship with the surrounding community is created through an appropriate scale of buildings along 33rd and 37th Ave and adjacent to existing neighbourhood lanes.



# Guiding Principles

## 1. Relationship to Neighbourhood




# Guiding Principles

**2. Public Space Focus** The concept is organized around a clear system of very public open spaces. These open spaces also invite people to and from Queen Elizabeth Park.



# Guiding Principles

## 2. Public Space Focus



# Guiding Principles


**3. Connections** There are clear connections into and through the site using streets, paths, and open spaces.






# Guiding Principles

## 3. Connections




# Guiding Principles

**4. Sun & Shadow.** There is positive consideration of sunlight on parks, public spaces, neighbouring residences with regard to form, height, placement of buildings.




# Guiding Principles

## 4. Sun & Shadow




# Guiding Principles

**5. Building Variety.** Blocks are made up of distinctive buildings, varied in scale and limited in length.




# Guiding Principles

## 5. Building Variety




# Guiding Principles

**6. Views.** Buildings are located and scaled to preserve views to Mount Baker from the summit of Little Mountain in QE Park. A pattern of public open spaces and buildings creates or preserves views to QE Park and the North Shore mountains from within or across the site.



# Guiding Principles

## 6. Views



# Principles Summary

## **Performs Well**

- Public spaces
- Connections through site
- Building variety

## **Split**

- Views

## **Needs Work**

- Relationship to neighbourhood
- Shadowing



# Principles - Open-ended

Please provide any additional comments on the Guiding Principles’.

---

---

---

---

## **Positive Commentary**

- Praise for quality of site plan
- Visibly-improved design
- New residential opportunities
- Good project overall

## **Negative Commentary**

- ☒ Too dense – inappropriate scale
- ☒ Too much height
- ☒ Transitions to surrounding area
- ☒ Not enough green space
- ☒ Not enough social/affordable housing
- ☒ Holborn not listening to earlier input

# Height & Density


## HEIGHT AND DENSITY

7. **Height** The concept includes a range of different building heights from 4 to 14 storeys. Please provide your thoughts on the proposed heights. Please check

	Not Enough buildings of this height	Right Amount of buildings of this height	Too Many buildings of this height
2-6 storeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7-9 storeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10-12 storeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13 -14 storeys	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>


# Height & Density

Height




# Height & Density

8. The development density proposed by Holborn is 2.5 - 2.8 FSR.  
I feel this level of density is:



# Height & Density

8: Level of Density



# Height & Density - Open-ended

Please provide your comments on the level of density.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



## **Positive Commentary**

- ☑ Appropriate scale for large site
- ☑ Density right if designed well
- ☑ Affordability – young people, 1<sup>st</sup> time home buyers
- ☑ Sustainability – accommodate growth
- ☑ Increase vibrancy in area

## **Negative Commentary**

- ☒ Incompatible with single-family homes, Main Street character
- ☒ Not downtown, not on rapid transit line
- ☒ Sensitivity of QE Park
- ☒ Too many new people in neighbourhood
- ☒ Community facilities already overwhelmed
- ☒ Traffic impacts

# Community Benefits

## COMMUNITY BENEFITS

New community amenities (community centres, parks, daycares, and so on) are often built using funding generated by new development.

The current concept from Holborn proposes to deliver:

- A new Little Mountain Neighbourhood House
- A new 69-space childcare facility
- 234 units of non-market housing
- Local park and transportation improvements

**9. Community Benefits** Do you feel that this is an appropriate level of community benefits for the proposed redevelopment of Little Mountain?




YES  
(an appropriate level)

ALMOST  
(just about enough)

NO  
(not enough)

# Community Benefits

## 9. Level of Community Benefits



# Community Benefits - Open ended

- Some support for proposed benefits
- Additional childcare needed (>69 spaces)
- Existing facilities (e.g., Hillcrest) at capacity
- Additional affordable housing
  - 20%, 1/3, tenures (co-op, rental)
- More local-serving retail & services
- More green space and play space

# Additional Comments


- *“Get on with it!” vs. “back to the drawing board!”*
- Attractive design
  - but too tall/dense
- Opportunity for young families to live in area
- More social/affordable housing
- Too out-of-character
  - Height, density, design

# Paper Forms vs. Online

- First time in process online forms used
- Limited to one form per household
- 30% of all responses on-line
- Most responses from immediate area
- 5%-15% difference between on-line and paper forms
  - Generally more critical of the concept

# Paper Forms vs. Online


## 1. Relationship to Neighbourhood






# Paper Forms vs. Online

## 3. Connections




# Paper Forms vs. Online

## 8: Level of Density




# Anomalies - 2011 Example

## 9. Transition to Neighbourhood



# Former Residents


## 1. Relationship to Neighbourhood



Attended Open House or Submitted On-line (n=23)

# Former Residents


## 1. Relationship to Neighbourhood



Submitted Independently (n=16)

# Former Residents


### 8: Level of Density



Attended Open House or Submitted On-line (n=23)

# Former Residents

8: Level of Density



Submitted Independently (n=16)

**Questions & Comments**

**Discussion**

**Next Steps**