OVERVIEW

This summary provides the results from the feedback the City received on and after the November 27th, 2018 workshop on potential land-use options for the 2400-block E 12th Ave & N Grandview Highway area.

A total of 12 people attended the workshop. Feedback forms were distributed both at the workshop, and were also delivered via email and door drop in the subsequent days to 44 adjacent residences (total of 54 letters, including the block under review). Informational letters and feedback forms were also mailed to 12 absentee owners of property within the notification boundary. The deadline for providing feedback was December 21, 2018.

In total, 10 completed feedback forms were received either through e-mail or in the mail. A blank copy of the feedback forms is also attached to this document for reference.

Below are results from the feedback we received on potential land use options for the block under review.

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

Question 1 – Options for Land-use Change

Respondents were able to indicate their preference(s) for land-use options in three different sub-areas of the block, identified as Area 1, 2, and 3.

![Diagram showing the blocks 1, 2, and 3 of the area under review.]
The options under consideration were:

- **RT-5** – Two family (or duplex). This is the existing zoning for sub-area 1 – and is shown in the illustration above

Participants could also indicate their preference for one or more alternative land-use options for the three sub-areas:

- **RM-8** – Residential street townhouse – up to 3-storeys, and up to 1.2 FSR
- **RM-12N** – Arterial townhouse – up to 3.5 storeys, and up to 1.5 FSR (with allowance for a 4-storey apartment form with larger frontage)
- **RM-11** – Apartment – up to 4-storeys, and up to 1.7 FSR
- **C-2** – Mixed-use – up to 4-storeys with ground-floor retail/commercial uses

Both the staff presentation and related materials indicated that not all of the options were recommended for each of the sub-areas – either because of physical constraints (e.g. RM-11 4-storey apartments would be challenging to locate in sub-area 1 because of lot sizes), or because of established precedents from other Nanaimo Street planning work (e.g. RM-12N arterial-facing townhouses were not recommended for sub-area 2, which is located in the quieter residential interior of the block).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Change of Zoning</th>
<th>Change (total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RT-5</td>
<td>RM-8A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Not everyone that submitted feedback selected an option. One resident left comments only. Thus, the total numbers contained in the tables is slightly less than the total number of responses received.

In general, the results indicate that all of the residents who responded are open to considering a change of land-use in all three sub-areas of the block. RM-12N (arterial townhouse) was the most popular choice for all three sub-areas, including sub-area 2 (where RM-12N is not a recommended form).

**Question 2. Additional comments:**

Participants were able to provide additional feedback and comments about the three sub-areas in the 2400-block. A number of consistent themes were noted.

**Supporting Change**

- Strong preference for additional density in the block under review;
- Additional density can better serve needs of families who need housing (detached units are becoming too expensive).
Form of Development

- RM-12N was the preferred form for all sub areas, even though it is not recommended for Area 2; however since RM-12N was not recommended for Area 2, some respondents noted that RM-8A was their second choice;
- Suggestion that because the elevation on the north side of E 12th Ave is greater than that of the south side, a higher density form could work well in Area 2;
- The potential for a courtyard form (option 3 in the menu of development scenarios) could work better if the courtyard faced south rather than north.

Commercial opportunities?

- There was some discussion at the event about the potential for the block to incorporate C zoning to allow commercial spaces. Some comments in the feedback forms stated that Area 1 of the block under review is already close to commercially-zoned areas, so this pattern could make sense.

NEXT STEPS

Staff will continue to conduct technical analysis on the 13 lots in question, with a view to holding further discussions with the community sometime in spring 2019. Information gathered during the November/December 2018 engagement process will help to inform the potential options under consideration.
As a resident of this area, your feedback is important for the City to better understand opportunities related to different options for land use changes. Information gathered as part of this questionnaire will be used to inform staff recommendations to City Council. Please take a moment to share your thoughts on the specific land-use/building options discussed at tonight’s meeting. Below is a representation of the 13 lots under review.

1) Below is a table with the land-use/building options presented this evening. Each row corresponds to one of the 3 areas of the block under review. You may refer to the ‘menus’ on your table for examples of the options. Please indicate which option you prefer for each area by placing a check mark in the box.

Please select only one zoning option per area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning:</th>
<th>RT-5 (Duplex)</th>
<th>RM-8A (Townhouse)</th>
<th>RM-12 (Townhouse)</th>
<th>RM-11 (4-storey apartment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Please provide any other feedback or comments below and/or on the back of this page.

Thank you!

Scan + e-mail your completed form to:
grandviewplan@vancouver.ca

Or mail it back to Andrew Pask using the stamp provided.