



## Next Community Plan – Background

### Revised: November 2010

In 2005, nine communities were considered to receive Community Plan updates. At the time, staff set out a process to determine objective criteria that would assist in determining the relative need for a Community Plan among these areas.

Initial work to develop criteria began in 2004 with a random survey of residents in these communities to assess general levels of satisfaction with a range of topics typically covered by a community plan. Survey responses helped identify key issues and areas of concern.

Over 100 representatives from these nine communities were then invited to participate in workshops to assist staff to develop the criteria and indicators that would help rank these communities in order of planning need. Staff reviewed these indicators and excluded some that were obvious duplications and others where data was not available. The remaining indicators were used to do an initial ranking of nine communities to determine the relative need for broad Community Planning. Based on this work, Mount Pleasant was recommended as the first area for planning.

In Fall 2010, staff worked with community representatives to review and update Selection Criteria to determine the order of planning need among Vancouver neighbourhoods. Of the communities under consideration for the next Community Plans, **Grandview-Woodland**, **Marpole** and the **West End** ranked highest.

Appendix A: Summary Scores and Rankings

Appendix B: Final Criteria and Indicators

#### **The Communities**

The five areas under consideration during this 2010 selection process for the Next Community Plans are **Fairview**, **Grandview-Woodland**, **Kitsilano**, **Marpole** and the **West End**.

In 2005, there were nine neighbourhoods under consideration for new community plans, including Mount Pleasant. In addition to the community plan that was developed for Mount Pleasant, other planning work has occurred in several communities since the selection process was developed in 2005. Three areas (Downtown, Oakridge and Southlands) are currently **not** being considered for updated Community Plans in this round.

##### 1. Downtown

While population and development change has been most rapid in this area of the City, the Downtown has undergone a number of policy reviews in recent years, including the **Metro-core Jobs and Economy study** (2008), the **Downtown View Corridor and Capacity Study** (2010), and the policy for **Northeast False Creek** (*Directions for the Future*, 2009).



Existing public benefits policies have also been in place in the South Downtown, False Creek and Coal Harbour to ensure provision of additional public amenities including park space, daycare and new community centres in these locations.

Consequently, unlike most other local area neighbourhoods, policy guiding land use change in the Downtown is current. Finally, much of the potential for redevelopment in the Downtown has been taken up already. As a result, staff suggest that the Downtown not be considered for further community planning at this time.

### 2. Oakridge

Other than Mount Pleasant, Oakridge has the most recent community plan (1995). A large portion of Oakridge is the subject of the on-going **Cambie Corridor planning program** – a comprehensive process to plan for the growth associated with the Canada Line. Consequently staff are recommending that Oakridge not be considered for an additional Community Planning Program at this time.

### 3. Southlands (and Dunbar)

This local area includes both Dunbar, which has an adopted Community Vision, and Southlands, a semi-rural area of the City bordering the Fraser River. Southlands is a relatively small area, much of which is in the Agricultural Land Reserve. Representatives at the 2005 workshops, suggested that they felt the existing community plan was functioning well. Consequently staff suggest that Southlands-Dunbar not be considered for a Community Planning Program at this time.

## **Principles for Updating the Criteria and Indicators**

To prepare for the selection of the next community, Staff have undertaken a review of the criteria and indicators used to select Mount Pleasant. In doing this review, Staff were conscious of respecting the original ideas generated at the two workshops in 2005 and relied on the following general principles to review the work. The indicators need to:

- have data that is reliable, and available for each community.
- be consistent with the intent of the criteria.
- provide clear direction on the need for planning
- avoid duplication
- not contradict City-wide policies and priorities

Using these principles, the criteria developed in 2004/2005 have not changed. However, some changes have been made to the indicators, including seven exclusions and 3 additions. The following reasons are given:

1. Updated information was not available for four of the original indicators; these indicators were excluded.
2. One indicator – housing diversity – was excluded as it did not provide consistent, clear direction for planning need.



3. Two indicators were duplications of indicators in other criteria.
4. Three indicators were added that reflect relevant City policy adopted since 2005. These are identified by asterisks.

Additionally, some of the initial indicators were gathered from an Ipsos Reid survey of community perceptions in the nine communities being considered at that time. These survey results have not been updated because of the significant cost involved in conducting a survey of this type and scope.

### **2010 Community Workshop: Reviewing the Criteria and Indicators**

On October 3, 2010, City staff held a workshop at the Native Education Centre in Mount Pleasant. The purpose of this workshop was to:

1. Report back to the community on updates and revisions made to selection criteria developed with representatives from community organizations in 2005, and
2. To work with the community in assessing the chosen criteria and indicators for completeness, relevance and feasibility.

Five communities were under consideration for a 2010 Community Plan, but invitations were sent out to 163 organizations active in neighbourhood-based issues in the same nine communities involved in the process in 2005. There were thirteen attendees.

### **Results of the Workshop Suggestions and Review**

Staff conducted a detailed review of all the ideas and suggested changes to the criteria and indicators that were discussed at the October 3 workshop. Detailed results are available in the notes from the workshop

The highlights of the changes include:

- **Criteria 7 - Existence and Relevance of a Plan** is no longer a criteria but has become one indicator under Criteria #1 Development Pressures and Rate of Change.
- **Indicator 1.5 - Total Area of Residential Rezonings** has been changed to include commercial and industrial floorspace added through rezonings. The new indicator is 1.5 Total Area of Rezonings.
- **Indicator 3.7- Area of Schools by child population** has been added as a new indicator.
- **Indicator 5.4 – Average Rental Payments** has been changed to 5.4 – Percentage change in Rental Payments 2001 – 2006.

### **Limitations to the Criteria/Indicators Approach**

During the workshop, concerns were heard about this approach to assessing planning need - indicators only give a snapshot of what is happening, a data-centred methodology is flawed because things can change quickly and the data can't capture this. Also, this approach can also only report on **what** changes are happening; it cannot account for the more important question of **why** these changes are happening. For example, several participants identified the importance of understanding demographic changes. A decline in the population of seniors may be due to a number of different factors (for example a loss of seniors' housing, an



increase in rental rates, greater mobility of all residents including seniors, higher mortality rates etc.). All these factors are relevant considerations during a planning program, however cannot be adequately measured and understood as a means of assessing planning need in advance.

A general conclusion from the workshop and this further work is that the criteria/indicator approach should be considered as a tool to help identify a general planning need but cannot in itself determine which community has the “greatest” need.

**Options for more than one Plan**

Staff are continuing to investigate options for providing planning resources to all three top-ranked communities and will be looking to include this information in the Council report. Our approach to developing these options will consider alternative planning program types that could address a more limited range of issues, involve different consultation methods and be done in less time.

**Next Community Plans  
2010 Criterion Scores and Overall Rank**

Criterion Scores - November 2010								
Overall		Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	Criterion 5	Criterion 6	
Score	Rank	Development pressure and Rate of Change	Opportunities to Build Cohesive Community	Recreational, Social, and Cultural Services	Quality of Life	Appropriate and Affordable Housing	Opportunity to Build a Unique Community	
Fairview	56%	4	41%	61%	70%	52%	75%	58%
Grandview-Woodland	64%	1	34%	88%	75%	72%	74%	59%
Kitsilano	54%	5	42%	57%	52%	39%	78%	69%
Marpole	61%	2	42%	80%	62%	83%	75%	52%
West End	59%	3	48%	67%	48%	52%	84%	66%

**Next Community Plans  
2010 Criterion Scores and Overall Rank**

Criterion 7
Transportation and Mobility
77%
87%
79%
92%
75%

# Next Community Plans

## Summary of Final Criteria

November 2010

### CRITERION 1: Development Pressures and Rate of Change

---

1.1	Population growth (%), between 2001 to 2006
1.2	New residential units, '06-09 as a % of '06 stock
1.4	Population density
1.5	Total Area of Rezoning (square footage of proposed development in rezoning applications)
1.6	Age of general community plan(s)
Survey	% who agree character, form, and height of new development 'fits'

---

### CRITERION 2: An Opportunity to Build a Cohesive Community

---

2.1	Population that moved (%) between '01 and '06
2.2	Child Vulnerability (% kindergarten kids at risk) - Wave 3 (2008)
2.3	Single parent families as % total families, '06
2.4	Population without basic English or French (%) '01
Survey	Population who agree comm. groups represent community values (%)

---

### CRITERION 3: Recreational and Social Services

---

3.1	Local park area per 1000, '06
3.2	Functional floor area of community centres/1000 population
3.3	Existing childcare spaces as a per cent of total need, 2005
3.4	***# Community Garden Plots per 1000/people
3.5	***# Public Art installations per local area
3.6	*** Percentage of population living more than 400m from green space
3.7	*** Availability of Schools by child population
Survey	% who agree streets clean, maintained, & attractive
Survey	% who agree the City provides good services for a diverse community
Survey	% who agree festivals/events important to community

---

**CRITERION 4: Quality of Life**

---

4.1	Total crimes per 1000 (including violent and property crimes), '09
4.2	Unemployment rate '06
4.3	Population living in LOW income households (%) '06
4.4	% Population more than 400m from local shopping area
Survey	% respondents satisfied with overall quality of life
Survey	% who agree comm. has distinctive, positive character

---

**CRITERION 5: Appropriate and Affordable Housing**

---

5.1	% non market housing, 2005
5.2	% households spending 30% or more of income on rent, '06
5.3	% rental housing, 2005
5.4	Percentage change in Rental Payments, 2001-2006

---

**CRITERION 6: An Opportunity to Create/Enhance a Unique Community within the City as a Whole**

---

6.1	Number of heritage buildings per net acre
6.2	Share of city jobs, 2006
6.3	Share of city housing units, 2006
6.4	Fair share of growth (% city growth/% city population '96)
6.5	Street trees per net acre '04
Survey	% who agree heritage important aspect of character
Survey	% who agree local shopping has good range of stores
Survey	% who agree new dev. in shopping areas fits well

---

**CRITERION 7: Impact and Availability of Effective Transportation and Mobility**

---

7.1	Total arterial street length multiplied by 24 hour traffic count divided by net land area, 2004
7.2	Length of greenways and bikeways/net area of local area
7.3	Number of injury/fatality traffic accidents/net area
7.4	% of population more than 400 m from transit route/station
Survey	% who agree enough parking for shoppers in shopping areas

---

**CONTACT:**

Community Planning, City of Vancouver  
Harv Weidner, 604 871-6538, [harv.weidner@vancouver.ca](mailto:harv.weidner@vancouver.ca)  
Yvonne Hii, 604 873-7458, [yvonne.hii@vancouver.ca](mailto:yvonne.hii@vancouver.ca)

## Criteria and Indicators - Details

The following pages outline criteria and the indicators used to calculate the extent of planning need across five local areas.

### Criterion 1: Development Pressures and Rate of Change

Indicators for the first criterion seek to measure planning need based on:

- Population and density
- Rate of change
- Impacts and opportunities related to major initiatives
- Relevance of Existing Plans
- Land Use Conflicts

	Indicators	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?	Comments
1.1	Population growth (%), between 2001 to 2006	HIGH	Recent population growth provides a measurement for additional pressure on existing infrastructure.
1.2	New residential units, '06-09 as a % of '06 stock	HIGH	Indicates recent residential development in the area.
1.4	Population density	HIGH	Additional planning may be required in areas with higher population densities.
1.5	Total Area of Rezoning (square footage of proposed development in rezoning applications)	HIGH	<b>Substitution.</b> This indicator replaces 1.3 ( <i>Number of Rezoning</i> ) and 7.2 ( <i>Number of Rezoning Enquiries</i> ), as a more precise measure of rezoning impact on communities.  Square footage of rezonings in residential, commercial and industrial areas are included.
1.6	Age of general community plan(s)	HIGH	Indicator measures the need for a new community plan based on age of existing plan. Formerly, Indicator 7.1.

	Excluded Indicators	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?	Rationale for inclusion/ deletion / change
1.3	# Rezoning within each area 2006-2010	HIGH	Indicates recent development interest in the area that has resulted in change of use and/or density.
7.2	Number of rezoning inquiries		<b>Duplication.</b> Indicator 1.5 (Total Area of Rezoning) considers impact of rezonings.

SURVEY QUESTIONS	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?
% who agree character, form, and height of new development 'fits'	LOW

## Criterion 2: An Opportunity to Build a Cohesive Community

Indicators for this criterion seek to determine planning need based on:

- Disorder and Threats to Community Cohesion
- Community Development Processes
- Crime and Safety
- Risk Prevalence and Level of Need
- Commercial Vitality and the Importance of Heritage

	Indicators	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?	Comments
2.1	Population that moved (%) between '01 and '06	HIGH	A measurement of how recently people in a neighbourhood have moved. A highly mobile population may be interpreted as having lower levels of social cohesion.
2.2	Child Vulnerability (% kindergarten kids at risk) - Wave 3 (2008)	HIGH	The EDI measures the school-readiness of six-year old children in a given neighbourhood. School-readiness is determined based on 6 scales of physical, social, economic and cultural development, as indicators of child vulnerability.
2.3	Single parent families as % total families, '06	HIGH	Single parent families are more prone to vulnerable life situations, including higher incidence of poverty and higher risk of homelessness.
2.4	Population without basic English or French (%) '01	HIGH	Lack of basic language skills in official language may be a barrier to participation in broader civic and community processes.

	Excluded Indicators	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?	Comments
2.5	<i>Voter turnout 2008 municipal election</i>		<b>Data does not match with community boundaries.</b>
2.6	<i>Prostitution offences per 1000 in '04</i>		<b>Duplication.</b> Note: Rates of violent and property crimes are accounted for in the Criterion 4, Quality of Life.

SURVEY QUESTIONS	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?
Population who agree comm. groups represent community values (%)	LOW

### Criterion 3: Recreational, Social and Cultural Services

Indicators for this criterion seek to determine planning need based on:

- Community Amenities
- Community Services
- Greening of the Environment
- Adequacy of Parks and Facilities

	Updated Indicators	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?	Comments
3.1	Local park area per 1000, '06	LOW	Provides a measurement for availability and adequacy of Park space.
3.2	Functional floor area of community centres/1000 population	LOW	Provides a measurement for availability and adequacy of community amenities.
3.3	Existing childcare spaces as a per cent of total need, 2005	LOW	Availability of childcare may help to reduce child vulnerability, reduce barriers for parents to re-enter the workforce, strengthen community support for families.
3.4	***# Community Garden Plots per 1000/people	LOW	*** <b>New indicator.</b> Community gardens can help to strengthen community networks, and provide greater food security for some households. Allocation of space for community agriculture opportunities is one part of the City's Greenest City goals (Access to Nature
3.5	***# Public Art installations per local area	LOW	**** <b>New indicator.</b> Availability and distribution of public art is linked to the building of vibrant communities and encouraging creative expression; one of the targets of the Cultural Plan for Vancouver.
3.6	*** Percentage of population living more than 400m from green space	HIGH	*** <b>New Indicator.</b> Provides a measure for availability of, accessibility to green spaces (including but not limited to parks)
3.7	*** Availability of Schools by child population <i>(square footage of elementary school floor space per 100 children aged 6-12, and square footage of secondary school per 100 children aged 13-17).</i>	LOW	*** <b>New Indicator.</b> This indicator recognizes the primary (and mandated) function of schools, as an important resource for learning and engagement for a community, and particularly for children and youth.

SURVEY QUESTIONS	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?
% who agree streets clean, maintained, & attractive	LOW
% who agree the City provides good services for a diverse community	LOW
% who agree festivals/events important to community	LOW

## Criterion 4: Quality of Life

Indicators for this criterion seek to determine planning need based on:

- Overall Satisfaction
- Importance in the City
- Cohesive identity of Community
- Environmental Pressures

	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?</b>	<b>Comments</b>
4.1	Total crimes per 1000 (including violent and property crimes), '09	HIGH	Indicator provides a measurement of neighbourhood safety.
4.2	Unemployment rate '06	HIGH	High unemployment rates may be linked to greater vulnerability.
4.3	Population living in LOW income households (%) '06	HIGH	Low income may be linked to greater vulnerability, including greater risk of homelessness.
4.4	% population more than 400m from local shopping area	HIGH	Provides a measurement of (walkable) accessibility to retail amenities.

<b>SURVEY QUESTIONS</b>	<b>Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?</b>
% respondents satisfied with overall quality of life	LOW
% who agree comm. has distinctive, positive character	LOW

### Criterion 5: Appropriate and Affordable Housing

Indicators for this criterion seek to determine planning need based on:

- Adequacy of Housing
- Affordability

	Indicators	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?	Comments
5.1	% non market housing, 2005	LOW	City policy is to distribute non-market housing throughout the city.
5.2	% households spending 30% or more of income on rent, '06	HIGH	This indicator relies on a standard public policy definition of relative housing affordability.
5.3	% rental housing, 2005	LOW	City policy is to build and protect affordable rental units.
5.4	Percentage change in Rental Payments, 2001-2006	HIGH	<b>Modified</b> from Average Rental Payments to measure rate of change in rents.

	Excluded Indicators	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?	Rationale for inclusion/ deletion / change
5.6	<i>Housing diversity, 2001</i>	LOW	<b>Unclear planning direction / problem calculation.</b> No accurate method to measure diversity.
5.5	% units in need of major repair, 2001	HIGH	No updated data.

## Criterion 6: An Opportunity to Create/Enhance a Unique Community within the City as a Whole

Indicators for this criterion seek to determine planning need based on:

- Commercial Vitality
- Importance of Heritage
- Importance in the City
- Fair Share of Growth

	Indicators	Planning Need indicated by HIGH/LOW score?	Comments
6.1	Number of heritage buildings per net acre	HIGH	
6.2	Share of city jobs, 2001	HIGH	High shares of total jobs in the City of Vancouver indicate greater contribution to city economy, and increased need for planning
6.3	Share of city housing units, 2001	LOW	Higher share of total dwellings shows higher relative importance in city indicating increased need for planning
6.4	Fair share of growth (% city growth/% city population '96)	LOW	Workshop participants felt communities should take a fair share of city growth, as a result a lower 'shares' indicate increased need for planning
6.5	<i>Street trees per net acre '04</i>		<b>CHANGE FROM MAILED VERSION.</b> <b>No new data available</b> , but 2004 data was included in the calculations to date.

SURVEY QUESTIONS	Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?
% who agree heritage important aspect of character	HIGH
% who agree local shopping has good range of stores	LOW
% who agree new dev. in shopping areas fits well	LOW

## Criterion 7: Impact & Availability of Effective Transportation and Mobility

(Formerly called Criterion 8)

Indicators for this criterion seek to determine planning need based on:

- Transportation Impacts
- Local Transportation
- Pedestrian Safety
- Access to Transit

	<b>Updated Indicators</b>	<b>Planning Need indicated by HIGH/LOW score?</b>	<b>Rationale for inclusion</b>
8.1	Total arterial street length multiplied by 24 hour traffic count divided by net land area, 2004	HIGH	Busy streets (as indicated by average traffic volume along the length of an arterial) may indicate a need for greater planning attention, to ensure pedestrian safety, livability, walkability, etc.
8.2	Length of greenways and bikeways/net area of local area	LOW	Indicator provides a measurement of accessibility by walking and biking. Encouraging modes of non-motorized transportation is a Greenest City goal.
8.3	Number of injury/fatality traffic accidents/net area	HIGH	Indicator provides a measurement of neighbourhood safety and success in transportation planning.
8.4	% of population more than 400 m from transit route/station	HIGH	Indicator shows availability and distribution of public transportation options as a measure of accessibility by public transit.

	<b>Excluded Indicators</b>	<b>Planning Need indicated by HIGH/LOW score?</b>	<b>Rationale for deletion / change</b>
8.5	<i>Pedestrian injury/fatality accidents/net area</i>		<b>No available data.</b> Data available does not cover all the sites as needed.
8.6	<i>Total truck route length multiplied by truck count divided by net land area, 2004</i>		<b>No available data.</b> Data available does not cover all the sites as needed.

<b>SURVEY QUESTIONS</b>	<b>Planning need indicated by HIGH or LOW score?</b>
% who agree enough parking for shoppers in shopping areas	LOW