



**October 27, 2010**

**Re: Next Community Plans followup**

**Dear Oct. 3 Workshop attendees:**

Thank you again for your comments and advice at the October 3 workshop. Workshop and background materials for the Next Community Plans are now available online at [www.vancouver.ca/communityplanning](http://www.vancouver.ca/communityplanning).

Staff have had an opportunity to investigate all the suggested changes and have modified some of the criteria/indicators as a result. We include an explanation of our review of the input received and the changes to the Criteria and Indicators in Appendix A. Appendix D includes all comments from the break-out groups.

On Wednesday, November 3, we will hold a follow-up meeting for those who wish an opportunity to consider the information and the background data in more detail prior to us posting the information on the web site and reporting back to all the workshop invitees. The meeting is being held as follows:

**Date:** Wednesday, November 3, 2010

**Time:** 5:30PM – 6:30PM

**Place:** Coaches Corner (4<sup>th</sup> floor East Wing Annex, City Hall)

Please note that the East Wing Annex is the small building on the City Hall campus, adjacent to the main building.

**City Hall is closed to the public after 430PM. Please RSVP to [yvonne.hii@vancouver.ca](mailto:yvonne.hii@vancouver.ca) to let us know to expect you.**

---

### **Results of the Review**

The attached Appendix 1 provides a detailed review of the ideas and suggested changes to the criteria and indicators that were discussed at the October 3 workshop and how staff addressed them. Following are the highlights of the changes:

- **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 Rezoning** has been changed to include commercial and industrial floorspace added through rezonings. The new indicator is 1.5 Total Area of Rezoning.
- **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.

Staff have also updated data for Indicator 8.2 Length of Greenways and Bikeways and have moved “Street Trees per net acre” to Criteria 6 from Criteria 3 where it had been miscategorized.

### **Limitations of 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.

We look forward to seeing you out next week when we'll have the detailed data available to report back.

### **If you have any questions or comments, or would like to RSVP, please contact:**

Harv Weidner: [harv.weidner@vancouver.ca](mailto:harv.weidner@vancouver.ca) / 604-871-6538

Yvonne Hii: [yvonne.hii@vancouver.ca](mailto:yvonne.hii@vancouver.ca) / 604-873-7458

### **Attachments:**

Appendix A: Suggestions for Changes to Criteria and Indicators

Appendix B: Notes from the October 3<sup>rd</sup> Workshop

Appendix C: Workshop Agenda

Appendix D: Additional Discussion and Comments

**Breakout group questions:**

- a) Are there any missing criteria or indicators?
- b) Are there indicators that are no longer relevant?
- c) General Issues/ Comments?

	Related Indicator or topic	Suggestion	Discussion	Staff response
<b>Criterion 1: Development Pressure and Rate of Change</b>				
1	<b>1.1 Population Growth</b>	Modify indicator to capture <b>the rate of change</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate of change may be a more important measure than % growth</li> </ul>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b> Population growth is already calculated in terms of rate of change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>1.1 Population Growth:</b> calculated as <i>percentage change in population between 2001 and 2006</i></li> </ul>
2	<p><b>1.5 Total Area of Residential Rezoning Applications</b> and <b>7.2 Number of Rezoning Enquiries</b></p> <p>(also relates to dropped criteria <b>1.3 Number of Rezoning Applications</b> and <b>7.2 Number of Rezoning Enquiries</b>)</p>	Modify indicator to Include <b>changes to commercial and industrial areas</b> via rezonings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential rezonings aren't the only ones affecting neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• Isn't <b>the number of rezoning enquiries</b> still valuable? (refers to dropped indicator 7.2)</li> </ul>	<p><b>MODIFIED.</b> Square footage of rezonings in commercial and industrial areas are now also included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>1.5 Total Area of Rezoning Applications:</b> <i>square footage of proposed development(s) in rezoning applications</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rezoning applications are used instead of rezoning enquiries to ensure the most reliability and consistency in data.</b> Enquiries are not tracked in a central City database; it is also a stage of the development process that is strongly encouraged but not mandatory (i.e. not all rezonings and developments go through the enquiry stage).</li> <li>• Please also read notes on 'significance of change,' below.</li> </ul>

	Related Indicator or topic	Suggestion	Discussion	Staff response
3	<b>Magnitude of Change</b>	Add indicator to measure the significance of changes occurring in a neighbourhood	<b>How can we account for ‘significance’ of change?</b> Difference between moving from single-family to duplex is not really comparable to the change from 4-storey walkups to 35-storey towers, <i>e.g.</i>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b> Please see notes on Rezoning, above. Also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicator 1.5 reports on <b>Square footage of proposed developments in rezoning applications</b> . Square footage is used instead of number of rezoning applications in order to capture the magnitude of the proposed changes, and to better anticipate the potential impact on the community.</li> <li>Rezoning applications do not include information about change in square footage (gain or loss), number of units, or number of residents expected. <b>Proposed square footage</b> of the upcoming development is the most reliable data available.</li> </ul>
<b>Criterion 2: An Opportunity to Create / Enhance a Cohesive Community</b>				
4	<b>Demographics</b>		<p><b>Track changing demographics as a marker of the need for amenities and social services?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>e.g.</i> Seniors, newcomers, youth, 1<sup>st</sup> Nations, GLBT?</li> <li>Discussion of adding these indicators raised some questions around making assumptions of “issues” or “problems” related to an entire cultural group?</li> </ul>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b> However, demographic analysis will be a key element of any Community Planning process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff agree that demographic mix and shifts in demography are important aspects of community planning. However, the numbers (and percentages) only show us a directional trend, without providing clear reasons for the trend or a clear direction on whether or not more planning attention is needed. This makes them less reliable as indicators.</li> <li>For examples, census data indicating the more <b>or</b> fewer seniors in a neighbourhood could indicate a greater need for planning, depending on the cause and significance of the shift.</li> </ul>

	Related Indicator or topic	Suggestion	Discussion	Staff response
5	2.2 Child vulnerability		<p><b>Add indicator for youth at risk and families at risk?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The problem is not just for children at the age of 6 (as this indicator measures), but from 0-6, and beyond that – children in the middle years and youth at risk.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of readiness in young children reaching school age is generally linked to potential vulnerability for younger children, older children and youth, and families in need of support.</li> <li>To our knowledge, there is no comparable research being conducted for other age groups, or for families at risk.</li> </ul> <p><b>Notes on the data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The indicator we use to measure Child Vulnerability is the Early Development Instrument (EDI)</b>, based on done by Clyde Hertzman’s research team at the Human Early Learning Partnership (HELP) at the University of British Columbia. This long-term study has tracked school readiness in 6 year olds on a number of scales (including elements such as health, well-being, social and emotional competence) as a marker of vulnerability in children. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More information on the EDI can be found here: <a href="http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/research/initiatives/early-development-instrument/">http://www.earlylearning.ubc.ca/research/initiatives/early-development-instrument/</a></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	Related Indicator or topic	Suggestion	Discussion	Staff response
6	<b>Number of service organizations</b>		<b>Track number of neighbourhood-based social and cultural service organizations</b>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reliable data available. Once the Community Planning processes have begun, the community involved may decide that an inventory of social and cultural service organizations may be useful as a step in their process.</li> </ul> <p><b>Notes on the data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff have considered using the listings in the Redbook Directory of Services for the Lower Mainland, which includes nearly 2000 listings for Vancouver.</li> <li>However, meaningful analysis of this data requires that staff comb through the listings to ensure that key neighbourhood organizations are not missed, and that the services can be differentiated between neighbourhood-focused, city-wide, regional, and other.</li> </ul>
7	<b>Community Resilience</b>	Include an objective indicator of community resilience	<p>Is there a way to include some indicator for <b>community resilience</b>?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e.g. How is a neighbourhood already coping? Some neighbourhoods may rank high for need on many of the scales suggested here, but may be better prepared to cope with change and crisis.</li> </ul>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community resilience is an important element of any community, but difficult to quantify.</li> <li>When viewed together, a number of the indicators in this Selection Criteria are meant to capture the balance of vulnerability and support available within a community.</li> </ul>

	Related Indicator or topic	Suggestion	Discussion	Staff response
8	Quality of Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modify or add indicators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can we account for the quality of facilities, not just physical presence?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e.g. Community Centres and Parks facilities badly in need of repair should be factored in.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b></p> <p>Park Board is currently working on a more finely tuned quantitative assessment of their facilities, including measurement of functional program space and a qualitative assessment of building maintenance and repair, etc. This information is not yet available.</p>
<b>Criterion 3: Recreational and Social Services</b>				
9	Access to Schools	Add an indicator to address access to schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Track presence of/access to schools as a community amenities – schools are critical to communities. Can provide options for meeting space, greenspace (fields)</li> <li>School closings may change data substantially from year to year</li> <li>Differentiate between <b>Community Schools</b> and other?</li> </ul>	<p><b>ADDED. 3.7 Availability of Schools by child population</b> (<i>square footage of elementary school per 100 children aged 6-12, and square footage of secondary school per 100 children aged 13-17</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Staff recognize that some schools, including but not limited to community schools, have filled a very valuable secondary role as community resource, sometimes providing valuable space for daycares and community groups; school fields also sometimes provide informal park space to neighbouring residents.</li> <li>However, arrangements for sharing and renting space and field time to the community, including whether or not these arrangements are an option, varies from school to school. This data is not tracked by the City.</li> </ul>

	Related Indicator or topic	Suggestion	Discussion	Staff response
11	<b>Number of public amenity</b>	Add number of available public amenities, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Public toilets</b></li> <li>• <b>Drinking fountains</b></li> <li>• <b>Street furniture</b></li> </ul>		<b>NO CHANGE.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Public toilets:</b> The vast majority of public toilets are Park Board amenities, housed within parks and community centres. None of the City-owned public toilets are located within the 5 areas under consideration.</li> <li>• <b>Drinking fountains:</b> Data available, however the vast majority of public drinking fountains are provided in conjunction with Parks facilities; in addition, they are not a strong indicator of planning need.</li> <li>• <b>Street furniture:</b> No data available. Staff recommend that street furniture not be included in this assessment, as the data would be difficult to track, particularly those elements that are mobile, and/or not provided by the City.</li> </ul>
10	<b>Libraries and Public Spaces</b>	Add Libraries and Public Spaces as new indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While some community amenities are represented in this criteria, there are other important ones to track</li> </ul>	<b>NO CHANGE.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data about <b>library facilities</b> is not tracked by the City. Each community has at least one library.</li> <li>• <b>“Public gathering spaces”</b> that are not park spaces are generally defined informally, and therefore difficult to track. Some of these spaces have been accounted for in other measures, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>3.1 (Local Park area per 1000):</b> accounts for officially designated parks</li> <li>○ <b>3.6. (% of population living more than 400 from greenspace):</b> accounts for official parks and greenways, as well as some green spaces that are not parks (including private and public sites).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
12	<b>Broader definition of Culture</b>	Modify the title of this criterion to include “cultural services”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culture should be included in this list of important community services, and should include a broader definition of culture than just public art</li> </ul>	<b>CHANGE OF TITLE to Criteria 3: Recreational, Social and Cultural Services.</b>



	Related Indicator or topic	Suggestion	Discussion	Staff response
13	<b>3.5 Public Art installations</b>	Consider whether this indicator should be modified or deleted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why Public Art?</li> <li>• Should Public Art have the same weighting as Housing Affordability indicators?</li> <li>• Possible to use another indicator to speak to issues of access to arts and culture?</li> </ul>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Art is a community amenity that is sometimes (though not always) delivered as part of a contribution to the City from development. In this respect, presence of public art may be closely linked to recent developments.</li> <li>• Although there were concerns from some participants regarding the inclusion of this indicator, there was also support for its inclusion from other participants.</li> </ul>
14	<b>Access to Cultural Festivals and Events</b>	Add number of community-based arts and cultural events as a new indicator.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use City's Community Calendar to track the number of community-based arts and cultural festivals?</li> <li>• Band venues?</li> <li>• Poetry Slams?</li> </ul>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Community Calendar exists as a resource for organizations that wish to publicize their events, but the listings do not provide an accurate or comprehensive count.</li> <li>• City of Vancouver only tracks permits for performance spaces attached to restaurants, bars and other venues</li> </ul>
<b>Criterion 5: Appropriate and Affordable Housing</b>				
15	<b>Number of Homeless People</b>	Add an indicator that counts the number of homeless persons living in each community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can we use data from Homeless Count?</li> </ul>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of homeless are reported on a city-wide basis. No data have been published for the homeless count in individual neighbourhoods.</li> </ul>

	Related Indicator or topic	Suggestion	Discussion	Staff response
16	<b>Housing vulnerability</b>	Add indicators to provide more detailed data on housing issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People experience vulnerability in their housing situations for a variety of reasons that haven't yet been captured in the selection criteria.</li> <li>• Is there any way to track:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>evictions?</b></li> <li>• <b>Illegal suites / overcrowding?</b></li> <li>• <b>Number of people</b> living in new developments?</li> <li>• <b>Conversion</b> of multifamily dwellings to single-family dwellings?</li> <li>• <b>Owner-occupied vs renters?</b></li> <li>• <b>Concentration /monopoly of ownership</b> for market rental suites?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no data available to track these symptoms of housing vulnerability.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rezoning is not required when a site is converted to incorporate fewer dwellings and/or occupants</li> <li>○ Percentage of housing stock that is rental is tracked in indicator <b>5.3 Percentage of Rental Housing</b>; however there is no available data regarding number of units that are owner occupied.</li> <li>○ The City does not track the number of market rental units by owner/manager. There is also currently no demonstrable link between concentration of rental ownership to housing vulnerability for residents.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
17	<b>5.4 Average Rental Payments</b>	Modify indicator to track rate of change of rental payments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rate of change seems like a more important indicator of planning need than absolute rental averages</li> </ul>	<b>MODIFIED to 5.4 Percentage change in Rental Payments, 2001-2006</b> (formerly Average Rental Payments).
<b>Criterion 6: An Opportunity to Create / Enhance a Unique Community within the City as a Whole</b>				
18	<b>Uniqueness of Community</b>	Use the mix of land use types as a marker of the uniqueness of a neighbourhood		<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b></p> <p>Difficult to measure “uniqueness” or “diversity” in this context; also difficult to determine what mix of land use s would indicate a greater or lesser need for planning.</p>

	Related Indicator or topic	Suggestion	Discussion	Staff response
19	<b>7.1 Age of current plan(s)</b>	Recategorize Age of Plans as an indicator.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Recategorize this indicator.</b> Currently weighted equally with entire categories (criteria) – a reasonable indicator, but should not be weighted so heavily.</li> <li>• <b>Modify indicator?</b> Relevance of current plan more important than age of plan – possible to quantify/come up with a measure for relevance?</li> </ul>	<p><b>RECATEGORIZED.</b> Criteria 7 (Age and Relevance of Plan(s)) will be removed, as there was only one indicator under this criteria. <b>Indicator 7.2 Age of Current Plan(s) is now located under Criteria 1 Development Pressure and Rate of Change.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While staff agree that the relevance of a current plan is more important than its age, there is no objective way to identify “relevance” through a quantitative measure.</li> </ul>
20	Community-based art production	Add an indicator to measure community-based art production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include indicators other than “public art” as determinant of cultural service need?</li> </ul>	<p><b>NO CHANGE.</b> Inadequate data for location of “community based art production”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff have considered an indicator for arts and cultural production, performance and gallery facilities. However community-serving “cultural facilities” that have been identified are generally considered “multifunctional spaces” or “arts secondary”, including community centres, cultural centres, and schools.</li> <li>• The Cultural Facility Priorities Plan, developed in consultation with the local arts and cultural community, identified Downtown, Mount Pleasant and Strathcona as the three “core neighbourhoods” of arts and cultural production/performance.</li> </ul>

**Next Community Plan Workshop**

Native Education Centre – 285 E.5<sup>th</sup> Avenue

October 3, 2010 - 12:30pm – 4:00pm

**Agenda**

1. **Welcome and Introduction** (5 min)
2. **Presentation:** (10 min)
  - Approaches to Community Planning
  - Background to 2005 work
3. **Updated Indicators** (10 min)
4. **Break-Out Groups** (45 min)
  - a) Are there any missing criteria or indicators?
  - b) Are there indicators that are no longer relevant?
  - c) General Issues/ Comments?
- BREAK** (15min)
5. **Reconvene and Report out** (20 min)
  - Key Messages
  - Suggested changes/additions
6. **Community Rankings** (50 min)
  - What's changed and why
  - Questions/ Discussion
  - Next Steps
- ITEM ADDED TO AGENDA:**
7. Discussion
  - Options and alternatives to the Community Planning process – are we on the right path?
8. **Wrap up** (5 min)

**CHANGES TO THE BACKGROUNDER mail out (already fixed on version available on the website):**

**Added two items** to the intent of criteria 6 (*page 2, Summary of Criteria*)

- Importance in the City
- Fair Share of Growth

These items were original to the criteria and intent, and accidentally omitted from the mail out document.

**Added new indicator** to measure impact of rezonings (*Appendix A, page 3*):

- 1.5 Total Area of Residential Rezonings

This replaces criteria 1.3 (Number of Rezonings) and 7.2 (Number of Rezoning Enquiries). Only ONE rezoning criteria was used at any given time.

**Reinstated indicator** to measure street trees (*Appendix A, page 8*):

- 6.5 Street Trees per Net Acre

This indicator was reported as **excluded** in backgrounder mailed out, but had actually been used in updated calculations. 2004 data was used, as it is the most updated data available. Significant changes in number of street trees per acre since 2004 would be most likely to have occurred in areas that have been excluded from the Next Community Plans for reasons specified before (areas of significant new development, *i.e.* Downtown and Mount Pleasant)

## **MEETING NOTES<sup>1</sup>**

### **Next Community Plans Workshop**

Native Education Centre – 285 E.5<sup>th</sup> Avenue

October 3, 2010 - 12:30pm – 4:00pm

Terry Neiman, Facilitator (Neiman and Associates)  
Matt Shillito, Assistant Director of Community Planning  
Harv Weidner, Senior Planner, Community Planning  
Andy Coupland, Planner, Data and Research Group  
Yvonne Hii, Planner, Community Planning  
Beverly Chew, Planning Assistant, Community Planning

### **Context:**

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.

Invitations were sent out to 160 organizations active in neighbourhood-based issues in nine communities, including those communities not under consideration for this round of community planning. There were thirteen attendees.

### **Introductions:**

Terry Neiman (principal, Neiman and Associates) facilitated the proceedings and open discussion.

Following a suggestion from participants, the agenda (see Appendix A) was amended to include a discussion about options and alternatives to the Community Planning process (“is this the right process for every community?”).

### **Presentation:**

City of Vancouver staff members Harv Weidner and Yvonne Hii presented background material on Community Planning, the selection process, and updates to the process.

### **Breakout Groups:**

---

<sup>1</sup> Sent to attendees for review on October 6, 2010. Suggested changes have been incorporated.

Participants divided into two breakout groups to assess the criteria and indicators presented. Participants were asked to look for completeness, relevance and feasibility of the selection criteria/indicators.

The Criteria and Indicators tables were presented on poster boards, and participants were given the opportunity to write comments on sticky notes to paste onto the boards, as well as to share their comments with the breakout group.

One volunteer from each breakout group took notes and reported back when the two groups reconvened.

Notes from the breakout group discussions are included in Appendix B.

**Draft Rankings:**

City staff presented the draft rankings of the communities, in order of planning need, based on the data collected and assessed prior to the workshop.

**General Discussion:**

Participants were interested to know how and when there might be an opportunity to have a broader discussion of planning options and alternatives to the Community Planning process which might serve specific and more immediate needs of communities. Staff will investigate options for this type of discussion.

**Next Steps:**

Minutes of the meeting will be sent back to the attendees for verification and additions; as well, materials presented at the workshop will be made available to the public online.

Staff will investigate suggestions made for changes/additions/exclusions to the selection criteria and indicators. Once new data has been incorporated and analysed, staff will invite workshop attendees to review the work.

A report to Council is anticipated for November 2010. The first Community Planning process is anticipated to begin in early 2011. Harv Weidner said the report to Council may need to be put back in light of the extensive comments received from attendees.

Consideration is being given to finding additional resources to allow the Planning Department to conduct processes for more than one community at the same time. Staff will also continue to explore options and alternatives to the Community Planning process which may meet the needs of each community.

COMMENTS FROM PARTICIPANTS:

**Discussion of the Criteria and Indicators:**

**The following are comments made by participants during the breakout groups and after reconvening as a larger group:**

- Weighting:
  - Some criteria/indicators seem more important than others
  - Discussion amongst the group also acknowledged that a subjective judgement is problematic – that identification of the ‘more important’ criteria was a function of the personal and professional interests of the speaker.
    - No consensus on the “more important” criteria. Different criteria were identified by different attendees as “more important.”
    - No consensus on the “more important” indicators. Different indicators were identified by different attendees as “more important,” including Share of City Jobs (6.2), transit indicators (Criterion 8), and social services and amenities indicators.
    - There was consensus that Existence and Relevance of a Plan (Criterion 7) was weighted too heavily, as this criterion is composed of only one indicator (Age of Plan).
- Recognize difficulty in getting at the *reasons* behind these indicators. Opposite results can actually point to different planning needs (e.g. loss of seniors population may be a result of seniors being “priced out” of rental suites and therefore more need for planning; gain in seniors’ population may signal a need for more social, housing and support services, and therefore more need for planning).
- Can’t capture everything with numbers – qualitative analysis is important as well.
- Rezoning:
  - Suggestion to look into attaching a Community Benefits Agreement to rezonings for larger projects, and prior to rezoning and redevelopment in a community.
- How can we account for the impact of climate change?
- Project continuity:
  - No institutional memory for the selection criteria process: of the attendees, only one person had attended previous sessions. Staff team also new to the project.
- Seems that the Social Policy department was not part of the review of criteria and indicators
- Rate of change happens too quickly for a process like this to help – need to target resources to specific problems.
- Use the data from this process to identify specific problem areas for each neighbourhood, and tailor planning processes (not just a Community Plan) to address these identified needs.
- The indicators only give a snapshot of what is happening; but things can change quickly and the data can’t capture this



- The “snapshot”: presented by these indicators is static, while the citizens of Vancouver need a more dynamic way to allocate planning resources.
- The bottom line of this entire process of identifying criteria and indicators should be stated more clearly at the outset every time, *e.g.*: “The purpose of these criteria and indicators is to assess the need for the City’s planning resources in specific neighbourhoods.”
- We need a way to measure the “paradigm shift of change” being proposed in a community.
  - This indicator would relate to the physical form and density of buildings. For example, going from single family dwellings to low-rise buildings may be less of a “paradigm shift” than going from low-rise to 35-storeys.

### **Summary of General Comments**

- These criteria and indicators should be considered as only one tool among several to identify the need for the City’s planning resources, and to allocate those resources.
- Background documents were somewhat helpful, but not enough context given and purpose not clearly stated. More background needed on: the process, ways that planning needs are usually determined, etc.
- Low turnout – 163 invites were sent out, but Planning department should have contacted invitees by phone to assess interest, how they would like to be involved, *etc.*
- The venue was wonderful, preparations were excellent, and the coordination great.
- Inappropriate venue – uncomfortable seating, hard to hear
- Resources need to be shared across departments at City Hall.
- City Hall needs to be more supportive of community-planning and visioning initiatives
- This “objective”, data-centred methodology is flawed
- A more intelligent and dynamic approach is needed to allocate planning resources over time.
- Purpose of workshop (procedure and substance) and role of participants was unclear; however the workshop was well-intentioned.
- Not as good as the 2005 process