



**POLICY REPORT  
DEVELOPMENT AND BUILDING**

Report Date: July 18, 2016  
Contact: Kent Munro  
Contact No.: 604.873.7135  
RTS No.: 011046  
VanRIMS No.: 08-2000-20  
Meeting Date: July 26, 2016

TO: Vancouver City Council  
FROM: Acting General Manager of Planning and Development Services  
SUBJECT: Grandview-Woodland Community Plan

**RECOMMENDATION**

- A. THAT Council approve the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan, substantively as attached in Appendix E and direct staff to proceed with appropriate next steps towards implementation.
- B. THAT Council repeal the policy *Rezoning Applications and Heritage Revitalization Agreements during Community Plan Programs in the West End, Marpole and Grandview-Woodland* that had been adopted by Council on July 28, 2011.
- C. THAT, subject to Council approval of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan, the Acting General Manager of Planning and Development Services be instructed to initiate tasks to implement the plan as outlined in this report.
- D. THAT Council set Community Amenity Contribution targets of \$646 per square metre (\$60 per sq. ft.) in the Nanaimo Shopping Nodes, \$215 per square metre (\$20 per sq. ft.) for the mid-rise multi-family sub-areas, and \$32 per square metre (\$3.00 per sq. ft.) for the lower density townhouse and multi-family sub-areas as outlined in Appendix D, and that these targets apply to rezoned floor area achieved in excess of the floor area permitted in the existing zoning.

**REPORT SUMMARY**

This report provides an overview of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan which is the culmination of a comprehensive planning and community engagement process. Over the past two years, the process has focused around the efforts of a Citizens' Assembly that liaised

extensively with the community and deliberated on essential matters. The final plan is reflective of those inputs and it strives to provide a clear yet flexible framework to guide future growth and change in the community over the next 30 years.

Key community values are balanced with sound planning principles and important city objectives to address affordability, sustainability and liveability. The plan strives to maintain the distinct character of the area, improve housing diversity and manage overall growth in an incremental and sensitive manner.

This report summarizes the planning process, outlines the land use policies for each of the distinct “places” or subareas and presents an accompanying public benefits strategy that aims to match community needs and aspirations with a financial approach to achieve them. Since release of the plan on June 25, 2016 the city staff team has been reviewing the plan with the community and has been collecting feedback. That feedback is presented in this report and some final amendments to fine tune the plan have been incorporated. The report also discusses future work that will be required to ensure the implementation of the plan.

### ***COUNCIL AUTHORITY/PREVIOUS DECISIONS***

While many policies are relevant to a broad community planning process, some of the most pertinent policies include:

- Grandview-Woodland Area Policy Plan (1979-1983)
- Regional Context Statement (2013)
- Greenest City Action Plan (2011)
- Vancouver’s Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2012-2021 (2011)
- Transportation Plan 2040 (2012)
- Healthy City Strategy 2014-2025 (2014)
- Rezoning Policy for Sustainable Large Developments (2013)
- Kensington Cedar Cottage Community Vision (1998)
- Hastings-Sunrise Community Vision (2004)
- Culture Plan (2008)
- City of Reconciliation (2015).

### ***CITY MANAGER’S/GENERAL MANAGER’S COMMENTS***

The Grandview-Woodland Community Plan strives to balance what is important to the community with city-wide goals that will help make Vancouver a more affordable, liveable and sustainable city. The plan will increase the diversity of housing to meet the needs of a growing population, by providing additional opportunities for new non-market housing, rental housing and family-friendly housing such as townhouses, duplexes and coach houses. Among other key issues, the plan tackles the challenging matters of protection for existing rental housing stock while allowing for managed and incremental housing renewal to increase the supply for renters and families in strategic locations.

As in other recent community planning initiatives, the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan includes a Public Benefits Strategy (PBS) to provide high-level, strategic financial guidance on matters of renewal of existing and the provision of new amenities and infrastructure in this

community. A notable consideration with this plan is that the development contributions (cash CACs and Citywide DCLs) anticipated to be generated from development are insufficient to achieve all of the listed aspirations due to relatively low density that is maintained through the majority of the community plan area. The community plan and PBS as recommended contains an estimated “shortfall” of \$60 million and, therefore, development contributions generated from development activity outside of Grandview-Woodland would need to be directed to this community in order to support the entire public benefits package. In such cases where funding sources from outside of the community are brought into Grandview-Woodland, these funds can be expected to be allocated to projects that serve the city’s broader northeast district (e.g. an expanded pool at Britannia Centre) or that serve all of Vancouver (e.g. new cultural facilities, the expanded bikeway network). Most specifically, with respect to cash CACs, Council would need to make the future decision at the time of specific rezonings to direct funds toward Grandview-Woodland; it is recognized that this is likely to generate public pressure from that other “contributing” local community regarding the destination of those CAC funds. The “shortfall” may result in amenities being delivered at a slower pace than the community would like. Despite these challenges, the considerable efforts from the community and staff have resulted in a great plan that will serve the community well in the years ahead. The City manager supports the recommendations contained within the report.

## **REPORT**

### ***Background/Context***

A community plan is a forward-looking document that addresses a range of matters including land use, housing, urban design, transportation, parks and open space, community facilities, local economy, heritage, culture and public safety. A sound plan anticipates change before it happens. It gives guidance to be used by those who have to face the realities and challenges of future growth. While it gives predictable direction, a community’s plan is a “living” document in the sense that it must be able to give guidance to currently unforeseen challenges or new opportunities that may emerge over its typical 30-year time horizon.

In March 2012, Council endorsed the Terms of Reference and a program to update the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan was launched. While originally foreseen as a two-year process, by 2013 it became clear that consensus about some key matters was not being achieved. At that time, the planning process was extended and Council directed staff to convene a Citizens’ Assembly process to explore options, to address challenges and to resolve key issues that had emerged (a comprehensive summary of the engagement activities is included in Appendix A).

A Citizens’ Assembly is a body of people that is randomly selected along demographic characteristics such that it is reflective of the population of the community. The Citizens’ Assembly for the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan was not a body that deliberated on these important matters on their own. Throughout the year-long series of sessions, the work of Assembly members was integrated with events involving the community at-large. Workshops, roundtables and walking tours ensured that the Assembly’s work was conducted in the context of a thorough and ongoing understanding the community’s thinking. In the end, the recommendations of the Citizens’ Assembly speak to and are reflective of the diversity of perspectives evident in the community. As outlined in this report, the proposed Grandview-

Woodland Community Plan now garners a high degree of broad community support, in large part because it was so heavily shaped by the work of the Citizens' Assembly.

The Grandview-Woodland Community Plan covers an area generally bounded by Clark Drive, Nanaimo, East 12th Avenue and Burrard Inlet. Those boundaries are slightly larger than the geographic scope of the Local Area Plan that the updated community plan will supersede. These updated boundaries were enabled in the Council-approved Terms of Reference for the planning work to bring complete attention to key areas close to the community's periphery such as the Broadway-Commercial Station area and Nanaimo Street.



### ***Context, Opportunities and Challenges***

Grandview-Woodland is an engaged and deeply passionate community. It is home to an eclectic population - a mix of cultural traditions (including the largest off-reserve Aboriginal population in the city), a significant economic diversity (represented in its mix of renters and owners) and a high proportion of artists and creative types. It is one of Vancouver's oldest neighbourhoods, having roots in the city's early transportation history with the development of the inter-urban tram line in the 1890s. Since that time, it has grown into a highly walkable and connected community. Activity focusses on Commercial Drive, the physical centre and much-loved destination for residents and visitors alike. At the south end of the community,

the city's most significant transit interchange is the focus of a precinct having one of the greatest degrees of accessibility in Vancouver.

A fundamental purpose of a community plan is to establish a long-term strategic approach to enable a community to seize upon future opportunities and to address key issues and challenges it will face. Some of these include:

- *Stagnating population growth* - Over the past 40 years, while the overall Vancouver population has grown by 42%, the population of Grandview-Woodland has increased by less than 3%. Over the past three census periods, the community has seen a decline in population of approximately 2,000 people.
- *Diminishing number of young people* -- The community is also losing young people. In the 15-year period ending in 2011, the number of children aged 0-9 years old in Grandview-Woodland declined by 35% (about 1130) while young people aged 10-19 years old fell by 23% (540). Not surprisingly, some of the community's schools (elementary and secondary) are seeing steadily declining enrolments.
- *Housing affordability* - Two-thirds of Grandview-Woodland households are renters and this community has the highest proportion of households spending over 30% of their incomes on shelter of anywhere else in the city. The rate at which new options for affordable housing is being introduced does not address the demand. In addition, the current rental stock is aging and some of it is approaching the end of its suitable life.
- *Unique social circumstances* - Grandview-Woodland residents have a lower median and average income than the city as a whole, and many in the community face challenges related to employment, income security, health and well-being.
- *Transit optimization* - The precinct centred on the Broadway-Commercial Transit Station offers the highest degree of access to transit services in the city. This includes rapid transit (Sky Train) and rapid bus service along the Broadway corridor.

Grandview-Woodland is a community striving to preserve its valued qualities, and improve upon matters of affordability, sustainability, inclusivity, vitality, and liveability.

### ***Strategic Analysis***

#### ***Overview of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan***

All of the efforts in preparing this plan have been guided by the values expressed by the Grandview-Woodland community. The fundamental ideals, principles and desires - the matters that are essential and inherent in this community -- are summarized under ten themes:

- Representation
- Diversity
- Character
- Change
- Community and Wellness
- Affordability
- Safety
- Environmental Stability
- Transportation
- Arts and Culture.

In setting out a long-term guide for Grandview-Woodland, this community plan follows seven overarching principles to respond to the local context, the values and all of the opportunities and challenges present. These foundational principles not only speak to the community's aspirations but they also reflect citywide policies and goals that aim to benefit all of Vancouver.

- Principle 1 - Achieve a green, environmentally sustainable, urban pattern.
- Principle 2 - Support a range of affordable housing options to meet diverse needs.
- Principle 3 - Foster a robust, resilient economy.
- Principle 4 - Enhance culture, heritage and creativity.
- Principle 5 - Support a range of sustainable transportation options.
- Principle 6 - Protect and enhance civic places, public parks and green linkages.
- Principle 7 - Foster a resilient, sustainable, safe and healthy community.

Over the lifespan of the plan, it is anticipated that the policies and management strategies set out will result in population growth of about 9,500 people by 2041. This would represent a 28% increase to the community's current population of about 34,000 people. Recognizing the existing housing mix in the community, the plan emphasizes a focus on the addition of more affordable housing choices for families, singles, young workers, seniors and renters. Of the future households that the plan policies will support, 2,800 units of new secured rental housing can be expected - 1,400 units of non-market (social) housing and an estimated 1,400 units of market rental housing.

## Overview of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan

Grandview-Woodland is one community. Yet it is made up of many unique places. The plan builds on the character of each of seven sub-areas and the future of each will be managed differently. An overview of the sub-area objectives and some of the key policies is as follows:

### *“The Drive”*

The plan recognizes the energy, the identity and “the vibe” that is “The Drive”. It ensures that this unique character will remain vital into the future.

1. Retain the existing mixed-use zoning (four storeys or less) throughout the core blocks of Commercial Drive.
2. Maintain the pattern of smaller, individual retail frontages to help keep The Drive eclectic and active.
3. Outside of core and only on selected sites at the East 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue node, allow buildings up to six storeys to provide new housing.
4. Create a more “complete street” along Commercial Drive to better serve all modes of transportation.
5. Renewal and expansion of key social and community facilities - including the Britannia Community Centre and Kettle Friendship Centre.

### *Grandview*

The plan preserves the low-scale, traditional character of the historic Grandview sub-area while allowing for incremental growth through new ground-oriented housing for families.

1. Modify regulations to discourage demolition of pre-1940 character houses.
2. Expand the duplex areas and revise regulations to encourage new infill housing.
3. Preserve the small-scale local serving shops.
4. On arterial streets and in transition areas near transit routes on Hastings and on Broadway, allow a mix of four- storey apartments and rowhouses for families.
5. In the apartment district at the north end, allow buildings up to six-storeys to provide renewed and additional secured rental housing while protecting character streetscapes.

### ***Hastings***

The plan respects and protects the role of the Hastings Village shopping area while providing new opportunities for growth to create a vibrant new corridor neighbourhood along the western portion of Hastings Street.

1. Create a new gateway area near Clark Drive that incorporates renewed cultural, social and heritage assets, along with non-market and other housing, with the tallest buildings at 18-storeys.
2. Improve pedestrian comfort along Hastings Street with improved public realm features and public plazas that will activate and unify the street.
3. Support renewal and expansion of key Aboriginal and social service facilities such as those provided by the Urban Native Youth Association and the Vancouver Aboriginal Friendship Centre.
4. Step buildings down to heights in the 8- to 10-storey range as one goes eastward up the hill towards Victoria Drive and provide new rental and ownership housing.
5. Retain the existing mixed-use zoning (four storeys or less) in the Hastings Village shopping area near Nanaimo Street.

### ***Cedar Cove***

This area's existing stock of rental housing will continue to be protected. The city's Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan sets a requirement that, if redevelopment occurs, rental units are replaced one for one. The plan goes farther. Policies allow for the incremental renewal of rental housing but only to achieve additional new rental housing. The plan also limits change over time to minimize the displacement of existing tenants while accommodating new renters.

1. Maintain the existing protected rental housing stock while allowing for managed rental replacement and new supply in buildings up to six storeys in the area west of Nanaimo Street and up to four storeys on the eastside of Nanaimo Street.
2. Expand the neighbourhood shopping node at Dundas and Wall to allow for more services closer to home by allowing for mixed-use buildings in the eight to 12 storey range.
3. To the north of the shopping node, encourage expansion of Oxford Park.
4. Preserve the significant character streetscapes that have been identified.
5. Protect the city's industrial and port-related jobs while improving the interface with residential areas.

### ***Britannia Woodland***

The plan protects this area's affordable rental housing that is well located near jobs, shops, community services and rapid transit. The city's Rental Housing Stock Official Development Plan's one for one replacement requirement will continue to apply to existing rental housing. The plan builds upon the area's key strengths by allowing new rental housing opportunities. The plan manages change over time to minimize the displacement of existing tenants while accommodating new renters.

1. Maintain the existing protected rental housing stock while allowing for managed rental replacement and new supply in buildings up to six storeys.
2. Preserve significant character streetscapes that have been identified and allow infill housing to encourage retention of older buildings.
3. On selected blocks on Pender Street, adjacent to the new gateway neighbourhood along Hasting Street, allow buildings up to ten storeys to achieve new non-market and other housing.
4. Retain space for local jobs and improve the interface between industrial and residential uses.

### ***Nanaimo***

Close to schools and parks, Nanaimo Street provides a notable opportunity to increase the supply of family-friendly housing. The plan also enhances small, local-servicing retail and service nodes to provide better services closer to home.

1. Allow ground-oriented housing, such as rowhouses suitable for families, along much of Nanaimo Street.
2. At commercial shopping nodes, allow mixed-use buildings of between four and six storeys to help bring new life to the local shopping nodes.
3. Improve pedestrian comfort in the public realm to activate and unify the street.

### ***Commercial-Broadway Station Precinct***

With one of the highest levels of transportation accessibility in the region, people in this area are no more than a ten-minute walk from the rapid transit station. The plan envisions a mixed-use community centred on a vibrant new urban plaza at the SkyTrain Station. Expanded opportunities for a wide diversity of people to live, work, shop and gather in this area are introduced. The plan manages change over time to minimize the displacement of existing tenants while accommodating new residents in a variety of forms of housing.

1. Create a new social heart for the community with a new civic plaza as part of a renewed Safeway site with ground-floor commercial uses and new housing in buildings ranging from 12- to 24-storeys.
2. Near the station, allow mixed-use and mixed-tenure buildings ranging from six to ten storeys.
3. In the Station Precinct residential areas, maintain the existing protected rental housing stock while allowing for managed rental replacement and new supply in four- to six-storey buildings and ten-storey buildings on larger sites, provided that all new units are secured as rental housing.

4. Allow six-storey buildings on East Broadway and rowhouses in selected areas to provide family housing close to transit.
5. In the low-scale, traditional character area located west and south of the transit station, allow duplex and two-family dwellings with a focus on infill housing to retain character buildings.
6. Create new office space close to the rapid transit station.

The plan strives to manage growth and change in the community with a particular focus on the pace at which affordable rental housing may be replaced and the supply augmented. While the overall plan will support a significant number of new non-market housing units as well as new affordable rental housing units, the number of approvals for developments that involve demolition of existing market rental housing is limited to five new developments in the first three years of the plan, or a maximum of up to 150 existing market rental units (see Policy 7.1.5). This so-called “Pace of Change” policy will ensure incremental change in the rental housing stock, allowing time for other plan policies to begin to realize the new affordable rental and non-market housing that is supported by the plan’s Public Benefits Strategy.

### **Grandview-Woodland Public Benefits Strategy**

A Public Benefits Strategy (PBS) provides strategic direction for future investments in a community over the long term (typically 25-30 years). It includes eight key areas that support livable, healthy and sustainable communities: affordable housing, childcare, parks and open spaces, community facilities, civic facilities, transportation, utilities and heritage. Each PBS takes into account the existing network of amenities and infrastructure within the community, as well as district-serving and city-serving amenities located beyond the community boundaries. It aims to optimize the network of amenities and infrastructure that supports service and program delivery at citywide, district and local levels.

The area covered by the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan is home to about 34,000 residents today. Given the proposed land use policies, the population is anticipated to grow by about 9,500 residents over the next 25 years, which represents a projected growth in population of approximately 28%. The city population as a whole is expected to grow by approximately 25% over the same period.

Grandview-Woodland currently has access to many of the amenities available in communities across Vancouver, including affordable housing, childcare, a neighbourhood house (Kiwassa), a branch library (Britannia), a community centre (Britannia), two swimming pools (Britannia and Templeton), one ice rink (Britannia) and local parks (Grandview, Victoria, Woodland are among the larger parks).

Public amenities and improvements to services occur in communities throughout Vancouver on a continual basis. For context, it is important to note some of the more significant amenities that have been realized in Grandview-Woodland in the past few years, some even as the community plan process and the consideration of its public benefits strategy was under review. Examples are Grandview Park renewal, Victoria Park renewal, Pandora Park renewal and a significant expansion and refurbishment of the “Cultch” (the Vancouver East Cultural Centre and Green House). As well, the historic York Theatre was fully restored.

The Grandview-Woodland PBS envisions future projects that renew existing amenities and infrastructure as well as projects that address current gaps or demands anticipated as population grows. The significant elements of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan's PBS include:

- Renewal of the Britannia Community Centre
- Housing for vulnerable populations including 1,400 new non-market homes (social housing, supportive housing and co-ops)
- Improved parks and public spaces to better serve the community
- 430 new childcare spaces.

The overall value of the PBS over 25 years is approximately \$800 million. About one-third of the PBS is focused on the renewal of existing amenities and infrastructure and about two-thirds is directed towards new or upgraded amenities and infrastructure. A full discussion of the PBS is contained in the Financial Implications section of this report.

## Community Feedback on the Plan

### A. Citizens' Assembly

Members of the Citizens' Assembly were given the first opportunity to review and comment on the draft of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan. The Terms of Reference for the Citizens' Assembly, as approved by Council, stipulated that before a draft Community Plan is put before Council for its consideration, the Assembly members would have an opportunity to comment on the work, with the results being made public prior to Council's receipt of the draft Community Plan. The ability for the Assembly members to review and comment was considered to be essential for members to assess how the draft Community Plan reflects the perspectives expressed in the Assembly's Final Report.

A full-day session with the Citizens' Assembly took place on Saturday 25 June 2016. City staff presented the comprehensive analysis of the Citizens' Assembly recommendations. Staff reviewed the analysis and conclusions that arose from the Assembly's Final Report and explained how the Assembly recommendations had been incorporated into the completed community plan draft. Sub-area policies as proposed in the draft plan were reviewed. Members participated in a question and answer session with city staff.

A total of 26 members of the Citizens' Assembly attended the June 25<sup>th</sup> session. Those not able to attend were asked to watch the video recording of the staff presentation to the Assembly and to review the documents. All members of the Assembly were asked for their comments on the proposed Grandview-Woodland Community Plan. It is recognized that this feedback was very preliminary in nature given that the Assembly members had not yet had the opportunity to fully review and read the plan and accompanying documents. Based on the feedback forms submitted, this early assessment by the Citizens' Assembly membership indicated a high degree of support for the plan noting the following:

- 95% felt that the community's values are reflected or are strongly reflected in the community plan;

- 91% are satisfied or are very satisfied with the degree to which the 268 recommendations put forward by the Citizens' Assembly are incorporated into the plan;
- 82% agree or strongly agree that the proposed plan strikes an appropriate balance between the specific interests and issues of the community and broader city-wide goals and aspirations.

A more detailed summary of the feedback received from the Citizens' Assembly is contained in Appendix A.

### *B. Review with Advisory Committees Representatives*

On Thursday 14 July 2016 city staff met with representatives from the city's advisory bodies. While the plan had been available to the public for almost three weeks, staff provided the attendees with an overview of the plan and answered questions. The following advisory bodies were invited to the session:

- Urban Design Panel
- Vancouver City Planning Commission
- Vancouver Heritage Commission
- Active Transportation Policy Council
- Children, Youth and Families Advisory Committee
- Cultural Communities Advisory Committee
- LGBTQ2+ Advisory Committee
- Persons with Disabilities Advisory Committee
- Renters Advisory Committee
- Seniors' Advisory Committee
- Urban Aboriginal Peoples Advisory Committee
- Women's Advisory Committee
- Arts and Culture Policy Council
- Public Art Committee
- Civic Asset Naming Committee.

### *C. Community Outreach*

The draft Grandview-Woodland Community Plan was released to the public on June 25, 2016 and a wide-ranging program of outreach and consultation was immediately initiated. A variety of opportunities for the community to review the plan and to provide feedback were provided, including:

- Three community open houses held Wednesday 29 June at the Maritime Labour Centre, Tuesday 5 July at the Croatian Cultural Centre and Saturday 9 July at the Aboriginal Friendship Centre. Total attendance at these three events was about 450.
- Three "coffee talk" smaller scale sessions to allow for more personal, one-to-one discussions with the planning team. These were held Monday 11 July at the Croatian Cultural Centre, Friday 15 July at the Aboriginal Friendship Centre and Monday 18 July at the WISE Hall. Total attendance at these three events was about 80.
- Notice about the release of the plan was advertised and promoted through the media beginning on Monday 20 June.

- On Saturday 25 June, the city's website was fully updated with summary information as well as complete drafts of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan. This was followed up with a video of the staff presentation to the Citizens' Assembly a few days later when production was completed.
- List-serve notifications were sent out to the 1,470 unique email addresses, the 700 Twitter followers and the 380 people who have "liked" the plan on Facebook. These are individuals who have signed up or have shown an interest through the planning process and have asked to receive updates. The notifications directed recipients to the information materials (including summaries as well as complete drafts of the community plan) on the city's website and asked people to comment via the feedback form.
- A postcard was delivered to every household (approximately 18,000) in Grandview-Woodland and adjacent areas the week starting June 20<sup>th</sup>. This postcard alerted people of the plan release, outlined the opportunities for public engagement and feedback, and directed people to the city's website for additional information.
- Large posters notifying passersby of the plan's release were installed at a number of key locations in the community.

Overall, feedback from the community outreach has been generally supportive. When the comment forms (received at the public events and submitted online through the website) are aggregated, the following summarizes some of the key findings:

- 71% of respondents agree or strongly agree that the plan protects key elements of the community's character
- 60% agree or strongly agree that the plan directs future change in appropriate locations in the community
- 78% agree or strongly agree that the public benefits priorities are appropriate for the community
- 56% of respondents agree versus 23% disagree that the plan strikes a balance between local issues and city-wide goals.

A more detailed summary of the feedback received from the community is contained in Appendix B.

### **Feedback including Issues and Concerns**

Through the consultation events following the release of the draft community plan, most feedback related to site-specific or detailed matters. Many participants had questions and those were answered by staff. The following list is a summary of the issues or concerns that have been raised most often through the consultation process or have been the catalysts for a reconsideration of and revisions to plan policies:

- *Building Height and Density; Creation of New Housing*

Throughout the planning process, building heights and densities have been the focus of significant concern. Not surprisingly, therefore, many comments have been received about how these matters are addressed in the community plan. Many comments have been voiced about specific geographic areas or sites (and the more commonly referenced areas are discussed separately herein), however, a number can be

considered more general in nature. Commentary can roughly be categorized into three groupings: (1) concern that building heights and densities, or the extent of change, anticipated in the plan is too much; (2) concern that the extent of change is too little (e.g. more density is needed, or a greater number of affordable housing units needs to be provided); and, (3) feedback that the plan strikes an acceptable balance.

Questions of building height and density were a primary reason for the extension of the planning process in 2013. In considering these matters through the latter half of the planning process, staff undertook a considerable outreach program with the community and engaged in the Citizens' Assembly process. The present plan attempts to balance a range of ideas on matters of built form and community design. Staff have concluded that the feedback on heights and densities is generally more supportive than unsupportive and, therefore, are not proposing any further substantive revisions on those matters. A minor adjustment to the allowable density for six-storey mixed-use buildings on Hastings Street and at the Nanaimo Street commercial nodes, from 3.0 FSR to 3.2 FSR, has been made to more accurately reflect the achievable density given the form of development policies (which have not changed).

As a supplemental consideration, staff note that there was general support for the creation of a diversity of new housing opportunities, as well as considerable interest in the proposed Pace of Change mechanism, which is designed to protect existing affordable rental stock and manage its renewal in an incremental manner.

- *Heritage/Character Merit*

Grandview-Woodland is home to a substantial inventory of pre-1940s buildings. The new community plan introduces policy to encourage the retention of pre-1940s character buildings in existing RS and RT zones, as well as character streetscapes in RM zoned areas.

Several questions were received about the conditions that will apply when redevelopment of those sites is proposed - in particular, how the policy might impact non-character sites (both pre- and post-1940s construction), as well as questions regarding renovation, variances and the nature of infill or duplex development. Some of the concerns are regulatory in nature and will be addressed through the development of new district zoning schedules, however, staff have added some additional text to the final plan to add clarity around the intent and application of the proposed policy.

Other questions were received regarding the impact of the proposed policy on character streetscapes in RM-zoned areas, and in particular the relationship between the proposed rezoning policy and allowances under existing zoning. After further review of this matter, staff have made some adjustments to both allowable FSR and the suggested policy process.

- *Broadway East (between Victoria Drive and Nanaimo Street)*

Generally eastward from the Grandview Cut, the plan designates the properties that front directly onto Broadway for six-storey residential development (see Sections 6.7.1 and 6.7.3). Properties along the south side of East 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue are designated in the

plan for 3.5-storey rowhouse forms in order to address, through building design, the interface between the apartment form and the duplex forms in the Grandview sub-area. Concerns have been raised, primarily from existing residents in the blocks behind these properties, about the scale of the proposed development along Broadway and about the transition from six-storeys to the lower scale of development behind. Concerns have also been expressed about traffic and circulation around Laura Secord School in the area south of Broadway.

This is a concern that has been raised during the planning process and was a key consideration when the Citizens' Assembly liaised with this community at the roundtables. It is acknowledged that, in the end, the Citizens' Assembly recommended a four-storey form for these Broadway fronting properties. The staff analysis, however, concluded that Broadway is a broad avenue that is one of the most significant east-west arterials in Vancouver. It enjoys some of the best transit service of anywhere in the region, and transit accessibility is only expected to get better in the future as the city pursues rapid transit along the Broadway corridor westward. Furthermore, most of this section of East Broadway is a direct walking route of less than five-minutes to the Broadway-Commercial Transit Station. For these reasons, staff continue to recommend the proposed plan designations noting that policies in the plan will ensure that the lane-facing facades of six-storey buildings will be stepped and articulated to address transition, overlook and shadow issues. It is also noted that policy 8.2.2 in the plan speaks to the matters of traffic and safety around schools and this provides guidance to address the issues in and around Laura Secord School.

A secondary concern has been raised by some about the requirement in the Broadway East area for new developments to incorporate second-floor office uses. The concerns centre on matters of financial viability and the physical challenges of integrating a relatively modest amount of office use within a mixed-use development (e.g. on-site parking, off-site impacts, entry and exiting requirements). Staff have reviewed this concern, having due regard to the economic testing of potential future developments, and have made a minor revision to this section to make second-storey office use optional in this area. Other office requirements in locations in close proximity to the transit station remain unchanged.

- *Special sites (Kettle Friendship Centre Society)*

Throughout the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan process, the block bordered by Venables Street, the Commercial Drive Diversion and Commercial Drive has been the subject of a great deal of attention. The plan recognizes the importance of the services that the Kettle Friendship Centre Society provides from their existing location and it is clear that there is strong community support for a redevelopment of the site to renew and expand the services offered there.

During the community planning process, a proponent made up of a partnership between the Kettle and Boffo has publicized a redevelopment concept for the site. While the form of the proposal has been the subject of discussion, it is recognized that the development proposal is of a scale that it is thought to be economically self-supportive. The community plan as proposed puts forward a scale of development that is less than the Kettle/Boffo concept and it should be noted that this lower scale of

development can be expected to result in a financial shortfall that will require funding to be brought to bear from other as yet undetermined sources.

The plan outlines a set of form of development principles to guide the future redevelopment of the site. Many variables remain including parcel configuration/consolidation, land ownership, funding strategies, physical integration of program elements, number of social housing units and design details such as incorporation of outdoor plaza space. The intent of the plan policies is to provide a framework to follow that is flexible enough to accommodate any combination of these variables when a formal redevelopment application comes forward.

- *Commercial Drive/Complete Street*

Some questions and concerns have been voiced about the complete street policies as proposed in the plan for Commercial Drive. In particular, the nature of improvements for pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and the potential implications on parking, transit, motor vehicles and goods movement have been raised.

As noted, in the “Next Steps” section, City staff have not yet undertaken any detailed design work but rather this policy is intended to set an aspirational goal for the Commercial Drive streetscape to better serve all users. Should the community plan be adopted, staff are proposing to initiate a further consultation process with an extensive “listen and learn” phase with stakeholders (including the local Business Improvement Association) and the community at large to help to develop concepts to address outstanding concerns. Engagement activity will be further supported by additional analysis of related transportation considerations.

- *Other matters, corrections and clarifications*

Since the release of the community plan on June 25<sup>th</sup>, staff have kept track of a number of relatively minor revisions. Many of these correct errors, resolve inconsistencies or provide better explanation of policies. All are considered to be improvements to the draft plan. These final revisions are itemized and explained in the table contained in Appendix C.

## ***Financial***

As reflected in the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan, the overall value of the Public Benefits Strategy (PBS) is estimated to be approximately \$800 million over the next 25 years (see Table 1). Approximately 33% of the PBS involves renewal of existing amenities and infrastructure while 67% of the PBS is directed towards new or upgraded amenities and infrastructure.

Renewal of existing amenities and infrastructure is typically funded from property taxes and utility fees (“City contribution”). Provision of new or upgraded amenities and infrastructure is typically funded from city contributions through development. The sources of these funds can include a combination of Community Amenity Contributions (CACs), Citywide Development Cost Levies (CW-DCLs), direct contributions from developers toward amenity and infrastructure upgrades, plus payments collected through density bonus zoning in the proposed new zones. These contributions are expected to be augmented by financial and/or

in-kind contributions from other governments and non-profit partners (“Partnership contribution”).

**Table 1 – Preliminary Cost Estimates and Funding Strategy**

Service Category	Renewal of existing amenities and infrastructure	New or upgraded amenities and infrastructure	TOTAL	City contribution	Development contribution		Partnership contribution
					From Grandview-Woodland	Outside Grandview-Woodland	
HOUSING	\$50M	\$315M	\$365M	-	\$42M	\$19M	\$304M
CHILDCARE	\$8M	\$32M	\$40M	\$8M	\$21M	-	\$11M
PARKS & OPEN SPACES	\$8M	\$43M	\$52M	\$11M	\$25M	\$16M	-
Community and recreation facilities @ Britannia Centre	\$66M	\$39M	\$105M	\$7M	\$7.5M	\$7M	\$83M
Library @ Britannia Centre	\$10M	\$3M	\$13M	\$1M	\$0.5M	-	\$12M
Social facilities	\$43M	\$33M	\$76M	\$8M	\$4M	-	\$64M
Cultural facilities	-	\$24M	\$24M	-	\$4M	\$8M	\$12M
COMMUNITY FACILITIES	\$119M	\$99M	\$218M	\$16M	\$16M	\$15M	\$171M
CIVIC FACILITIES	\$10M	\$19M	\$29M	\$29M	-	-	-
TRANSPORTATION	\$18M	\$27M	\$45M	\$18M	\$14M	\$10M	\$3M
UTILITIES	\$42M	\$5M	\$47M	\$42M	\$5M	-	-
HERITAGE	\$2M	-	\$2M	-	\$2M	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$257M</b>	<b>\$540M</b>	<b>\$797M</b>	<b>\$123M</b>	<b>\$125M</b>	<b>\$60M</b>	<b>\$488M</b>
Percentage of Total	32%	68%	100%	15%	16%	8%	61%

\* Totals may vary due to rounding.

### **Capital**

The Grandview-Woodland PBS is an aspirational plan that reflects the needs and desires of the community. It is intended to provide strategic direction to guide the City (including City Council, Park Board and Library Board) in making investment decisions on public amenities and infrastructure in the Grandview-Woodland community over the next 25 years. The City’s fiscal capacity, emerging opportunities and evolving needs in this community and across the city will determine the specific amenities that will be delivered incrementally over the long-term. As such, the PBS will be reviewed and refined periodically and it will be integrated into the City’s 10-year Capital Strategic Outlook, 4-year Capital Plan and annual Capital Budget for prioritization and funding consideration on a citywide basis.

All development contributions (cash and in-kind CACs, Citywide DCLs, and value generated from the proposed density bonus system) generated within Grandview-Woodland will be allocated to deliver new or upgraded amenities and infrastructure in the community. Based on the land use policies outlined in the community plan, it is estimated that development in the Grandview-Woodland will generate about \$125 million in development contributions.

The proposed funding strategy for the PBS assumes approximately \$125 million in City contribution (~15%), \$185 million in Development contribution (~25%) and \$490 million in Partnership Contribution (~60%).

It is important to note that the amount of locally-generated development contributions (\$125 million) is not sufficient to fulfil all of the aspirations contained in the PBS. As such, future Councils would need to allocate an estimated total of \$60 million of development contributions (cash CACs and Citywide DCLs) generated outside of the Grandview-Woodland community to achieve the new or upgraded amenities and infrastructure that is outlined in the PBS. These funds could then be allocated to projects that serve the northeast district (e.g. an expanded pool at Britannia Centre) or the city as a whole (e.g. new cultural facilities, the expanded bikeway network). The majority of the \$60 million would be Citywide DCLs, which Council can allocate through the Capital Plan and annual Capital Budget process. However, at least \$15 million would be cash CACs (since community facilities are not eligible to receive DCL funding), which Council would have to allocate from future rezoning(s) located outside of the Grandview-Woodland community.

Certain areas like housing, childcare, social and recreational programs that build on innovative partnerships with senior levels of government, charities, and non-profit organizations will require strategic alignment and coordination with partner entities. In particular, most new non-market housing contemplated in the PBS is attributable to partner sites from non-profits and senior governments, requiring strategic alignment and coordination with partners. Affordability targets will be determined as part of rezoning process to ensure that these housing projects will be financially sustainable over the long term.

### ***Operating***

Capital investments, especially for new and/or upgraded amenities and infrastructure, often result in ongoing financial implications associated with programming and facility operation, maintenance and rehabilitation. For example, infant/toddler grants at \$1650 per space annually may be required for a new childcare facility. The budget impact will likely be added incrementally over the 25-year time frame of the community plan as projects get completed and will be considered as part of the long-term financial plan and regular budget processes.

### **Next Steps and Implementation**

Should the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan as presented herein be adopted by Council, staff will proceed to take it as the substantive basis of the final plan and will proceed to fully format and publish it in the city's standardized community plan format. The final document is expected to also include supplementary graphics and illustrations; these are intended to assist the reader in understanding the content but will not alter the substance of the approved plan.

In terms of next steps subsequent to the adoption of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan, a number of near-term implementation tasks can be expected to be initiated. Some, such as the new district schedules, are expected to be developed in the fall of 2016.

Near term implementation tasks include:

1. Preparation of new district schedules for duplex, town-house, and four-storey multi-family areas, as outlined in the plan, can be expected to be initiated as a priority so that applications that address plan policies can proceed. Work will involve consultation with the community, refinement, and adoption of new district schedules will be subject to Council consideration at a public hearing.
2. Britannia Community Centre - Consultation on the renewal of the Britannia Community Centre is expected to begin in the fall of 2016 and will be coordinated by the city's Facilities Planning group. Initial work will involve a review of master-planning work to date and the development of a vision for the future of the community centre site.
3. Commercial Drive - Engineering staff will initiate consultation on the development of a vision for Commercial Drive as a more complete street (policy 8.1.1). Work is anticipated to begin in the fall of 2016, starting with a "listen and learn" process to gather community input on street and pedestrian/public realm improvements.
4. Updating light-industrial guidelines - Planning staff will undertake the drafting of new guidelines to support public realm and safety improvements in I-2 zoned areas (and residential interfaces) in Grandview-Woodland. Consultation will involve work with property owners and businesses, as well as the larger community.

The Public Benefits Strategy in the plan also identifies a number of five-year priority projects that may be pursued subject to funding and the necessary approvals. These include:

**Housing** - The creation of new non-market housing as part of the redevelopment of large sites, if and as they come forward for development as well as new secured rental in Grandview-Woodland's apartment areas through applications that might be considered in accordance with the plan's Pace of Change policy.

**Childcare** - Renewal of 20 childcare spaces for 0-4 year olds and 70 spaces for school age children; creation of 49 new 0-4 spaces and 30 new 5-12 spaces.

**Aboriginal services** - Collaborative work with the Urban Native Youth Association (UNYA) on the development of the Native Youth Centre project at Commercial and Hastings.

**Open Space** - Increase tree planting in key parts of the neighbourhood; create a plaza as part of the anticipated redevelopment of the Safeway site (should a development application be initiated for the site).

**Public Safety** - Secure a renewed lease for the community policing centre.

**Transportation** - Improve safety and highest-priority collision hotspots; upgrade the 10th Avenue bike-route; address major cycling gaps, including the Portside Greenway.

Rescinding of Interim Rezoning Policy and Rezoning Applications - Concurrent with the approval of the community plan, staff recommend the removal of the Interim Rezoning Policy that has been in place since 2012. It is anticipated that the removal of this policy will result in the submission of rezoning inquiries and applications which could include those related to key sites such as the Kettle Friendship Centre.

In advance of the preparation of new district schedules, site-specific rezonings that are consistent with the directions of this Plan may be accepted. In areas identified as having potential for redevelopment to higher densities than existing zoning permits, the City typically seeks contributions toward the amenity and facilities needed for growth. These development contributions, such as CACs, are a key component of the PBS for Grandview-Woodland.

To provide certainty and predictability for future rezoning applications, three CAC target areas are proposed, as identified Appendix D. The recommended CAC targets are:

- Nanaimo Street/East 12th Avenue shopping nodes - \$646 per square metre (\$60 per sq. ft.);
- Mid-rise Multi-family sub-areas - \$215 per square metre (\$20 per sq. ft.), and;
- Lower Density Townhouse/Multi-family sub-areas - \$32 per square metre (\$3.00 per sq. ft.).

These CAC targets are applicable to rezoned floor area achieved in excess of the floor area permitted in the existing zoning.

## **CONCLUSION**

This report seeks Council approval of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan. It also seeks instructions to staff to proceed with implementation actions for future Council consideration to manage future growth in accordance with the plan.

The plan is the outcome of a comprehensive planning program to renew Grandview-Woodland's outdated community plan. Over the next 30 years, the plan will thoughtfully guide growth and change. It responds to the challenges facing the community, it is proactive in addressing current issues and it builds upon the area's spirit and potential. The plan's public benefits strategy addresses the renewal, replacement and improvement of key public facilities and amenities to ensure that Grandview-Woodland continues to be a socially diverse, welcoming and complete community.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Appendix A - Initial feedback from the Citizens' Assembly on the plan**

A total of 26 members attended the session with the Citizens' Assembly on June 25, 2016. From that meeting, 22 feedback forms were submitted. Summary results for each question are as follows:

1. Of the responses received, 21 responded that they felt the proposed plan reflected the Citizens' Assembly values (12 registered as "Strongly reflected" and 9 as "Reflected"). One respondent was "Neutral".
2. Regarding the degree to which the Assembly's recommendations were incorporated in the plan, 20 respondents registered satisfaction (12 as "Very satisfied" and 8 as "Satisfied"). One respondent was "Unsatisfied", noting that the changes to increase building heights were more reflective of the City's recommendations than the Citizens' Assembly. One respondent registered as "Not sure".
3. Regarding the priorities for public amenities for the community, 21 respondents agreed that the public benefits identified in the proposed plan seem appropriate (11 as "Strongly agree" and 10 as "Agree"). One respondent was "Neutral".
4. With respect to the matter of whether the plan strikes an appropriate balance between local interests and broader city-wide goals, 18 respondents registered agreement (9 as "Strongly agree" and 9 as "Agree"). Three respondents registered as "Neutral" and one as "Not sure".
5. Members were asked about their level of agreement that the proposed plan meets the needs of the community today and into the future, 17 respondents agreed (4 as "Strongly agree" and 13 as "Agree"). Three respondents were "Neutral" and one was "Not sure".
6. Respondents were asked which of the following statements best reflected their initial feelings about the plan:
  - "I really like it" - 9 responses
  - "I like most aspects of the plan but there are a few things that I am not sure about" - 11 responses
  - "I have mixed feelings, there are some aspects I like but some I don't" - 2 responses.

Detailed results with comments:

1. To what degree do you feel the values of the Citizens' Assembly are reflected in the proposed Grandview-Woodland Community Plan?

Strongly reflected	Reflected	Neutral	Not reflected enough	Not reflected at all	Not sure
11	9	1	-	-	-
52%	43%	5%	-	-	-

Strongly reflected

- We are a diverse group. I think you got the 'overall vibe' of the place. Well done.
- I think overall quality of life has been mindfully considered
- Still need to look at the details

- While I do not agree that all aspects of the plan are reflected, I can see that the city did take our values into account.

Reflected

- Commercial Broadway building heights are still too high for this neighbourhood, and add too much density to an already overtaxed transit system
- There are issues that have not been addressed thoroughly such as affordability among rental spaces. I would have liked to hear about an initiative to control rental prices.

Neutral

- Very hard to know because there were a number of terms not defined "secure rental" "affordable housing" changes to zoning not defined

2. The Assembly submitted 268 recommendations. How satisfied are you with the degree to which the Citizens' Assembly recommendations have been incorporated into the plan?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied	Not sure
12	7	-	1	-	1
57%	33%	-	5%	-	5%

Very satisfied

- Obviously it was not likely that all would be incorporated, but honestly I feel more heard than I thought we would be.
- My primary concerns are regarding arts, which has generally incorporated our recommendations. I'm also pro-bike lanes.
- I don't agree with all of it, but accept the changes/modifications as a reasonable compromise
- The number/percentage of recommendations that were not incorporated is very low.

Satisfied

- Again. Lots of strong feeling on either end of each spectrum. I can live with what you produced.
- In terms of number of recommendations incorporated, I'm very satisfied. I need to review in more detail to understand the specific implementation/modification of recommendations. I really appreciate the tracking document.
- I still need to read the community plan.

Unsatisfied

- Changes to increase higher buildings did not reflect the recommendations. Done throughout the zones changes to reflect City not Assembly.

3. Do you agree or disagree that these are the right investments for the neighbourhood?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
11	9	1	-	-	-
52%	43%	5%	-	-	-

Strongly agree

- High school closure? Will park remain?
- The focus is on amenities open to most with some specific amenities for the more vulnerable, and this is a good balance.
- Particularly in favour of non-market housing and artist studios.
- We need to hold the City's feet to the fire to make sure these promises are kept.
- Although I'd like to see even more units of non-market housing
- 1,400 units should not be in mixed model. "For-profit" and non-profit do not mix well in same development "over time". Funding model and business structures are not similar.

Agree

- Please do not leave out a strong place making community area at Garden and Franklin/Hastings
- Sad to hear no communication about Templeton. I imagine it will be in bad shape 30 years later. Many of the Anticipated Social Housing opportunities (p. 211) seem tenuous and not guaranteed.
- We need more park spaces, protection of our schools and affordable accommodation

Neutral

- Co-op housing isn't expanded in any meaningful way. Disappointed that the major new aboriginal community piece was not included. Wish the plaza at Broadway/Commercial were large enough to be public meeting place.

4. Do you agree or disagree that the proposed Grandview-Woodland Community Plan strikes a balance between the specific interests and issues of the neighbourhood and broader city-wide goals and aspirations?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
9	8	3	-	-	1
43%	38%	14%	-	-	5%

Strongly agree

- I can't imagine how hard it must be to strike that balance when there is such a strong and vocal group in GW.

Agree

- I'm not sure of the city-wide transportation plan, so I will say that bike-lanes need connecting and additions generally. I feel I can get around the neighbourhood well.

Neutral

- How do we know about broader city-wide goals if there is no city plan?

Not sure

- I don't necessarily see these to be in conflict and in need of the striking of balance.

5. Do you agree or disagree that the proposed Grandview-Woodland Community Plan meets the needs of the community today and into the future?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure	No response
4	12	3	-	-	1	1
19%	57%	14%	-	-	5%	5%

Agree

- It feels like the plan will retain the neighbourhood character and introduce some innovations (particularly in public space) that are appropriate to the neighbourhood.
- Hard to know. 30 years/25 years into the future is hard to imagine/plan for.
- Affordability continues to be a top concern, and is out of scope for the neighbourhood plan. The plan seems good as far as scope allows.
- Provided its implementation is over 25-30 years
- Approx \$800 million over 25 years is approx \$32 million/year. Britannia CC will absorb a chunk. The remainder might not be sufficient.
- I am confident the plan reflects the today's needs of the community. I am not sure about the future, this will depend on the City of Vancouver and its efforts to implement the plan.

Neutral

- The community will change, and its aspirations will change as well. For the present I still do see gentrification as a difficulty for most.
- Provisions to maintain reasonably priced housing are not convincing (but this may be a city-wide issue)
- Plan will create a future based on City's changes. Pace of change key.

Not sure

- I would need more information to decide on this.

No response

- Our services, transit, childcare is already not meeting needs. 30 years is a long time to wait.

6. Overall, which of these statements best reflects your feelings about the proposed Grandview-Woodland Community Plan?

“I really like it”	“I like most aspects of the plan but there are a few things I’m not sure about”	“I have mixed feelings, there are some aspects I like but some I don’t”	“There are more things I dislike about the plan although I like some aspects”	“I don’t like it, I have significant issues with the plan”
9	10	2	-	-
43%	48%	9%	-	-

“I really like it”

- I cannot imagine a more thorough process than a Citizens' Assembly process by a careful cross section of the community AND a full study of the recommendations by professionals and planners!
- I feel our recommendations have been carefully considered.
- Provisionally I really like it, haven't read it in detail yet.

“I like most aspects of the plan but there are a few things I’m not sure about”

- I wish that there was more of a philosophical statement of principle by which the whole thing could be measured. We have a good management team. But do we have a soul?
- Until I've read the full report and had time to review it thoughtfully, I can't fully answer the question.
- Heights on Hastings and Clark are too high; 9 storeys at Commercial and Venables is a concern; 4 and 6 storey structures along Commercial between Venables and Adanac is well done.
- The plan is a reasonable compromise of divergent interests and priorities.
- The plan reflects a lot thought and efforts. I was very pleased to see the results of our work and City of Vancouver employees' commitment. All together was a tremendous accomplishment. Thank you!

“I have mixed feelings, there are some aspects I like but some I don’t”

- No timelines, definitions, details, and assumption lacking. Could/should be more transparent.

7. Additional comments

- Lengthy process, but I've been very glad to be a part of it. Seems like the City is trying their best.
- This neighbourhood is my home, and I don't want to live anywhere else in Canada. The housing bubble is out of control and multiple friends have had to leave after having children. I value my community, bike lanes and walkability, access to art studios (just west of G-W). I look forward to a progressive and well considered future. Thank you!
- I feel that there are outside interest that are jumpstarting their own agenda, and some of the plan may become redundant.
- Like the Victoria bikeway as an alternative (flatter) to Lakewood!

- I am convinced that City planners have acted in good faith and to the best of their ability to help us express our views in this plan. I never felt pressured into adopting their preconceived ideas. (They did offer guidance on feasibility of different alternatives.)  
Fanstastic work, everybody!
- Thanks for all the work you did to put together the Citizens' Assembly, workshops, public meetings and ongoing development of the plan.
- Convert soon to be shut down schools to become new parks.
- Concerns: 1) permeability of new Broadway and Commercial "plaza" - I'm concerned that it is essentially an outdoor wall on private property; 2) Didn't hear anything about activating back lanes; 3) The way the Trace Document addresses "Beyond Scope" recommendations; 4) Would like to hear more about how the City can help keep rent under control

**Appendix B - Comments from community feedback on the plan**

From the various consultation activities subsequent to the June 25, 2016 public release of the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan, 444 feedback forms were received. This included forms completed at events as well as online through the city's website. Summary results for each question are as follows:

1. Do you agree or disagree that these are the right investments for the neighbourhood?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
36%	42%	8%	5%	5%	1%

2. Do you agree or disagree that the areas of change and non-change presented in the plan are appropriate for Grandview-Woodland?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
16%	44%	10%	13%	10%	2%

3. Do you agree or disagree that the plan protects key elements of neighbourhood character?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
36%	35%	11%	7%	7%	1%

4. Do you agree or disagree that the proposed Grandview-Woodland Community Plan strikes a balance between the specific interests and issues of the neighbourhood and broader city-wide goals and aspirations?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
10%	46%	14%	14%	9%	3%

5. Do you agree or disagree that the proposed Grandview-Woodland Community Plan meets the needs of the community today and into the future?

Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not sure
9%	39%	19%	16%	10%	3%

6. Overall, which of these statements best reflects your feelings about the proposed Grandview-Woodland Community Plan?

“I really like it”	“I like most aspects of the plan but there are a few things I’m not sure about”	“I have mixed feelings, there are some aspects I like but some I don’t”	“There are more things I dislike about the plan although I like some aspects”	“I don’t like it, I have significant issues with the plan”
21%	37%	23%	9%	7%

Respondent profile:

Total received: 444 comment forms  
 Home: Renter = 24%, Home-owner = 40%  
 Participation in process: Questionnaire = 35%, Did not participate = 34%, Participate in at least one activity = 29%  
 Location of home: Northeast quadrant of Vancouver = 60%  
 Gender: Male = 47%, Female = 43%, Did not answer = 7%  
 Age Profile: 20-29 = 10%, 30-49 = 51%, 50-64 = 22%, 65-79 = 10%, Did not answer = 7%  
 Language at home: English = 87%, Cantonese = 3%, Did not answer = 5%

What excites you about the plan? - General Themes	
<b>Development (places)</b>	
Thoroughfare development	9
Broadway/Commercial development	43
Hasting development	13
Kettle-Boffo development	18
Cedar Cove improvements	4
Nanaimo development	5
Dundas shopping node	4
Area revitalization	10
	107
<b>Housing (all)</b>	
Housing (increase supply/affordable)	68
Row housing	15
infill housing	3
rental options	26
social/coop housing	12
duplexes	4
	128
<b>Transportation</b>	
Improved cycling/ bike lanes	50
Complete streets design	11
Traffic calming/ transit planning	6
	67
<b>Public Space/ Public Life</b>	
Wider sidewalks	7
Public spaces/ gathering places/ plazas	28
Pedestrian experiences	15
Park improvements/ green spaces	51
	101
<b>Local Economy</b>	
Increased retail	5
Increased jobs/office spaces	4
Supporting small businesses	13
Industrial retention	3
	25
<b>Arts and Culture</b>	
Artist studios	9
<b>Community Well-being</b>	
Britannia upgrades	82
Daycare/ childcare spaces	18
Planning for families	9
Social services	16
Increased population/new residents	10
	135
<b>Heritage</b>	
Heritage preservation	9
Character preservation	25
	34
<b>Other</b>	
Aboriginal spaces/services	2
Public art	1
Streetscapes	2
Parking improvements	2
Pace of change mechanism	1
	8

What concerns you about the plan? - General themes

<b>Development</b>		<b>In favour of more development &amp; density</b>	
Too much density	69	Bike lanes (for)	5
Commercial/Broadway development (against)	6	Commercial/Broadway development (for)	2
Aesthetic concerns re: development	7	Kettle-Boffo (for)	10
Density in wrong locations	4	Concerned about NIMBYs	12
Worried about displacement	10	Need more density	33
Kettle-Boffo (against)	4		<b>62</b>
Concerned about safety	7		
Worried about population increase	7		
	<b>114</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>6</b>
		Implementation (timing/funding)	
<b>Housing</b>		<b>Other</b>	
Housing	16	Viduaux	2
Housing for families (3+ bedrooms)	12	Community services (overburdened)	1
Affordable housing	42	6-storey along East 8th	2
Rental housing	14	Dundas shopping node	1
Social/coop housing	12	Nanaimo Broadway transition	1
	<b>96</b>	Broadway (Between Nanaimo and Gandvie	2
		Want more even distribution of density	2
		Pedestrian concerns	2
<b>Transportation</b>		Hertiage owners penalized	2
Bike lanes (against)	28	More artist studios	2
Congested/busy transit	13	Social housing at Britannia	1
Traffic calming	6	Limited amenities	1
Parking concerns	12	Industrial (noise/smell)	2
Congested/busy vehicle traffic	17	Want wider sidewalks	2
	<b>76</b>		<b>23</b>
<b>Heritage</b>			
Heritage protection	5		
Neighbourhood character	34		
	<b>39</b>		
<b>Amenities</b>			
More green space/park space	5		
Need more daycare	3		
	<b>8</b>		
<b>Local economy</b>			
Protect small business owners	8		
	<b>8</b>		

Appendix C - Detailed Summary of Revisions made to the June 25<sup>th</sup> Draft Grandview-Woodland Community Plan

PAGE(S)	REVISION AND EXPLANATION
p. 23	Correction made to change 3,600 units to 2,800; additional text added for clarity.
p. 24	Added bullet re social and community facilities.
p.26	Clarification of applicability of Rental Housing ODP.
p. 28	Added text to clarify specified heights and densities to ensure that it is understood that these are maximums. Also added text to clarify relationship of plan policies to other city planning documents (i.e. the Hastings-Sunrise Community Vision).
p. 38	Commercial Drive Choice of Use should include area between Adanac and Venables to allow for commercial activity facing Commercial Drive. Map adjusted and policy language added.
pp.33-42 and pp. 72-84	“Canada Post Site” at East 6th and Commercial Drive was incorrectly outlined on various maps; corrected.
p. 40	Policies for Britannia do not adequately reflect opportunities for green space improvements; additional policy language added.
p. 42 and p. 150	Policies for Commercial Drive do not adequately reflect potential opportunities for pedestrianization of the street right-of-way; additional policy language added as well as a map in Chapter 9.
p. 47 and p. 49	Policy clarification added re the delivery of non-market housing (units changed to floor area) and re minimum frontage requirements.
p. 48	Additional text to confirm maximum heights and densities for special sites.
p. 51 and p. 91	Based on further analysis, adjustment to maximum achievable density from 3.0 to 3.2 FSR for north side of Hastings Hilltop and at Nanaimo commercial nodes. No change to form of development policy.
p. 46, 49, 51, 52, 87, 88, 90	Various maps revised to correct boundaries.
p. 67, p. 82, p. 83, p.98, p. 102, p. 103, p. 104 and p. 106	Based on further analysis, reduced frontage requirement for six-storey secured market rental policy.
pp. 76-77, pp. 88-89, pp. 107-108 and p. 165	Clarifying text added re pre-1940s character and non-character buildings, allowable density and built form opportunities.
p. 57, p. 67 and pp. 82-83	Clarifying text added re heritage streetscape policies to align with existing zoning and opportunities to retain character streetscapes.
p.89	Based on further analysis, added frontage requirement to be consistent with other townhouse areas in the plan.
p. 96	Added reference to publicly accessible restrooms.
p. 96 and p. 98	Added policy text re the desire to support retention of cultural space on the Rio Theatre site.
p. 91	Deleted the building separation requirement that was not applicable.

p. 94, p.95, p. 101, p. 104, p. 106 and p. 107	Various maps revised to correct boundaries.
p. 97	Based on further analysis, second-floor office uses changed from “required” to “encouraged” to provide greater flexibility.
p. 97	Based on further analysis, frontage requirement added.
p. 98	Clarifying text added re heights and densities on RM-4 zoned sites.
p. 99	Added clarifying text to footnote in diagram.
p. 103	Corrected error re requirement for rental.
p. 117	Clarifying text added to Policy 7.1.5 re “Pace of Change” to clarify the maximum number of existing units that can be approved.
p.119	Map adjusted to correct errors.
p. 118	Clarifying text added to reflect now approved family housing policies.
p. 130	Added William Street as a potential east-west bike route.
pp.178-179, p. 181 and pp. 190-191	Added places of worship as key social spaces and added new policy to support renewal of these facilities.
p. 215	Corrected ten-year and five-year childcare priorities.
pp. 231-232 and p. 234	Adding clarifying text re city-wide contributions to the Public Benefits Strategy; added greater detail to PBS table.
p. 214	Correction to childcare numbers.
p. 234	Added text to clarify that the delivery of non-market housing may be supported through additional city incentives.
p. 236, p. 238 and p. 241	Corrected errors in maps.

Note: This list does not include corrections to spelling, grammar or other minor errors that were identified in the draft community plan.

Appendix D - Map showing target fixed-rate CACs applicable in Grandview-Woodland

