City Council Action

On November 1, 2005 City Council APPROVED the Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision Directions that are shown in the following pages as “Approved”.

Council also approved the following:

THAT Council and departments use the Riley Park/South Cambie Vision Directions to help guide policy decisions, corporate work, priorities, budgets, and capital plans in the community.

THAT Council direct the Director of City Plans to report back on an action plan to implement and monitor the Riley Park/South Cambie Vision.
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Vision Highlights

Riley Park/South Cambie Today

Riley Park/South Cambie (RPSC) is a community rich in diversity and history. Its residents value the area’s distinct single family neighbourhoods, character homes, views, and its variety of convenient shopping areas, especially on Main Street. RPSC has excellent accessibility due to its central location and is well served by major transportation and transit corridors. The area’s two community centres and neighbourhood house are heavily used. City-serving and local parks and open spaces are considered key assets. Transit projects on Main (Showcase) and on Cambie (Canada Line), the building of new community facilities as part of the 2010 Olympic legacies in Riley Park, and the redevelopment of large sites are key projects that will bring changes to RPSC over the next 10 to 20 years. The community’s tradition of involvement in local issues continues with active community associations, neighbourhood and school groups, and emerging artistic and business associations.

The RPSC Vision seeks to maintain and strengthen the community’s identity in the face of considerable change. Here are some key Vision messages.

Create Neighbourhood Centres and Enhance Important Shopping Areas

The shopping areas located along Main (16th to 33rd), Oak and King Edward, Fraser (16th to King Edward), Cambie (16th to 19th), and Cambie and 41st should be strengthened with improved shopping and pedestrian experiences. New housing should be added adjacent to the shopping areas. Along Cambie and Main, retail should be encouraged to wrap around onto side streets to create more attractive and usable public spaces.

Make Streets Safer and More Attractive

Residents want better pedestrian crossings, traffic enforcement, and improved appearance of their arterial streets. Streets should be easier to cross, safer to walk and drive along, and more livable and attractive. There should be more neighbourhood traffic calming, bikeways and greenways, and transit priority measures.

Maintain and Enhance Single Family Neighbourhoods

Most single family areas of RPSC should be kept and design controls for new homes should be considered. Incentives or guidelines should be developed to further improve the quality and sustainability of new single family housing, and more efforts made to preserve character and heritage buildings.
Enhanced Community Services

Many facilities for recreation, library, social, and health services are in transition due to upgrades, expansions or renewal. Careful integration of new facilities is needed, and more programs and additional affordable services for seniors, youth, and families are desired.

Build a Safer Community

Residents want individuals, the community, and the police to work cooperatively to create a safer community. The Community Policing Centre should be expanded to develop more programs dealing with crime prevention and education. There should be more actions taken to reduce youth crime and patrols by police on foot and bicycle.

Manage Large Site Redevelopment

The RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’, St. Vincent’s Hospital, Little Mountain Housing, and the Balfour Block (18th and Laurel) are large sites in RPSC that could redevelop in the future. Residents support additional housing on these sites if traffic, parking, and community facility impacts are addressed.

Increase Housing Variety

Residents supported more infill and duplex housing, and some small houses on shared lots provided they are designed to fit into the single family areas. Additional new housing could be located around parks and community centres, on large sites, around the Canada Line Stations, and near shopping areas.

Improve Parks, Streets, Lanes, and Public Places

Parks and school grounds should be improved for more diverse activities and enhanced safety. Views from parks and other public places should be protected. Streets should continue to be pleasant green links that connect the neighbourhood and residents should be encouraged to landscape traffic circles, corner bulges, and boulevards. The Cambie Heritage Boulevard should be preserved.

Protect and Enhance the Environment

New development should be encouraged to adopt more sustainable building practices, and more food should be grown and distributed locally. The community and the City should work together to keep RPSC clean and litter free. Recycling and composting programs should be expanded and greater conservation of energy and water should be encouraged.

Improve Community Involvement in Decision making

Residents should have greater and timelier input into decision making about changes in their community. The community should also have a role in actively measuring and monitoring how well future actions work toward achieving Vision Directions.
Vision Background

An Overview of the Community Vision Program

The Vision is based on CityPlan: Directions for Vancouver which was adopted by City Council in 1995 as an overall vision for the city. In July 1996 City Council approved the Community Visions Program as a way of bringing CityPlan’s city-wide directions to the community level. The program Terms of Reference describe the ground rules and process for creating a Community Vision. The program asks each community to implement CityPlan Directions in a way and at a scale and pace that suits the community.

What is This Vision?

This Vision describes the kind of community that people who live and work in Riley Park/South Cambie (RPSC) want it to become over the next 10 to 20 years, and how CityPlan Directions should be implemented in RPSC. It identifies what people value and want to preserve, what improvements are needed, and how change should occur. It will be used at City Hall to help set priorities for capital projects, direct City programs and services, and make decisions affecting this community. It also provides an opportunity for community organizations and individuals to act on Directions that the community has endorsed.

How was this Vision Created?

The Vision Directions were developed by people who live and work in RPSC. The program began in October 2003 with community outreach and a weekend Visions Fair in February 2004. The heart of the process was a series of intensive public workshops from April to June 2004, where over 400 people spent many hours developing ideas and options on a variety of topics. From these sessions, Vision Directions were created and published in the Community Vision Choices Survey which was distributed to all households, businesses, and property owners in May 2005. In addition, a random sample of households was given the same survey. Over 1900 people responded to the survey to create a shared Vision for the future. In November 2005 the Vision Directions that were supported by survey respondents were approved by City Council.

A Community Liaison Group, which was composed of a wide range of community volunteers, provided continuity throughout the process, served as a ‘watchdog’ to ensure that community input was carried through, and advised staff on community outreach and other matters.

Making the Vision Happen

The Community Vision sets broad Directions for the future. Some of these Directions will happen almost immediately, others over many years. Some Directions will help to set priorities and to direct funds within the wide variety of existing of tools and programs like capital plans, zoning, traffic calming, business improvement area assistance, bike-ways, and greenways. The Vision will help to set priorities and to direct funds to programs which achieve the Vision over time.

Some Vision Directions are translated into actions and projects through more detailed planning — for example: to identify the specific location and design of new types of housing, and to design improvements to community shopping areas. The Vision also provides the community with a framework for action and volunteer initiatives. Continued community involvement will be necessary to set priorities and provide leadership over the life of the Vision. Combined action by the City and the community is the key to making the Vision happen.
Vision Directions

Introduction

This section presents the Vision Directions grouped into eight themes, with directions for 34 specific topics. Different types of information are provided:

Background Information

Introductory material for each theme and topic provides information on the existing situation and on existing City policies and practices which are not changed by the Vision.

Vision Directions

The RPSC Choices Survey asked people to respond to draft Directions on a range from ‘Strongly Agree’ to ‘Strongly Disagree’. Each Direction has been classified as Approved, Not Approved (Uncertain), or Not Supported based on community response in the Choices Survey. This classification is shown above each Vision Direction. Noted below each Vision Direction is the percentage agreement it received in the general and random surveys (complete statistics and survey methodology are available in a separate publication, “Report on the General and Random Surveys: Riley Park/South Cambie”).

Approved Directions: Most Directions received enough agreement to be classified as ‘Approved’. These Directions were supported not only by 50% or more of the general survey respondents but also by at least 55% of the random survey respondents (a level that ensures support for the Direction by a majority of these respondents, taking into account the plus or minus 5% sampling error of the random survey). These Directions have been adopted by City Council and are official City policy.

Not Approved (Uncertain) Directions: When a Direction did not receive enough support to be classified as ‘Approved’ but the agree votes outweighed disagree votes in either the general or random surveys, the Direction is listed as ‘Not Approved (Uncertain)’. Many of these Directions were supported by a majority of the general survey respondents and a majority of votes in the random survey (but below the 55% required to ensure community support given the sampling error of the random survey). These Directions were not adopted by City Council and although they are not City policy they remain on the table for further community discussion in subsequent planning processes. For these Directions, comments on their future role follows the ‘Peoples Ideas’.

Not Supported Directions: When a Direction received more disagree than agree votes in either the general or the random survey it is classified as ‘Not Supported’. These Directions were not adopted by City Council and they will not be brought forward for consideration in future planning processes.

People’s Ideas

For most Directions, specific ideas generated at the community meetings and workshops are listed here. They are for information and future reference but are not part of the City Council approved Directions.

Note: Percentages shown in this document have been are rounded-up when the detailed number is .5 or greater (e.g., 54.5% is rounded-up to 55%). However, this rounding-up has not changed the classification of a Direction (e.g., from ‘Not Approved’ to ‘Approved’).

Also note that the ‘Percent Agree’ figures refer to the share of the respondents who ‘agreed’ divided by the total number who provided an ‘agree’, ‘disagree’, or ‘neutral’ response on the Direction. ‘Neutral’ indicates the respondent did not have an opinion based the information provided. Most Vision Directions had at least 10% of the total respondents checking the ‘neutral’ box.
Trafﬁc and its impacts are major issues in Riley Park/South Cambie (RPSC). The area has two of the city’s busiest streets in terms of both car and truck trafﬁc. Within RPSC, Cambie carries over 45,000 vehicles per 24-hour period, Oak over 40,000. Many of RPSC’s arterial streets are used for truck travel: Vancouver’s Transportation Plan estimated that Oak, Cambie, Main, Fraser, and 41st each carry 200 trucks per day. In 2003, Oak and 41st had the highest number of motor vehicle collisions in RPSC (185), followed by Cambie and 41st (132), and Fraser and 41st (80).

The Richmond/Airport/Vancouver (Canada Line) Rapid Transit Project passes through RPSC. Stations will be built on Cambie at 41st and at King Edward. Provision for a possible future station will be made at Cambie and 33rd. Residents wanted good connections between Canada Line and important neighbourhood destinations (e.g. Queen Elizabeth Park, Riley Park Community Center), but expressed concerns about the potential impacts of these stations on crime, vandalism, and litter.

The Vision addresses a number of transportation issues including the trafﬁc and parking impacts associated with the future development of community facilities at Riley and Hillcrest Parks (i.e. the 2010 Winter Olympic Curling venue and the new Aquatic Center), the speed of trafﬁc along Main and 41st, the proposed transit improvements along Main, and the difﬁculties faced by people walking and biking along 16th and Midlothian. There is a need to improve the situation for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users along many of RPSC’s busiest streets. Many of these Directions are described below, others are in the NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES; PARKS, STREETS, LANES, AND PUBLIC PLACES; and LARGE SITES sections.

The streets included here are those identiﬁed as priorities at the Vision Fair and community workshops. These are:

• primary arterials: the busiest streets in RPSC — King Edward, 41st, Oak, Cambie, and Main
• secondary arterials: less-busy streets where pedestrians, bikes, and transit should be encouraged — 16th, 29th/Midlothian/33rd, and Fraser
• a street proposed to be removed from the arterial network: 33rd (Cambie to Oak).
Primary Arterials

(King Edward, 41st, Oak, Cambie, and Main)

King Edward, 41st, Oak, Cambie, and Main will continue to be primary arterials used by traffic traveling across the city and region. All except King Edward are truck routes, all have transit service. King Edward, 41st, and Main have been designated in the Transportation Plan as having potential for ‘increased priority for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit’. Traffic speed and congestion can make these streets difficult to live on or to cross. Cambie, Main, and Fraser have special needs for pedestrians crossing the streets to reach their many retail stores (also see Directions in the NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES section of the Vision).

1.1 Improve Conditions and Safety on King Edward, 41st, Oak, Cambie, and Main

Approved

The conditions and safety for residents and pedestrians on King Edward, 41st, Oak, Cambie, and Main should be substantially improved by:

• adding and upgrading pedestrian crossings and sidewalks
• reducing the speed of traffic, more enforcement of traffic rules and regulations, and more education of motorists
• improving the safety of intersections
• reducing the adverse impacts of trucks on neighbourhoods
• adding more planting, landscaping, and public art.

Percent Agree 83%/83%

Peoples Ideas…

• make the King Edward and Oak intersection more pedestrian friendly
• use speed humps in side streets to discourage traffic trying to get around transit improvements along Main
• create more left-turn bays to reduce congestion on arterial streets, provided curb-to-curb width is maintained
• add left turn signal (advance) at 16th and Cambie to address traffic congestion once the old Produce City site is redeveloped
• install left turn signals at Main and King Edward
• add more planting/landscaping/public art along Main and grassed borders along 41st to reduce traffic noise and increase character and vitality (and hire community artists)

Secondary Arterials

(16th, 29th/Midlothian/33rd, and Fraser)

16th, 29th/Midlothian/33rd, and Fraser are secondary arterials. Fraser is a truck and transit route. 29th/Midlothian/33rd is designated in the Transportation Plan as having potential for ‘increased priority for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit’. Vision participants noted problems with traffic speed and pedestrian safety along Midlothian, some dangerous intersections along 16th, and difficulties crossing Fraser to visit local stores in the shopping area.
The City’s Transportation Plan was approved by City Council in May 1997. The Plan’s most important directions include:

- not expanding the existing network of arterial roads in the city
- improved transit and expanded cycling
- better conditions for pedestrians, especially in important shopping areas
- traffic calming to protect neighbourhoods from through traffic
- improved truck access for moving goods
- future growth in commuter trips to the downtown to be served primarily by transit, instead of creating more car trips.

2.1 Improve Conditions and Safety on 16th, 29th/Midlothian/33rd, and Fraser

Approved

The conditions and safety for residents and pedestrians on 16th, 29th/Midlothian/33rd, and Fraser should be substantially improved by:

- adding and upgrading pedestrian crossings and sidewalks
- reducing the speed of traffic, more enforcement of traffic rules and regulations, and education of motorists
- improving the safety of intersections
- landscaping and plantings.

Percent Agree 77%/78%

Midlothian: Secondary arterial needs increased priority for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit

Peoples Ideas…
- introduce pedestrian priority areas in neighbourhood centres/shopping areas with special treatments like landscaping and additional traffic calming measures (adjoining Fraser’s business area)
- enforce speed limits on Midlothian, or narrow Midlothian by adding bike lanes and medians
- don’t permit stopping on both sides of 33rd between Main and the lane west of Main to reduce congestion
- add crosswalks along Prince Edward at 33rd
- don’t permit parking on 16th at Ontario to increase visibility for pedestrians and bicyclists
- add median refuges along Fraser (especially at 31st) to allow for safe crossing of the street
- conduct education campaign about patience and risk avoidance, stopping respectfully for pedestrians at intersections

3 Neighbourhood Collector

33rd (Cambie to Oak)

33rd is now a secondary arterial which carries relatively low traffic volumes. Although the majority of streets proposed to be removed from the arterial network pass through predominantly residential neighbourhoods, this section of 33rd is predominantly institutional. The Transportation Plan proposes, and workshop participants supported, its reclassification to a neighbourhood collector. As a neighbourhood collector it would continue to give local traffic access to arterial roads but it would not be widened to increase the number of traffic lanes or the amount of car or truck traffic it carries. Participants noted that future transit use on 33rd should be a consideration when making any changes to this street because the Canada Line design includes a future potential station at Cambie and 33rd. The results of this Survey and of any further discussions with residents will be reported to City Council for a final decision on reclassification.
3.1 Change the Designation of 33rd (Cambie to Oak)

Not Approved (Uncertain)

33rd (Cambie to Oak) should be changed from a secondary arterial to neighbourhood collector to ensure this street is not widened or changed to increase the number of traffic lanes or the amount of car or truck traffic it carries. 

Percent Agree 54%/54%

Peoples Ideas…
- install corner bulges on Heather at 33rd
- keep access to St. Vincent’s Hospital site from 33rd

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be considered approved. In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (2.2 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classed as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion in further planning. An examination of the distribution of votes for both surveys found that respondents in the neighbourhood adjacent to the street (bounded by Oak, Cambie, King Edward and 41st) supported the Direction: 65% agree, 22% disagree.

Traffic Calming on Local Streets

Local streets should carry low volumes of local traffic travelling at moderate speeds. The Transportation Plan recommends lowering the speed limit on all local streets to 40 km/h. In some cases, through and/or speeding traffic consistently occurs on local streets. Traffic calming reduces the speed or volume of traffic on these streets to increase safety and amenity. Traffic calming may employ traffic circles, speed humps, corner bulges, traffic diverters, stop signs or other types of signs, street closures, street narrowing, raised crosswalks, and pedestrian islands/refuge areas (sometimes planted).

4.1 Use Traffic Calming Programs

Approved

Residents should ensure they contact the City about any traffic problems experienced on local streets so that the City’s traffic calming programs can be initiated.

Percent Agree 69%/71%

Peoples Ideas…
- need traffic calming on 19th between Laurel and Oak
- raise crosswalks at intersections of local streets with commercial streets to help slow traffic
- install crosswalks at 30th and James, 30th and Ontario, and 32nd and Prince Edward (to cross to and from the cemetery)
- close off some intersections of local streets to stop through traffic and create mini-parks
- use directional dividers to stop through traffic on Prince Edward (from King Edward to 33rd, and 33rd to 41st)
- need speed humps, stop signs or traffic circles on 28th at both John and Prince Edward
- need stop signs Main to Fraser, 16th to 25th
4.2 Provide Traffic Management and Parking Plans for Riley/Hillcrest Parks

**Approved**
Traffic management and parking plans should be developed, in consultation with the community, to address impacts of new facilities in Riley/Hillcrest (i.e. the 2010 Winter Olympic curling venue, and the new Aquatic Centre).

**Percent Agree** 72%/76%

Peoples Ideas…
• need to have a traffic calming plan in place for the area between King Edward and 33rd, and between Main and Cambie, before the implementation of the updated Riley/Hillcrest Park Master Plan
• need traffic calming on the residential streets surrounding the Olympic facilities
• improve the assessment of traffic impacts on the local community from major development proposals

40 km/h Speed Limit on Local Streets

The City’s Transportation Plan has a policy to reduce speed limits on residential streets to 40 km/h. This will require an amendment to the province’s Motor Vehicle Act.

5 Public Transit

The Transportation Plan recognized that future growth in trips must be accommodated on the existing road system (supplemented with rapid transit). According to the Plan, the City cannot afford the cost or impacts of widening roads enough to reduce auto congestion. The approach is to reallocate road space and accommodate more trips on transit. More people must be attracted to transit in order to keep future traffic congestion from becoming unbearable.

Control of transit has passed from the province to TransLink which plans, finances, and operates the transit system. Within Vancouver, the City owns the roads that buses operate on and is responsible for bus shelters, whether traffic signals give priority to buses, and how the streets are designed for buses. The Transportation Plan recommends that the City work with TransLink to create:
• better bus stops, bus shelters, and boarding areas (e.g. with timetables and maps)
• more frequent buses
• bus priority measures to increase efficiency and reliability of buses (e.g. bus bulges)
• community mini-buses
• a city-wide network of express bus routes (including 41st) and rapid transit.
5.1 Use Bus Priority Measures

Approved
The efficiency and reliability of buses should be improved through the use of bus priority measures such as bus bulges, bus signal priority, and bus only lanes. 
Percent Agree 60%/62%

Peoples Ideas...
• provide bus lanes on Main
• allow signal priority for buses at intersections to reduce delays on Main
• provide bus bulges and boarding spaces on transit-oriented streets where road space is available

Bus bulge: helps bus priority, more boarding space

5.2 Expand Bus Routes and Increase Bus Frequency

Approved
The City should consult with TransLink to increase the number of bus routes, the frequency of buses and the hours of operation to enhance transit service by bringing the bus closer to homes and other destinations, and to decrease crowding on buses.
Percent Agree 80%/78%

People’s Ideas...
• expand peak hours of service and Nite Owl service
• increase bus size or frequency to reduce overcrowding on Cambie, Main, Fraser, and King Edward
• provide more bus service East to West

5.3 Add Express Bus Routes

Approved
The City should consult with TransLink to add more express routes to facilitate transit service.
Percent Agree 71%/75%

People’s Ideas...
• provide ‘rapid bus’ service on Main, Cambie, and King Edward with reduced number of bus stops and quicker connections between buses (especially rapid transit stations)

5.4 Provide Shuttle Buses

Approved
TransLink should use shuttle buses to provide more flexible local service to and from key destinations like Vancouver General Hospital, Riley and Douglas Park Community Centres, Nat Bailey Stadium, Riley Park Library, and local shopping areas.
Percent Agree 57%/63%

People’s Ideas...
• use smaller community shuttles on fixed routes to improve services to local destinations and reduce car use
The Canada Line project is a rail-based rapid transit line that will link central Richmond, the Vancouver International Airport, and Vancouver along the Cambie corridor to central Broadway, the downtown Business District, and a transportation hub at Waterfront Station. The line is 19.5 km long with 18 stations. Once operational, the line will provide an alternative to the private automobile, address congestion, and encourage more compact urban form.

The development of the line and stations is the responsibility of a subsidiary of TransLink. The City will provide official advice to the project through development review processes (Urban Design Panel and Development Permit Board). The City is also responsible for any planning work outside of the line and stations, including public works, integration with adjacent development, zoning of property, parking impacts, pedestrian and bicycle access, and connections to the stations. The overall cost of the line is $1.72 billion and it will be open by November, 2009.

5.5 Improve the ‘Transit Experience’

Approved

The ‘transit experience’ (the comfort, convenience, and sense of safety experienced by users as they walk to, wait for or ride the system) should be improved in order to attract riders, for example, with better weather protection, transit schedules and route maps, bike racks, trash cans, and public washrooms.

Percent Agree 73%/74%

People’s Ideas...

• provide scheduling information about realistic connection times on buses or at stops
• post bus timetables and route maps at bus stops
• provide benches at NE corner of King Edward and Cambie
• provide a shelter and garbage can at NE corner of Main & 33rd
• need better storage on buses
• provide washrooms at major transit stops, and gain access by use of transit ticket or pass
• need weather protection, including sun protection

5.6 Address Crime, Safety, and Parking Impacts of Canada Line Stations

Approved

Crime, safety, and parking impacts should be addressed during the design and operation of the new Canada Line stations in RPSC.

Percent Agree 86%/89%

People’s Ideas...

• need strong connections to the stations for pedestrians, cyclists and buses to promote ridership on the system
• provide access for bicycles to Canada Line stations away from main roads, and have a good connection to bike routes

5.7 Provide Connections to Canada Line Stations

Approved

Appropriate pedestrian, cyclist, and bus connections should be provided in the design and operation of the new Canada Line stations in RPSC. Develop safe, strong linkages to allow for easy movement between stations and important destinations within RPSC (e.g. Queen Elizabeth Park, Riley and Douglas Park Community Centres, Women’s and Children’s Hospitals, Nat Bailey Stadium).

Percent Agree 80%/83%

People’s Ideas...

• need strong connections to the stations for pedestrians, cyclists and buses to promote ridership on the system
• provide access for bicycles to Canada Line stations away from main roads, and have a good connection to bike routes

5.8 Address Impacts of Canada Line Construction on Local Residents and Businesses

Approved

Plans should be made to address potential impacts caused by construction of the Canada Line system, in consultation with local residents and businesses.
Main Street ‘Showcase’ Initiative

The Main Street Showcase Initiative is part of a package of sustainable transportation projects funded by Transport Canada’s Urban Transportation Showcase Program. Transport Canada awarded TransLink and the Greater Vancouver Regional District $8.8 million for selected programs that demonstrate innovation in promoting reductions in greenhouse gas and other emissions.

The #3 Main Street/Downtown trolley bus is one of the busiest, most frequent and highest passenger volume routes in the region. Growing traffic congestion along Main is slowing this service and causing buses to ‘bunch,’ affecting travel times, operating costs, and ridership. The ‘Showcase’ Initiative involves changes to the design of Main Street to incorporate a number of bus priority measures. These include adding ‘bus bulges’ and possibly providing bus signal priority at some intersections. Better bus stops with electronic displays similar to those used on the 98 B-Line will be included in the project to make the service more attractive.

These impacts could include street closures, additional car and truck traffic, road detours, noise, and litter.

Percent Agree 78%/85%

5.9 Reflect Main Street’s Unique Character in the Design of the ‘Showcase’ Initiative

Approved

The design of ‘Showcase’ transit and pedestrian improvements on Main in RPSC should respond to the unique character of the street and immediate neighbourhood (e.g. integrate public art by local artists, reflect history in bus shelter design).

Percent Agree 72%/75%

People’s Ideas...

• ensure transit vs. ‘great street’ balance on Main — keep it pedestrian-friendly and visually appealing
• take advantage of ‘Showcase’ investment to design improvements that consider history and special characteristics of Main
• retain parking on Main — provides separation of pedestrians from heavy traffic

5.10 Review Transit Fares & Promote Ridership

Approved

TransLink should consider ways to encourage greater ridership including special promotions and a review of its fare schedules.

Percent Agree 76%/77%

People’s Ideas...

• provide yearly seniors/disabled passes
• have free transit for school-aged children — easy way to educate, helps low income families and increases ridership for mothers and fathers with kids
• create a reward ‘point’ system for frequent bus users that can be redeemed for discounts on merchandise
• introduce a U-pass program for high school kids

5.11 Increase Local Involvement in Transit Decisions

Approved

There should be more local involvement in transit decisions.

Percent Agree 68%/73%

People’s Ideas...

• provide more local decision making in transit, including resident involvement
• involvement is important for those who are transit dependent

6 Greenways and Bikeways

Greenways, Bikeways, and Bikelanes are networks of routes designed to provide active and alternative ways to move through the city, while enhancing their experience of nature, community and city. Work is underway through various City programs:

• Greenways to provide enhanced walking and cycling routes
• Bikeways and Bikelanes to provide more functional routes specifically for bikes.

6.1 Improve Greenway and Bikeway Routes

Approved

Greenways should link major walking destinations within and outside of RPSC and should provide safe crossings at major streets. While the Ontario and Ridgeway Greenways, and the Ontario, Midtown/Ridgeway, and Heather Bike- ways are important community assets, improvements must still be made to
**Greenways** are streets and routes enhanced to create an interesting and safe environment for walking and recreational cycling. The Vancouver Greenways Plan was developed with public consultation and approved in 1995. It identifies two kinds of Greenways: City Greenways which have been planned to create a city-wide network of 14 routes and Neighbourhood Greenways which create pleasant local connections, are smaller in scale, and are initiated by neighbourhood groups, who receive technical and funding support from the City.

**Bikeways** are bike routes which cross the city on local streets which parallel arterials. These streets have features that make them "bicycle-friendly". For example, traffic circles can be installed to slow cars but not bikes and cyclist push buttons on signals can be provided where a Bikeway crosses a busy street.

**Bikelanes** are marked lanes (minimum 1.5 m wide) for bikes on some arterial streets. This idea was introduced by the Transportation Plan. Often space for bikelanes needs to be allocated from space reserved for other street uses. This can have impacts on parking, the number of travel lanes, and street and median curb-to-curb width.

Encourage greater use of pedestrian and cyclist routes and facilities, and improve safety at intersections. Special attention should be made to link the Ontario Greenway with the construction of new facilities in Riley Park, Hillcrest Park, and Nat Bailey Stadium. Provision of additional Greenways, Bikeways, and Bikelane routes should also be investigated.

**Percent Agree 78%/81%**

People’s Ideas...
- improve crossing at 16th and Ontario
- provide traffic calming, improved lighting, seating and water fountains, especially on routes with hills
- provide facilities for transition from bike route to transit (e.g. King Edward to Rapid Bus)
- need a neighbourhood east-west Greenway or Bikeway route (e.g. along 18th or 20th)
- create a Bikelane along Midlothian to and from Riley Park
- create a Bikeway/Greenway along Prince Edward with additional traffic calming and signals for crossing the major streets

6.2 Initiate Neighbourhood Greenways

**Approved**

RPSC residents should initiate neighbourhood Greenways on frequently used pedestrian and biking routes within the area (shown on the map).

**Percent Agree 70%/72%**

People’s Ideas...
- create a neighbourhood Greenway near the community centre and future Olympic facilities
- create a Jomar Lanot Memorial Greenway through Sir Charles Tupper Secondary School and along St. George

6.3 Provide General Walking and Biking Improvements

**Approved**

The frequently used pedestrian and biking routes within RPSC shown on the map should have additional greening and other types of improvements, including:
- installation of sidewalks on streets without sidewalks and improved maintenance of existing streets and sidewalks
- better pedestrian and bike crossings of arterials
- beautification of streets and sidewalks (e.g. tree-lined streets, landscaping, flowers, benches, special paving, lighting).

**Percent Agree 77%/81%**

People’s Ideas...
- provide lights on Prince Edward at 33rd and 41st, on 28th at Fraser and Cambie, on 18th at Fraser
- provide routes and crossings that encourage shopping and getting to school by walking or biking
- create strong pedestrian connections from Youville Seniors Housing to the St. Vincents and RCMP sites
- need pedestrian linkages, Greenways for Little Mountain Housing site
6.4 Provide Sidewalks

Approved

Sidewalks should be provided on all streets in RPSC.

Percent Agree 68%/71%

People’s Ideas...
- provide sidewalks around Queen Elizabeth Park
- need sidewalk along Midlothian
- need sidewalk on 18th, 19th, and Laurel
- need sidewalk along Prince Edward to 41st

6.5 Repair Sidewalks

Approved

Sidewalks in RPSC should be repaired where necessary.

Percent Agree 83%/87%

People’s Ideas...
- provide new sidewalks and street furnishings on Main
- Main sidewalks need to be repaved

6.6 Provide Bike Lockers and Racks

Approved

Bike lockers and racks should be more readily available in RPSC, particularly at major destinations and new Canada Line stations.

Percent Agree 65%/68%

People’s Ideas...
- provide more bike racks in shopping areas
- provide more bike racks on buses
- provide secure bike lockers at new Canada Line stations
- provide more bike racks and locker rooms at schools

6.7 Develop Bikelanes along King Edward

Approved

Bikelanes along King Edward should be developed as part of a city-wide commuter network (this would be considered as part of a more detailed plan, to ensure that it is safe and that it fits in with the City’s overall network of biking routes).

Percent Agree 61%/61%

6.8 Promote Biking with New Initiatives

Approved

New initiatives should be developed to promote bicycling in RPSC, especially at schools.

Percent Agree 63%/62%

People’s Ideas...
- provide free community bikes at key destinations e.g. like the shopping cart rental system
- provide rewards/recognition for students that ride their bikes to school
- make some roads only available for bikes before and after school hours
- make biking ‘cool’ (e.g. bike and walk to school days).
Riley Park/South Cambie (RPSC) has a diverse population with many languages, ethnic backgrounds, income levels, and ages. These demographics, coupled with new developments such as the Canada (rapid transit) Line, create challenges to understanding and meeting people’s safety, recreation, and social services needs.

Out of the broad range of services and service providers within RPSC, the Vision Directions concentrate on the services which are either provided directly, or partly funded, by the City.

**Paying for Services and Facilities**
The City pays for many of the services and facilities, including policing, recreation, libraries, and so forth, through property taxes, development cost charges, and user fees.

The CityPlan Direction on City finances is to continue to be cautious about increasing spending. Generally, new services would need to be paid for by redirecting funds now spent on other items or in other areas or through user pay funding sources (see MORE INFO — Development Cost Levies and Community Amenity Contributions in the NEW HOUSING section). There are usually more requests for new facilities than can be funded in any one period, so there is often a waiting period of years before a facility is expanded or rebuilt.

**Non-City Services**
Most health and social services are funded by the province and provided either directly by Ministries or through various agencies. The Vancouver Coastal Health Authority is responsible for health and community care services, including many for seniors. RPSC is served by the Mid Main Community Health Centre (3998 Main Street) and Raven Song Community Health Centre (2450 Ontario Street) located in Mount Pleasant.

**Non-government Community Services**
The community is also served by the Little Mountain Neighbourhood House (LMNH) (3981 Main Street). It is a non-profit organization and is a well used centre for local residents. It provides educational, cultural, recreational, and social services for different age groups, ethnic specific groups, and families. The LMNH has been serving residents in the area for over 25 years. LMNH is actively working to expand its facility and services by moving to a new building at 23rd and Main. The City of Vancouver provides some of the funding for the Neighbourhood House.

**Table: 2001 Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>RPSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>546,000</td>
<td>28,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: 1981 - 2001 Population Growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>RPSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: English Mother Tongue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>RPSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: Chinese Mother Tongue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>RPSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: Median Household Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>RPSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$42,026</td>
<td>$51,293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: Percent Low Income Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>RPSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: Single Parent Families**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>RPSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Census 2001*
Community Policing Centres (CPCs) are places where the police and community volunteers engage in the delivery of crime prevention programs and activities. After provincial funding for CPCs was withdrawn, a new model for community policing was adopted by the City. This revised model consists of 7 neighbourhood-based CPCs and 1 CPC designated for Vancouver’s Chinese population. Every office has a neighbourhood police officer assigned to work with the local citizens. CPCs rely on support and cooperation from local residents, businesses, the police, and the City. RPSC is served by the Kerrisdale Oakridge Marpole CPC at 5655 Cambie Street.

7 Community Safety

In 2001, the rate of property crimes in RPSC was slightly higher than most of the city’s local areas. However, the rate of crimes against people (violent crimes) was slightly lower than most of the city’s local areas. Within the RPSC, South Cambie’s property crime rate was significantly higher than in Riley Park.

Vision Directions focus on key components in a strategy to prevent crime: individual actions, community initiatives, and policing approaches. In addition, there are Directions which look at particular issues like youth crime and illegal drug activities.

7.1 Individual Actions to Improve Safety

Approved

Individuals should take responsibility for reducing the likelihood they or their property will be affected by crime. Possible actions include making their homes more burglar resistant, getting to know their neighbours, and joining a Block Watch program.

Percent Agree 79%/84%

People’s Ideas...

• keep yards clear of items of value including bottle returns
• display home security signage prominently to show residents are on the look out
• use alarms to deter burglars
• refuse to open door to sales people/solicitors
• promote an active community by walking and biking more to and from shopping areas

7.2 Expand the Community Policing Centre and Community Policing

Approved

The Community Policing Centre (CPC) serving RPSC should expand outreach efforts to attract new members, and develop additional programs.

Percent Agree 84%/90%

People’s Ideas...

Staff at Kerrisdale Oakridge Marpole Community Policing Centre

7.3 Community Actions to Reduce Crime and Nuisance Behavior

Approved

The community, including businesses, should work together with Community Policing Centres, the City, and the Police Department to address crime and nuisance behavior in the neighbourhood, through community-based crime prevention. Efforts should include building design reviews, improved lighting, encouraging activities in public places, wider use of crime prevention education and anti-graffiti programs, and strengthening community connections.

Percent Agree 80%/83%

People’s Ideas...

• outreach to youth so they are part of the CPC’s volunteer program
• extend outreach to the entire RPSC community, promoting crime prevention & recruiting volunteers
• advertise Block Watch Program community-wide in all languages, including Cantonese, Mandarin, Tagalog, Punjabi, and Vietnamese
• set up meetings for all Block Watch captains to share information
• hire a multicultural police officer to help residents
• send flyers to residents to let them know about the CPC’s role/function and programs, and conduct workshops on crime prevention
• locate the CPC office inside a future Canada Line Station
People’s Ideas...
• encourage more park and street activities: have citizen patrols to act as ‘safety watchers’
• address prostitution problems along Fraser
• address unsafe areas such as empty lots, dark narrow lanes, and hidden areas
• improve safety by installing motion activated lights and lowering fences
• involve youth from schools and community centres to create murals on walls prone to graffiti, or set aside a wall/sidewalk for graffiti
• educate people about crime prevention techniques (e.g. how to avoid purse snatching and use anti-theft devices)
• host more community events to strengthen community connections (e.g. community safety forums)
• support or develop BIAs to help address safety concerns in the neighbourhood shopping areas

7.4 Enhance Police Services

Approved
There should be more patrols by police on foot and bicycle, particularly in areas of the community with higher crime rates, to enable the police to be more responsive to local concerns and needs.

Percent Agree 84%/90%

People’s Ideas...
• increase police force and patrols in local areas; provide a ‘beat cop’ on main streets
• build the community’s trust by improving response time to reported crimes and inform the community on how police deal with crime
• need more police presence between Main and Fraser
• improve policing to reduce break-ins, car thefts, and grow-ops

Youth Crime

Very few youth are engaged in crime. Youth already make an important contribution to improving the community. However, a range of youth activities made residents feel unsafe: loitering, bullying, feeling threatened by groups of teens, vandalism, graffiti-making, open drug use, etc. Since the tragic murder of a young student, Jomar Lanot, on the school grounds of Charles Tupper Secondary School in November 2003, residents and the school have actively pursued community initiatives to prevent violent crimes. Some approaches identified in the Vision by participants would apply to both youth and adult crimes and some would require new or expanded youth programs.

7.5 Prevent Youth Crime

Approved
Youth crime should be prevented through the co-ordinated efforts of parents, schools, police, community organizations, and other groups working with youth. Initiatives could include additional facilities and programs in parks, community centres, schools, neighbourhood houses, etc. to provide alternative activities/environments for youth, and to remember the victims of crime.

Percent Agree 86%/89%

People’s Ideas...
• continue to support safety initiatives in schools, such as Safeteen, Safespeak, and Headlines Theatre
• support pilot project at Tupper school to increase connections with other organizations in the community
• educate children about anti-bullying at elementary school and encourage adult intervention at an early stage
• provide multicultural translation to help teens understand signage located in public places such as parks and school grounds
• need more activities or programs for youth during evenings/weekends and space for activities should be provided by schools and other community organizations
Special Needs Residential Facilities

The term 'Special Needs Residential Facilities' (SNRFs) refers to various types of group housing for people who need some form of support or assistance in their living place. People who benefit from this housing include the frail elderly, people with severe physical disabilities, battered women, children in care, people who have a mental illness, people with developmental delays, people in need of emergency shelter, people under the supervision of Corrections, and the terminally ill. The City’s zoning permits SNRFs in all residential zones. Within RPSC there are 10 SNRFs with 343 beds. This represents 7.1% of the SNRF beds in the city, higher than RPSC’s share of the city’s population (5.3%). The facilities in RPSC include community care facilities and group living facilities. Three facilities have over 25 beds, with up to 127 beds in the largest care facility. The remaining six facilities have eight beds or less. The SNRFs are distributed across RPSC.

• bring together victims, offenders, and community groups to find solutions (Restorative Justice Program)
• construct a Jomar Lanot memorial at Tupper School

The City’s Drug Prevention Policy

The City has adopted a comprehensive approach to the drug problem. Despite enforcement efforts, a large share of crime in the city continues to be related to drug use and the drug trade. The City is implementing a four pillar approach which supplements enforcement with prevention programs to reduce the number of new users, harm reduction to decrease the damage suffered by drug users, and enhanced treatment to help users to address their dependency. The approach recognizes that drug issues are not restricted to one area of the city and recommends community-based facilities for treatment and needle exchange. Full implementation is being pursued with the federal and provincial governments and their agencies, particularly the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority. Over time, there should be more prevention programs and treatment facilities in the city. For more information about the City’s Drug Prevention Policy, visit www.vancouver.ca/fourpillars.

7.6 Community Consultation on the Location of Treatment Centres

Approved

When the City and the Vancouver Coastal Health Authority or other institutions begin to plan the number and location of local treatment centres, needle exchanges, and other facilities, they should include extensive consultation with the local community.

Percent Agree 76%/78%

Recreation Facilities and Services

Many of the public facilities for recreation, library, social, and health services are undergoing a transition in Riley Park/South Cambie (RPSC). On the horizon for Riley Park are new, expanded facilities that replace a community centre, a curling and an ice rink, an indoor pool, a branch library, and a neighbourhood house.

The Little Mountain Neighbourhood House (LMNH) is located at 3981 Main Street, and offers residents a wide range of services. LMNH is working to expand its facility and services at a new site nearby. The Riley Park Branch Library currently occupies a small storefront in the same premises as the LMNH and offers limited circulation to area residents. The new LMNH facility is not large enough to accommodate a full sized branch library so a new location and library facility will be needed when LMNH moves.

Mid-Main Community Health Centre is an independent non-profit agency located at 3998 Main Street. The centres’ services include medical, dental, counselling, and health promotion and education. Plans are underway to expand and renovate the centre.

Both Douglas Park and Riley Park Community Centres serve RPSC. Community centres are built and maintained by the Park Board but programming at each centre is determined by a locally elected community centre association. These facilities provide sports, recreation, arts, and social programming for a wide range of residents from infants to seniors. Douglas Park Community Centre, situated at 801 West 22nd Avenue, opened in 1966 and was expanded in 1993 and 1996. Its service delivery approach is based on limiting expansion of the existing centre at Douglas Park and seeking satellite facilities within its service area. Recently, they acquired community space in the former Nurses Residence at Vancouver General Hospital.
Riley Park Community Centre, located at 50 East 30th Avenue, opened in 1966, and was expanded in 1991. The centre forms part of the Riley/Hillcrest Park Master Plan, which is being updated to address the development of a destination, indoor aquatic center, and the 2010 Winter Olympic curling venue (which will be converted for community use after the Olympics). Just north of RPSC, the Mount Pleasant Community Centre and childcare facility are being relocated and the outdoor pool faces closure.

All of these facilities strive to meet the needs of a diverse community. Renewal and expansion of so many new facilities presents both opportunities and challenges. The Vision supports improvements to indoor and outdoor recreation programs in both existing and future facilities; an expanded role of art and culture; and enhanced services especially for children and youth, seniors, and people with disabilities.

8.1 Ensure Community Involvement in the Implementation of the Riley Hillcrest Master Plan

Approved

The City and Park Board should ensure community involvement in the implementation of the Riley/Hillcrest Master Plan, addressing issues concerning: noise and lighting impacts, landscaping, green space and greenway linkages, the environment (e.g. energy efficiency, landscaping, storm water), urban design (e.g. relationships between the buildings) and individual building design, plus transportation issues (e.g. parking and traffic, transit, and pedestrian and bicycle access).

Percent Agree 81%/83%

People’s Ideas...
• provide adequate on-site parking, more handicap parking, and secure and covered bicycle parking
• retain existing green space and plant larger trees along the greenway and on new development sites
• provide better crosswalks and paths between RPSC parks

8.2 Improve Coordination of Services

Approved

Coordination amongst service providers like the community centres, neighbourhood house, library, schools, and the health centre should be improved. Services should continue to respond to the changing demographics (e.g. age, ethnicity, and income) in RPSC.

Percent Agree 76%/77%

People’s Ideas...
• create partnerships and use volunteers to bridge community centres, neighbourhood house, and schools
• expand programming and facilities to reflect demographic needs of seniors/aging population and young families
• expand outreach to Chinese communities
• keep the services together to improve accessibility, especially for single moms or low income families
• provide more preventative health education sessions to counter diseases like diabetes, cancer, Alzheimer’s

8.3 Make Programs More Affordable

Approved

An increased number of affordable programs should be provided by all community facilities and service providers.

Percent Agree 68%/72%

People’s Ideas...
• provide ‘specials’ for families (e.g. token charge for ‘family swim time’)
• consider private/public partnerships for affordable childcare
8.4 Provide More Indoor Recreation Programs

Approved
Existing facilities, including the community centres, neighbourhood house, schools, and other local organizations, should continue to seek opportunities to provide more indoor recreation programs. When new facilities become available, additional indoor recreation programs should be provided. Opportunities for partnerships in sharing facilities and providing satellite programs should be explored.

Percent Agree 70%/73%

People’s Ideas...
• promote public/private partnerships to provide gyms or indoor recreation space
• need an indoor basketball court, bigger/better gym facilities, fitness centre, and indoor track
• need a music studio, pottery studio, Tai-chi area, and bigger fitness classes
• initiate more indoor sports programs or clubs (e.g. bridge, aerobics, volleyball, basketball, boys drop-in hockey, swimming, women’s drop-in sports)
• more workshops or classes on auto-mechanic, carpentry, income tax, sewing, language programs, face painting, and cooking.

8.5 Endorse Policy for Percy Norman Pool and Mount Pleasant Pool

Approved
The Park Board’s policy to maintain existing pool service at Percy Norman and Mount Pleasant until a replacement is available (such as the new aquatic centre at Riley/Hillcrest Parks) should be endorsed. Programs in the new aquatic centre should continue to serve the needs and interests of local residents.

Percent Agree 77%/82%

People’s Ideas...
• retain the Mount Pleasant outdoor pool
• try to balance and meet the needs of diverse user groups (e.g. seniors, swim clubs, families, and people with disabilities)
• add more adult swim times to the schedule

8.6 Integrate the Future Riley Park Community Centre (2010 Olympic Curling Venue) with the New Indoor Aquatic Centre

Approved
The future Riley Park Community Centre/skating rink/curling rink (i.e. 2010 Olympic curling venue) should be integrated or co-located with the new indoor aquatic centre.

Percent Agree 69%/77%

People’s Ideas...
• keep the centres (pool, rink, and community centre) together and integrated
• need a newer/bigger and warmer indoor pool with a family changing room, a kids diving board, a wave pool with water slides, more swimming lessons, and longer pool hours

8.7 Provide New and Expanded Facilities and Programs for Children and Families

Approved
Current facilities and programming space for children and families should be expanded and new facilities should be provided. A variety of affordable programs in daycares, preschools and family places should be developed.

Percent Agree 72%/72%

People’s Ideas...
• keep Early Parents Program in the neighbourhood house and parent/toddler drop-in
• provide children’s programs in late afternoons or weekends for working parents
• need more daycare facilities and preschool options in the neighbourhood
• need more and bigger family places with increased accessibility and longer hours
Child Care

The City partners with senior governments, the private sector, the community, and parents to develop and maintain an affordable, high quality, and comprehensive child care system in Vancouver. The City helps support child care by:

- providing grants to support non-profit child care services
- working with community centres and schools to support child care services
- leasing land at reduced rates to non-profit child care societies
- using development cost levies on new development to support child care
- negotiating for child care in larger projects as part of their rezoning process
- creating City-owned child care facilities operated by non-profit agencies.

Workshop participants did not propose changes in the City’s approach to helping provide child care.

8.8 Provide Facilities and Programs for Youth

Approved

More facilities for youth in RPSC should be provided, such as a youth centre, skateboards parks, and sport courts in parks. More free and youth-driven programs should be provided to involve a greater diversity of youth in the community.

Percent Agree 75%/77%

People’s Ideas...

- develop full basketball courts and provide more free outdoor activities near Riley Park Community Centre
- increase sports activities that are recreational/non-competitive
- need to establish a better network of services for marginalized youth
- supply more summer programs for teens and pre-teens, or a teen centre and more places to hang out
- connect youth with local businesses for training/work experience
- add youth driven/oriented programs/events such as a soapbox practice track, BMX bike track, and skateboard parks

8.9 Expand Seniors’ Facilities and Programs

Approved

A seniors’ centre and/or expanded seniors’ facilities in community centres and the neighbourhood house should be provided. Programs for seniors should be expanded.

Percent Agree 75%/80%

People’s Ideas...

- provide a seniors’ centre just like the Kerrisdale Seniors’ Centre as part of the community centre
- hope to see a designated space/room for seniors at Riley Park Community Centre (similar to the space in the West End Community Centre)
- provide gym and pool time for seniors and offer a special rate
- encourage more seniors involvement in community programs, especially fitness programs
- create programs to include children, youth, and seniors together
- hire a seniors’ co-ordinator to assist with programs and excursions at both community centres
- take the programming out to the users (e.g. seniors’ housing complex) when they can’t go to the community centre or neighbourhood house

8.10 Provide Programs for Newcomers and Immigrants

Not Approved (Uncertain)

More programs and ESL classes should be provided to newcomers and immigrants in their own language in community centres, the library, and the neighbourhood house.

Percent Agree 54%/55%

People’s Ideas...

- provide more space and time for Chinese gathering group in the neighbourhood house
- need fitness & health classes for Chinese residents
- need ESL classes at Riley Park Community Centre
- need a space where newcomers can bring their families
- need VCC or ESL outreach programs at Riley Park Community Centre on weekends

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but was .2% short of the required support in the random survey to be classified as Approved (54.8%). In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (3.4 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion in further planning.
8.11 Increase Accessibility to Public Places

**Approved**

Public places in RPSC should be designed or upgraded to better meet the needs of the visually, hearing, and mobility impaired or disabled.

**Percent Agree** 74%/74%

People’s Ideas...
- provide more disabled parking spots closer to buildings
- provide touchless water faucets and wheelchair accessibility in public facilities
- provide special treatment for the visually impaired at street crossings and bus loading areas (e.g. bumps, bright colours, and audible signals)

8.12 Provide Information about Services

**Approved**

Information about services provided by the City and other service providers should be made more readily available in forms, languages, and locations that are convenient for residents, businesses, newcomers, and immigrants.

**Percent Agree** 62%/65%

People’s Ideas...
- improve communications with the multicultural community in different languages to create awareness

9 Arts and Culture

Public art and art/cultural activities are important expressions of life in RPSC. The large, active community involved in the arts and creative industries is an important asset for the neighbourhood. The Vision supports increased promotion and creation of public art.

9.1 Encourage Public Art

**Approved**

Public art in RPSC should be encouraged, especially at locations like schools, streets, shopping areas, parks, and exterior walls of public or private buildings.

**Percent Agree** 66%/67%

People’s Ideas...
- encourage and increase funding for more community art — provide open studio or workshop space for new artists or youth
- generate in-house art programs in community centres — have artists design street ‘elements’ (e.g. benches, trashcans, etc.)
• promote artistic events or competitions and public performances such as poetry readings
• provide more outdoor performance venues (e.g. dances and music festivals) and support local neighbourhood musicians/bands/dancers

10 Library Facilities and Services

The Vancouver Public Library (VPL) operates the Riley Park Branch Library at 3981 Main Street. Since opening, the LMNH has shared its space with this ‘storefront’ branch which is actually a satellite to the Mount Pleasant Branch Library at Kingsgate Mall. The LMNH and VPL Boards’ have concluded that the needs of both operations could not be met in the new LMNH building. The Vision supports the need to maintain and improve Library service to RPSC, and to have the community involved in decisions about developing a new library facility. In March 2005, the Vancouver Library Board agreed to locate the new Riley Park Branch Library in the 2010 Olympic ‘legacy’ building at Riley/Hillcrest Park.

10.1 Maintain and Improve Riley Park Library Services

Approved
Library services in the Riley Park area should be maintained until a new branch library is available. Improvements to library services should be made to better serve community needs based on a review of factors such as collections, internet access, service to non-English speakers, and hours of operation.

Percent Agree 77%/81%

People’s Ideas…
• increase collections of DVDs and videos and rotate AV material
• increase the Chinese collection and add staff who can speak Chinese

10.2 Ensure Community Involvement in Developing the New Riley Park Branch Library

Approved
The City (especially the Vancouver Public Library) should involve the community when developing the new branch library and shaping its services.

Percent Agree 76%/77%

People’s Ideas…
• increase potential partnerships with the School Board, Park Board, and developers
• keep library on Main Street (close to the neighbourhood house), perhaps at present site and expanding when the neighbourhood house moves
• need to keep within walking distance of the neighbourhoods in RPSC
• ensure accessibility for those with mobility issues
• locate library close to the community centre where there is parking
Riley Park/South Cambie (RPSC) has a mix of residential neighbourhoods. Most are made up of single family homes, many with secondary suites. North of King Edward and east of Ontario, there are many heritage and character homes. Elsewhere, the homes are mainly from the post-war period giving these neighbourhoods their own distinctive flavour. Higher density townhouses and four storey apartments line many of the major streets, especially north of King Edward. Apartments above stores are starting to be developed in commercial areas along Oak, Cambie, Main, and Fraser.

The Vision identifies aspects of housing which should be maintained or improved in the future, including initiatives to help accommodate existing residents as their housing needs change over time, and newcomers as they arrive.

Vancouver’s Zoning By-law determines what land uses and building characteristics are permitted on each lot in the city. The single family areas of RPSC are zoned RS-1, RS-5, and RS-7. In March 2004, Council made a rental secondary suite a conditional use in all areas of the city which allow single family dwellings. Changes to zoning and building regulations reduced the hurdles faced when legalizing a secondary suite, including elimination of the need for sprinklers in existing homes, reduction of the minimum ceiling height, and requiring new construction to be ‘suite-ready’. It is important to note that the new regulations still require City permits to make a suite legal.
11 Single Family Houses

Residents of RPSC value their single family neighbourhoods. Many were attracted to the area by the combination of housing and neighbourhood which met their needs. Vision participants wanted to maintain the single family character of much of the community.

Typical single family streetscape

11.1 Maintain Most Single Family Areas

Approved

In order to retain the basic character of RPSC, most of the area that is now single family (with suites allowed) should be kept that way (exceptions would only be considered where the community supports new housing choices as described in Directions 15.1-15.9, 15.11, 16.1-16.6, 18.8, 19.3, 20.6, 20.8, 21.5, and 22.2)

Percent Agree 77%/77%

People’s Ideas...
- retain single family houses as they are attractive to all types of households

12 New House Design

New houses frequently replace older ones. Currently about two-thirds of the single family zoning in RPSC has no review of external design elements which affect visual appearance, character, or landscaping. This zoning only controls the height, yard sizes, total floorspace, and garage size of new houses. The other one-third of single family zoned area has some form of design control. These areas are around Douglas Park, between 16th & 20th east of Cambie, and on either side of Main (north of 28th).

Design review is intended to encourage new housing to ‘fit into’ the existing character of the neighbourhood. Without design review, new houses may have a more innovative design. Vision participants felt that design of new houses is important to maintaining the character of their neighbourhood.

12.1 Design of New Single Family Houses

Approved

Some areas in RPSC have zoning with some level of design review of new single family houses. Those single family areas that currently do not have zoning with design review should be improved by putting in place one of the design review zones the City has already developed, if there is sufficient support within any sub-area of the community.

Percent Agree 77%/77%

People’s Ideas...
- prefer heritage character style homes
- do not permit Vancouver specials or monster houses
- prefer diverse housing styles to newly built, superficial ‘character’ homes
- establish design review for all new housing types
- provide different types of landscaping and green space with new housing
- repetition of same design makes for a boring street

12.2 Public Involvement in Review of New Single Family House Design

Approved

In areas with design review of single family housing, the City should explore alternative methods for improving public involvement in the review of new and substantially renovated single family house design, including some form of community based design panel or advisory committee.

Percent Agree 57%/56%
People’s Ideas…
- establish more direct community involvement in influencing housing and urban design issues
- develop a sense of community ownership with community input
- design controls should reflect criteria developed and approved by local residents

12.3 Improve Quality and Sustainability of Single Family Housing

Approved
The City should investigate opportunities to provide incentives or guidelines that further improve the quality and sustainability of new single family housing. This might include guidelines for more durable, sustainable building materials or green roofs.

Percent Agree 73%/77%

People’s Ideas…
- relax zoning or provide other incentives for using building materials that have a greater longevity (quality of materials)
- promote green roofs in the building code and zoning

13 Retaining Heritage

RPSC changed significantly after World War II, particularly on the south slopes of Little Mountain. The closure of the Provincial Military Camp opened up this area for residential development and by the end of the 1950s most residential areas were fully developed.

The Vancouver Heritage Register (VHR) lists pre-1940 buildings that have particular historical or architectural significance. Their owners can take advantage of some zoning relaxations which may make it easier to keep and renovate them. RPSC has 122 buildings on the VHR.

13.1 Retain Buildings on the Vancouver Heritage Register

Approved
For buildings listed in the Vancouver Heritage Register, the City should encourage retention by implementing additional incentives which are suitable in RPSC.

Percent Agree 81%/84%

People’s Ideas…
- encourage restoration of heritage buildings
- keep heritage buildings on Main Street which have a nice scale and anchor other heritage restoration
- enhance heritage building through green building principles
- retain heritage buildings as important ‘memory’ pieces, enriching the fabric of the community
- important to have a variety of past and current buildings
- establish a grant program to promote and restore heritage buildings

13.2 Retaining Other Character Buildings

Approved
In order to encourage retention of ‘character’ buildings not on the Vancouver Heritage Register, there should be incentives to renovate and disincentives to demolish these buildings (e.g. taxes, fees). This would also involve a process to establish which ‘character’ buildings would be eligible.

Percent Agree 76%/81%
People’s Ideas…
• need building controls to preserve the heritage/history of the area
• keep character buildings in shopping areas
• keep old buildings, but need to fix them up with façade improvements
• create character retention incentives for more housing types than listed heritage buildings

14 Changes in CD-1 Zones

Some developments in RPSC are on large parcels zoned CD-1, or Comprehensive Development District. CD-1s are ‘tailor-made’ zonings used by the City where standard zoning isn’t suitable for the proposed uses or building form. Since the ‘80s CD-1 By-laws have included a lot of detailed regulations, but earlier CD-1 By-laws were often more general. In addition, older CD-1 sites are often built to densities lower than those common today. Across the city, these older parcels are being redeveloped to higher densities. Examples include Arbutus Gardens (at Arbutus and 33rd) and Champlain Mall in Killarney.

The City has generally required changes to developments on CD-1 sites to undergo a rezoning process, culminating in a Public Hearing. However, in some cases, redevelopment of older CD-1s was treated as a change in regulations which did not require a rezoning. While decisions on these sites have included community consultation, Vision participants felt residents’ interests would be better protected, and the City’s powers over the development would be greater, if all significant changes to a CD-1 zone were treated as a rezoning.

14.1 Process for CD-1 Zoned Sites Anywhere in RPSC

Approved
When anything other than a small change is proposed to a development on a site zoned CD-1 — whether in its buildings or uses — the City should undertake a rezoning process in order to ensure appropriate community consultation and to provide the City with the ability to deny or impose conditions on the proposed development.

Percent Agree 71%/75%

CD-1 Zones

Multi-family housing zoned CD-1: Bloomfield Gardens on Oak
Vision participants looked at the future housing needs of RPSC residents including young singles and couples, families with kids, and seniors. Some, like singles and couples, prefer apartments or rental suites in houses. Families with children want the features of single family homes like bigger units, private yards, basements, and individual front doors — but at an affordable price. Many couples whose children have left home also want these features and continue to stay in their single family homes.

Demand for New Housing
By 2021 RPSC’s existing residents will create about 1,050 (10%) more households — today’s children will grow-up and maintain their own households; some couples will separate and become two households. Most importantly, there will be a significant increase in the number of mature households as the baby boomers age. All of this would take place without any migration into RPSC. Of course, people will continue to move to Vancouver from elsewhere and some will move into RPSC, causing additional demand for housing.

Mismatch Between Supply and Demand
Today there is capacity for only a few types of additional housing units in the community. Very few additional single family lots are available and about 36% of single family houses already have suites. With the recent changes to single family zoning, additional rental suites are allowed in all of the single family areas in the community. Some apartments can be built along the major arterial streets and above stores in the commercial areas. In total, the capacity under existing zoning stands at over 3,400 more housing units, meeting the overall future housing demand. However about two thirds of those housing units are in apartments (mostly above shops) and one third in additional rental suites (usually in the basement). Most future demand is from mature households who typically prefer ‘ground-oriented’ units (e.g. with ready access to a front or rear yard) but not in the form of a basement suite — so there is a mismatch between demand and supply under existing zoning.

Vision participants suggested some additional types of housing needed by residents in the future — infill, duplexes, cottages, fourplexes, six-unit villas, traditional and courtyard rowhouses, along with apartments (four storey, six storey, and twelve storey). All these housing types would typically provide units at a lower cost than a new single family house. Excluding apartments, all would offer features similar to those of a single family house (e.g. ‘ground-orientation’). Many participants felt that alternative forms of tenure such as co-ops or co-housing should be pursued in new multi-family housing projects.
Addressing Possible Impacts of New Housing

Vision participants generally felt that there was a need for new housing types better suited to meeting future housing demands, and to reflect the diversity within the community. However, residents were concerned about impacts of additional housing such as parking demands, increased traffic, loss of neighbourhood character, and loss of privacy. Impacts on community facilities and amenities were also a concern. As a result, each proposal for a new housing type has been made conditional on an assurance that potential impacts would be addressed prior to changes in zoning to allow for new housing. In addition, there are a number of large sites (such as St. Vincent’s Hospital, the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’, and Little Mountain Housing) that could be subject to privately-initiated rezonings. Prior to approval of these large site rezonings, a broad review of community facility and service needs must be conducted. This is discussed in more detail in the LARGE SITES section of this Survey.

The Directions on new housing options which follow have been divided into two sections. The Directions first focus on several housing types. Then a variety of possible locations are described. Combining various options for new housing types and locations results in the potential for different numbers of new units.

15 New Housing Types

Infill

Description: A smaller second home on a lot, usually behind the main house. Also called a ‘coach house’ or ‘granny flat’. Units are usually strata-titled but may be rental. Usually the garage is on the main floor with the infill dwelling above. Size and height are regulated by zoning but they usually look like a small one and a half or two storey house located at the rear lane. On wider lots (50’ or more) it is possible to build infill while keeping the existing home. However, on smaller lots, the side yards of existing houses are often not wide enough to provide the required fire-fighting access. As a result, small lot infill is most feasible when built with a new main house.

Status: This housing type is already allowed in parts of RPSC (north of 20th and flanking Main from 16th to 28th). It has also been permitted for 20 years on lots 50’ or wider in Kitsilano (north of West Broadway), and in Mount Pleasant (east and south of City Hall).

Attractive to: Young people, small families, older singles and couples, and seniors who want access to a yard and are comfortable with stairs.

15.1 Allow More Infill

Approved

Housing variety should be increased in RPSC by allowing more infill housing than is currently permitted, provided it is:

- designed to fit into the single family area, with attention to privacy, views, shadowing and landscaping
- provided with adequate community facilities (parks, schools, etc.) and services for the additional population
- accompanied by a plan to address any parking and traffic impacts.

Percent Agree 61%/66%
More Planning & Consultation Before Changes

For Vision Directions proposing a new housing type or location, a rezoning would be required before the new housing could be built. More detailed planning with community involvement would take place before the rezoning occurred. This planning would deal with precise boundaries where new housing types would be permitted, phasing development over time, traffic and parking impacts, fire-fighting access, the need for additional services and facilities (including parks), developer contributions, etc.

An example of this process is provided by the Kensington-Cedar Cottage (KCC) Community Vision. The Community Vision contains Directions supporting duplexes, fourplexes, sixplexes, and rowhouses to address future housing needs. After the Vision was approved by Council, City staff refined these housing types with advice from a Housing Area Working Group (made up of local residents and property owners), architects, and local developers. Locations for new housing, zoning, design guidelines, and improvements to community connections and greening were also dealt with. In a subsequent community survey, residents and property owners supported building duplexes, ‘small houses’, and rowhouses. The Kinsway and Knight ‘Housing Area Plan’ has been approved by City Council, and the new zoning to allow the housing types has been adopted by City Council.

People’s Ideas...
- allow infill with no stairs and improve access especially for seniors
- can create more community in back lanes
- provides a less expensive housing option and retains neighbourhood character
- allows for aging in place
- allows community members to increase density of their own lots

Duplexes

Description: A duplex provides two units on a parcel of land. Each unit can be individually owned. Since each half of a duplex uses less land and is smaller than a new single family house, they are more affordable than a new single family home. The units may be side-by-side, front-to-back, or up-and-down. Duplexes provide many of the features of a single family home including yards, individual entrances, garages, and enough floorspace to meet the needs of a family.

Status: Duplexes are currently permitted on a few lots in RPSC and are common in other areas like Kitsilano (north of West Broadway).

Attractive to: Families, couples, and parents whose children have left home.

15.2 Allow More Duplexes

Approved

Housing variety should be increased in RPSC by allowing more duplexes than are currently permitted, provided they are:
- designed to fit into the single family area with attention to privacy, views, shadowing and landscaping
- provided with adequate community facilities (parks, schools, etc.) and services for the additional population
- accompanied by a plan to address any parking and traffic impacts.

Percent Agree 63%/69%

People’s Ideas...
- can be less expensive for small families
- allow suites in duplexes to improve affordability
- not suited for building on small lots

Cottages or Small Houses on Shared Lots

Description: Two or three 33’ lots developed together to accommodate between four and eight free standing homes. Units could be individually owned. The units facing the street would have shorter front yards (16’ versus the usual 24’) than a typical single family house. A walkway between the front units would provide fire-fighter access to the rear units. Rear units would be constructed over the area typically used for a garage and extend into the rear yard. A driveway from the lane could go between the rear units to a central ‘carriage court’ and a parking space for each front unit. Each cottage or small house would have an individual entrance, front porch, private outdoor space, and could range in size from about 1,000 to 1,700 square feet. They would provide many of the features of a single family home including free standing buildings and a size suitable for families.
**Status:** A new housing type in the city recently approved in the Kingsway and Knight ‘Housing Area Plan’

**Attractive to:** Especially attractive to families with children, two income couples, parents whose children have left home, and seniors who are comfortable with stairs.

15.3 Allow Some Cottages or Small Houses on Shared Lots

**Approved**
Housing variety should be increased in RPSC by allowing some small houses on shared lots, provided they are:
• designed to fit into the single family area with attention to privacy, views, shadowing and landscaping
• provided with adequate community facilities (parks, schools, etc.) and services for the additional population
• accompanied by a plan to address any parking and traffic impacts.

**Percent Agree 61%/65%**

People’s Ideas...
• could be affordable to first time buyers
• could increase positive use of lanes and potentially decrease crime
• work well in part of neighbourhood with larger than average lots
• keeps more green space and park like setting
• must provide adequate parking on-site
• need small houses for seniors

**Fourplex & Villa (six units)**

**Description:** Four to six strata-titled units on one 50’ lot or six units on two 33’ lots. A fourplex is a pair of front-to-back duplexes and would occupy the space usually filled by single family homes (e.g. same 24’ front yard depth). A path for fire-fighting access would connect from the street to the rear-facing units. A villa (with 6 units) would be similar, although two upper units (with roof decks/balconies) could be added. All units would feature separate ground access, and ground-level units all provide private outdoor space. All parking would be at the lane. Units would typically range from 1,100 to 1,200 square feet.

**Status:** A new type of housing in the city.

**Attractive to:** Smaller families, couples, and parents whose children have left home and seniors comfortable with stairs.

15.4 Allow Some Fourplexes & Villas (six units)

**Not Approved (Uncertain)**
Housing variety should be increased in RPSC by allowing some fourplexes and villas, provided they are:
• designed to fit into the single family area, with attention to privacy, views, shadowing and landscaping
• provided with adequate community facilities (parks, schools, etc.) and services for the additional population
• accompanied by a plan to address any parking and traffic impacts.

**Percent Agree 49%/53%**
People’s Ideas...
• well suited to a co-operative or co-housing form of shared ownership to create community and affordable housing options
• provides safe environment for young children
• best suited to areas with larger houses
• good access for seniors

Comment: This Direction did not receive majority support in the general survey, and did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.5 to 1, random survey: 2.0 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion when additional housing planning occurs in the community.

Traditional Rowhouses

Description: A single row of attached housing units with separate front and rear entrances. The homes may be individually owned or strata-titled. They usually have individual garages or parking areas on the lane. Front yards would have the same depth as a new single family house, building depth could be slightly longer. Each rowhouse unit would be about 15’ wide so that six would fit on an assembly of three 33’ lots. Each unit would have about 1,200 to 2,400 square feet of floorspace.

Status: RPSC has some existing row-house units. (Examples include the Little Mountain Housing (Main & 37th) and along 16th near Oak.)

Attractive to: Families with children, established couples, and seniors who could manage stairs.

15.5 Allow More Traditional Rowhouses

Not Approved (Uncertain)
Housing variety should be increased in RPSC by allowing more traditional rowhouses than are currently permitted, provided they are:
• designed to fit into single family area with attention to privacy, views, shading and landscaping
• located in select areas and built as small projects rather than as a wide-spread replacement for existing housing types
• provided with adequate community facilities (parks, schools, etc.) and services for the additional population
• accompanied by a plan to address any parking and traffic impacts.

Percent Agree 48%/52%

People’s Ideas...
• can lead to more interaction between neighbours, a more active streetscape
• need more private green space with less privacy
• must provide adequate parking on-site
• cheaper to build but risk to privacy

Comment: This Direction did not receive majority support in the general survey, and did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.6 to 1, random survey: 2.0 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion when additional housing planning occurs in the community.
Courtyard or Carriage Court Rowhouses

**Description:** Two rows of attached units, one row near the street and the other row near the lane, grouped around a common open space. The units would likely be strata-titled. Courtyard rowhouses would have parking for all units in a single row that backs directly onto the lane. Carriage court rowhouses have their parking integrated with each unit, requiring part of the courtyard for car movement. An assembly of three 33’ lots could accommodate up to nine units. Both types would have a pathway providing pedestrian/firefighter access to the rear units from the street.

Courtyard rowhouses would each have about 1,000 to 1,600 square feet of floorspace. The front yard would be shorter than for a typical single family house, varying from 12’ to 16’ (versus 24’). Building depth of front units would be less than for a new single family home. The courtyard would typically be about 30’ deep. Rear units would be built partly above the garage and partly in the area required for a rear yard in new single family homes. Carriage court rowhouses would be similar except the courtyard would be divided into private open space and maneuvering space for cars (which could be finished in pavers to make it more attractive).

**Status:** Both types would be new to the city.

**Attractive to:** Families with children, established couples, and seniors who are comfortable with stairs.

15.6 Allow Some Courtyard or Carriage Court Rowhouses

**Not Approved (Uncertain)**

Housing variety should be increased in RPSC by allowing some Courtyard or Carriage Court rowhouses, provided they are:

- designed to fit into single family area with attention to privacy, views, shadowing and landscaping
- located in select areas and built as small projects rather than as a widespread replacement for existing housing types
- provided with adequate community facilities (parks, schools, etc.) and services for the additional population
- accompanied by a plan to address any parking and traffic impacts.

**Percent Agree 47%/47%**

People’s Ideas...

- can lead to more interaction between neighbours, a more active streetscape
- need more private green space with less privacy
- must provide adequate parking on-site
- cheaper to build but risk to privacy

**Comment:** This Direction did not receive majority support in the general survey, or the random survey. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.5 to 1, random survey: 1.5 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion when additional housing planning occurs in the community.
Four Storey Apartments

**Description:** Four storey apartments generally feature smaller, lower cost units (than apartments of more than four storeys). Units may be rental or strata-titled. Each unit is usually on a single level and accessible by elevator.

**Status:** RPSC has existing four-storey apartments along Main, Cambie, Oak, and 16th.

**Attractive to:** People just entering the housing market, singles, small families, and seniors who are no longer willing or able to maintain a single family home and are uncomfortable with stairs.

15.7 Allow More Four Storey Apartments

**Not Supported**
Some additional four storey apartments should be permitted in RPSC, provided they are:

- designed to be compatible with adjacent residential and commercial buildings, with attention to privacy, views, shadowing, and landscaping
- located in select areas and built as small projects rather than as a widespread replacement for existing housing types
- provided with adequate community facilities (parks, schools, etc.) and services for the additional population
- accompanied by a plan to address any parking and traffic impacts.

**Percent Agree 38%/38%**

People’s Ideas...
- responds to displacement of singles and young households due to area gentrification
- has better ‘green footprint’
- apartment dwellers may use the car less and take more public transportation
- not appropriate in the middle of single family areas

**Comment:** This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes outnumbered agree votes in both the general and random surveys. Additional four storey apartments will not be brought forward for consideration when additional housing planning occurs in the community, except when under consideration in the planning for Neighbourhood Centres and Large Sites that have approved Vision Directions which support four storey buildings.

Six Storey Apartments

**Description:** Six storey apartments would offer a range of unit sizes and costs. Because of their increased height, some units would enjoy views. Each unit would usually be on a single level and accessible via elevator. Units may be rental or strata titled.

**Status:** RPSC has no six storey apartments and there is currently no standard zone where this type of apartment is intended to be built in the city.

**Attractive to:** People just entering the housing market, singles, small families, seniors who are no longer willing or able to maintain a single family home and are uncomfortable with stairs.

15.8 Allow Some Six Storey Apartments

**Not Supported**
Some six storey apartments should be permitted in RPSC, provided they are:

- designed to be compatible with adjacent commercial and residential buildings with attention to privacy, views, shadowing, and landscaping
- located in select areas and built as small projects rather than as a widespread replacement for existing housing types
- provided with adequate community facilities (parks, schools, etc.) and services for the additional population
- accompanied by a plan to address any parking and traffic impacts.

**Percent Agree 25%/25%**
Working at Home

Vision participants expressed a desire to see more opportunities for residents to work and conduct business from a residence. They spoke about needs for live/work housing, more home-based businesses and artist studio residencies. These ‘housing types’ are not included in the Survey because some of this type of activity is already allowed in RPSC. Initiatives are underway to review the expansion of these opportunities across the city, provided compatibility with adjacent neighbours is ensured. Once technical issues are resolved and further consultation takes place, zoning may change to allow more new, purpose-built live/work buildings.

People’s Ideas...
• use along major roads and at major intersections

Comment: This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes out numbered agree votes in both the general and random surveys. Six storey apartments will not be brought forward for consideration when additional housing planning occurs in the community.

Twelve Storey Apartments

Description: Twelve storey apartments could offer a range of unit sizes and costs. Because of their increased height, many units could enjoy views. Units may be rental or strata-titled. Each unit is usually on a single level and accessible by elevator.

Status: RPSC has no high-rise style apartments. This type of housing is common in parts of Kerrisdale, Collingwood, and South Granville (north of 16th).

Attractive to: People just entering the housing market, singles, small families, seniors who are no longer willing or able to maintain single family homes and are uncomfortable with stairs.

15.9 Allow Some Twelve Storey Apartments

Not Supported
Some twelve storey apartments should be permitted in RPSC, provided they are:
• located in select areas, and generally part of a major rezoning
• designed to be compatible with adjacent residential and commercial buildings, with attention to privacy, views, shadowing, and landscaping
• provided with adequate community facilities (parks, schools, etc.) and services for the additional population
• accompanied by a plan to address any parking and traffic impacts.

Percent Agree 20%/17%

People’s Ideas...
• use as points or ‘accents’ to create visual interest on main arterial roads
• provide higher density by Canada Line stations and decrease as you move toward single family areas

Comment: This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes out numbered agree votes in both the general and random surveys. Twelve storey apartments will not be brought forward for consideration when additional housing planning occurs in the community.

Any New Housing Types

This section describes the housing types which Vision participants felt would be attractive to existing RPSC residents as they age and their housing needs change. In order to get a clear reading of the number of people who are interested in some type of new housing in the community, this Direction asked if the respondent supported (somewhat or strongly) at least one of the housing types in Directions 15.1-15.9.

15.10 Any New Housing Types

Several new housing types have been described in this section. Did you support any of the new housing types (Infill, Duplexes, Small Houses or Cottages on Shared Lots, Fourplexes and Villas, Traditional Rowhouses, Courtyard or Carriage Court Rowhouses, Four storey Apartments, Six storey Apartments, or Twelve storey Apartments) in the Directions listed above?

Percent Supporting at least one type 59%/63%

Comment: This Direction is not classed as Approved because it refers to the previous Directions rather than asking a specific policy question. It is interesting that respondents under-reported their support for at least one housing type since 63%/69% supported Move Duplexes (15.2).
Seniors’ Housing

Long term community residents frequently want to stay in their neighbourhood as they age. They know the local shops and services, have friends in the community, and want to stay near their doctors and dentists. Vision participants suggested housing options which would allow older residents to stay in the community when they are no longer able or willing to look after a single family home. In addition to the housing types outlined in the previous Directions, options include additional traditional apartments and smaller scale seniors’ homes. These projects would be purpose-built for seniors and some would provide for different levels of care.

Youville seniors’ housing

15.11 Seniors’ Housing

Approved

Some small developments designed for seniors (e.g. assisted-living facilities with various levels of care) should be considered near parks, shopping, transit, services, and on ‘Large Sites’ (especially near the hospital facilities on Oak) to allow seniors to stay in the community as their housing needs change.

Percent Agree 81%/84%

People’s Ideas...

- need security and safety features
- locate close to shopping, services, community facilities, parks, health care facilities, community gardens
- provide some complexes where meals, supervision and/or care is included
- need units without stairs and some wheelchair accessible
- close to programs in neighbourhood houses and community centre

Seniors’ Housing Rezonings

The strong community support for Vision Direction 15.11 will likely lead to individual ‘site specific’ rezonings. That means when a group organizing housing for seniors finds a site, they would apply for rezoning to permit their project. On larger sites, there could be a component of purpose-built seniors housing mixed within housing for other household types. Each rezoning would require consultation with neighbours prior to being considered by City Council.

Independent Living BC (ILBC) Program

The province, through BC Housing, facilitates the Independent Living BC program in partnership with the federal government, regional health authorities, and the private and non-profit sectors. Seniors with lower incomes and people with disabilities are able to rent the ILBC units for 70 per cent of their after-tax income. This covers their accommodation, meals, personal care and hospitality services, such as housekeeping, laundry, recreational opportunities, and a 24-hour response system. BC Housing provides housing subsidies to those who qualify for the ILBC program and the health authorities fund the personal care services.

The province, through BC Housing, facilitates the Independent Living BC program in partnership with the federal government, regional health authorities, and the private and non-profit sectors. Seniors with lower incomes and people with disabilities are able to rent the ILBC units for 70 per cent of their after-tax income. This covers their accommodation, meals, personal care and hospitality services, such as housekeeping, laundry, recreational opportunities, and a 24-hour response system. BC Housing provides housing subsidies to those who qualify for the ILBC program and the health authorities fund the personal care services.

15.11 Seniors’ Housing

Approved

Some small developments designed for seniors (e.g. assisted-living facilities with various levels of care) should be considered near parks, shopping, transit, services, and on ‘Large Sites’ (especially near the hospital facilities on Oak) to allow seniors to stay in the community as their housing needs change.

Percent Agree 81%/84%
New Housing Locations

Vision participants also looked at the locations which were important for different types of households.

RPSC contains several large sites that will likely face redevelopment over the next 10 to 20 years. These include: RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ and St. Vincent’s Hospital on Heather and 33rd, the Balfour Block on Heather and 18th, King Edward Mall on Oak, and Little Mountain Housing on Main. Vision participants identified some form of new housing on each of these sites which is consistent with general City policy. Large sites would likely be redeveloped using a site-specific CD-1 (or comprehensive development) rezoning. A separate section on ‘LARGE SITES’ addresses housing forms and other aspects of redevelopment to guide future redevelopment on these important sites. King Edward Mall is addressed in NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES.

Outside of these ‘large sites’, the results of the Survey will be the first step in determining if and where new housing options should be considered in RPSC. For the general locations supported by the community, there will be a subsequent planning process involving significant public consultation before City Council considers any zoning change.

In each of the possible Directions listed below, the reasons Vision participants supported the location are given before the choice. Participants tended to support low scale ‘ground oriented’ housing when located in the midst of single family housing, and higher scale, higher density housing on or near arterial roads, or around the King Edward Canada Line Station, or north of the 41st Canada Line Station.

New Housing Types On Corner Lots or Irregular Subdivision Areas

Some Vision participants felt that new housing types should be limited to the ends of blocks (e.g., corner lots) or in situations where there is an irregular subdivision pattern (e.g., very wide or deep lots, or double-fronting lots). This option would:

- allow new forms to take advantage of direct access from the side street rather than only from the lane (for corner lots)
- allow a gradual change on large lots which would likely redevelop to larger homes under existing zoning
- provide housing in locations that would be attractive to families with children, working couples, and seniors
- larger lots would allow more courtyard or yard space for new housing types which place some units near the lane
- leave large areas of single family housing unchanged.

16.1 Allow New Housing Types on Corner Lots or Irregular Subdivision Areas

Approved

New housing types should be permitted in RPSC on corner lots or areas with irregular subdivision patterns like very long and/or wide lots, or double fronting streets, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation.

Percent Agree 57%/62%
New Housing Types Scattered Throughout the Single Family Areas

Another location proposed by Vision participants was a broad option: permitting new housing types throughout the single family areas, provided that the new housing was designed to be compatible with adjacent single family homes. The new housing could be limited to ‘clumps’ as small as one half block or to corner locations. Neighbourhoods would determine the types of housing which are suitable for their area. This option would:

- allow housing which is more affordable than single family housing in a wide variety of locations
- permit more existing owners to redevelop their properties with a housing form which would allow them to stay in their community as they age
- provide housing in locations attractive to families with children, working couples, and seniors
- allow people with different housing needs to live close together (e.g. parents and their grown-up children).

16.2 Allow New Housing Types to be Scattered Throughout the Single Family Areas

Not Approved (Uncertain)

New housing types should be permitted in scattered locations throughout the single family areas of RPSC, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation.

Percent Agree 45%/48%

Comment: This Direction did not receive majority support in the general survey, and did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.3 to 1, random survey: 1.5 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion when additional housing planning occurs in the community.

New Housing Types Around Parks & Community Centres

Parks are attractive to most people. Vision participants felt new housing in this location would be appropriate when the amount of private open space associated with the new housing types is limited. This option would:

- allow ready access to places to exercise for those living in small dwelling units
- be useful for children’s play which cannot be accommodated in smaller yards
- potentially make community gardens available through conversion from park
- leave large areas of single family housing unchanged.
16.3 Allow New Housing Types Around Parks & Community Centres

**Approved**
New housing types should be permitted around parks and community centers in RPSC, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation.

**Percent Agree 53%/57%**

**New Housing Types Around Richmond-Airport-Vancouver (Canada Line) Stations**

There are two Canada Line rapid transit stations along Cambie in RPSC: one at King Edward, and one at 41st. Both would be underground stations with entrances from the street, or possibly integrated into adjacent buildings. Vision participants envisioned adding a variety of new housing types around these stations. Some suggested that housing density should be highest near the Canada Line station and gradually become less dense as distance from the station increases.

**Canada Line Station at Cambie & King Edward**

A small, one-block shopping area and some four-storey apartments are located to the north of this station. Further north on Cambie is the larger shopping area between 16th and 19th which includes the Park Theatre. To the south of this station is the beginning of the Cambie Heritage Boulevard lined with single family homes. Single family homes surround the station area (within a five minute walking distance of about 250 meters).

Many participants suggested that the Canada Line stations are opportunities for new housing because of the proximity to transit, and the additional density would support the success of the line while leaving large areas of single family housing unchanged. Also, see NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES for comments and directions related to shopping areas around this Canada Line station.

16.4 Allow New Housing Types Around the King Edward Canada Line Station

**Approved**
New housing types should be permitted around the King Edward Canada Line station on Cambie, subject to detailed planning, and impact mitigation.

**Percent Agree 56%/59%**
Around Canada Line Stations

Canada Line Station at Cambie & 41st

North of this station, within the boundaries of RPSC, is a small, two-block shopping area with some duplex housing surrounded by single family housing. South of this station is the Oakridge Shopping Centre and the multi-family housing surrounding it. While the area south of 41st is outside RPSC’s boundaries, it is important to note that participants identified the entire Canada Line station area as a neighbourhood centre. They saw any future redevelopment of Oakridge Shopping Centre as having an impact both north and south of 41st, as well the development of the Canada Line station itself. They also recognized that additional housing here could also leave large areas of single family housing unchanged.

The Oakridge/Langara Policy Statement (1995) identified properties along the north side of 41st, from Willow to the lane east of Cambie, as a ‘reserve sub-area’. The intent for this ‘reserve sub-area’ was to encourage rezoning of full blocks (i.e. street to street) if a transit station was to be located nearby. Vision participants supported this policy and suggested several forms of new housing for this ‘reserve sub-area’.

16.5 Allow New Housing Types North of the 41st Canada Line Station

Approved
New housing types should be permitted north of the 41st Canada Line station on Cambie, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation.
Percent Agree 56%/59%

New Housing On or Near Arterial Roads

The final location suggested by Vision participants was to locate new housing on or near arterial roads (i.e., Oak, Cambie, Main, Fraser, 16th, King Edward, 33rd, and 41st). Higher density housing is already allowed in many locations along these arterial roads in RPSC. This location would:
• provide convenient access to transit for residents without cars
• provide convenient access by walking, biking or taking transit to shops and services, especially near the shopping areas
• support local shops and services with additional population
• may shield, to some extent, adjacent single family homes from the noise of arterial traffic as the new homes (with good construction practices like double-glazed windows) and their landscaping act as a buffer
• leave large areas of single family housing unchanged.
16.6 Allow New Housing On or Near Arterial Roads

*Not Approved (Uncertain)*

New housing types should be permitted on or near arterial roads in RPSC, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation.

**Percent Agree 56%/54%**

**Comment:** This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but was .6% short of the required support in the random survey to be classified as Approved (54.4%). In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (2.2 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion when additional planning occurs in the community.

---

**Support for New Housing in at least One Location**

The Directions above identify locations which Vision participants felt made sense for new housing to accommodate the changing needs of RPSC residents as they age. In order to get a clear picture of how many respondents supported new housing in any of the locations, this Direction asked if respondents supported at least one the locations in Directions 16.1 - 16.6.

**16.7 Support for New Housing in at least One Location**

Did you support consideration of new housing in any of the locations identified in the Directions above (Corner or Irregular Lots, Scattered Throughout the Single Family Area, Around Parks or Community Centres, Canada Line Station at King Edward, Canada Line Station at 41st, or On or Near Arterial Roads)?

**Percent Supporting at least one location 54%/59%**

**Comment:** This Direction is not classed as Approved because it refers to the previous Directions rather than asking a specific policy question. It is interesting that respondents under-reported their support for at least one housing location (57%/62% supported New Housing Types on Corner Lots or Irregular Subdivision Areas, Direction 16.1).
Housing affordability is a major concern in RPSC. Vision participants were concerned that housing is becoming unreachable for many in the community. This applies to all housing from rental apartments to single family housing. Some noted that rental suites are an important pool of affordable housing for many area residents. As the area redevelops many of the existing affordable rental suites could be lost or replaced (with less affordable suites). People should be able to stay in the community regardless of age or income. Participants felt that if a range of housing (market and non-market) is available then the rich texture of incomes, backgrounds, and occupations that characterize the community today will be maintained.

Housing Affordability

The affordability of market housing was a significant concern of Vision participants. They developed Vision Directions that include proposals for additional suites, infill, cottages, duplexes, fourplexes and sixplex villas, traditional and courtyard rowhouses, and apartments (of various heights). These Directions would allow housing that meets the changing housing needs of existing residents as they age: the children who grow-up and maintain their own household, and the couples who separate and become two households. The additional homes should be more affordable than new single family homes because they use the land more intensively and they are usually smaller. Increasing the supply of housing may also help moderate price increases.

New housing that is built in the normal development market — ‘market housing’ — is usually not affordable to lower income households, regardless of the type of housing it is. The City assists in providing more affordable ‘non-market housing’ for lower income households in a number of ways:

- leasing City land, in some cases at substantial discounts, to non-profit housing sponsors who build housing funded by the provincial government
- using housing agreements with developers, where they include lower cost or guaranteed rental suites in their market projects in return for additional density
- using funds from Development Cost Levies to assist in buying land or paying for housing units directly.

These non-market projects generally require a site specific rezoning, with community consultation taking place in each case.

New non-market housing directions did not emerge from the workshops but participants did want to reinstate federal/provincial government funding for non-market housing.

17.1 Housing Affordability

Approved

The City should urge federal/provincial governments to reinstate programs that fund non-market housing and to develop new initiatives that would make housing more affordable for low income households.

Percent Agree 59%/61%

People’s Ideas...

- provide more affordable housing options so those with low income can own
- need more low cost options
- provide affordable housing to welfare recipients and others who require assistance
- distribute non-market housing throughout the community
- provide non-market housing on large site redevelopments
Vancouver’s CityPlan contains directions to develop ‘neighbourhood centres’ to serve as the ‘heart’ of a community. Neighbourhood centres are places where people can find shops, jobs, neighbourhood-based services, public places that are safe and inviting, and places to meet with neighbours and join in community life. Centres may also cluster new housing for various ages and incomes. All this helps the environment by reducing the need to travel long distances from home to jobs and services.

Vision participants looked at five key shopping areas in Riley Park/South Cambie (RPSC): Main Street - 16th to 33rd; Fraser Street - 16th to 19th and King Edward to 28th; Cambie Street - 16th to 19th plus the Cambie/King Edward Canada Line Station; Cambie and 41st (including the Cambie/41st Canada Line Station); and Oak and King Edward (including the King Edward Mall).

Directions for Neighbourhood Centres are organized into two main parts. The first provides specific Directions related to the unique identity of each neighbourhood centre. The second deals with general Directions that apply to all neighbourhood centres. Finally, there are directions to limit expansion of major malls and ‘big box’ stores, and to expand business organizations.
Main Street

Vision participants saw Main Street from 16th to 33rd as an important shopping area and potential neighbourhood centre. They valued the ‘trendy’ fashion shops, artisan studios, restaurants, and antique stores which all contribute to the unique Main Street character. Participants wished to retain this character and suggested a review of the policies that affect Main Street, including the mixed-use zoning. They suggested improvements like adding to pedestrian comfort and safety, encouraging retail to wrap around some side streets, making lanes more lively, improving parking and upkeep, and providing opportunities for more housing to be built nearby.

18.1 Strengthen Important Shopping Area

Approved

The shopping area along Main Street between 16th and 33rd should be strengthened as a major neighbourhood shopping area and special community place.

Percent Agree 88%/91%

People’s Ideas...

• enhance Main and King Edward as the gateway to the shopping area
• keep Main as a special street
• make the area more pedestrian friendly, need to revitalize

18.2 Review Policy for Main Street

Approved

The unique character of Main Street’s shopping area should be retained and enhanced. The City should work with merchants, property owners, and residents to review existing zoning and other policies to identify possible changes that would better support Main Street’s character and role in the City.

Percent Agree 83%/85%

People’s Ideas...

• build on the history of the area to help develop a persona/character for Main Street
• create financial incentives to diversify retail uses

• have zoning that encourages a diversity of forms and uses
• have zoning which allows more flexible use of the ground and 2nd floor (i.e. light industry, artisans, boat builders)
• retain existing businesses and commercial diversity

18.3 Retain Character Buildings on Main Street

Approved

The retention of ‘character’ buildings on Main Street which are not on the Vancouver Heritage Register should be encouraged. There should be incentives to renovate and disincentives to demolish.

Percent Agree 77%/79%

People’s Ideas...

• preserve heritage structures like the Walden Building, Garlane Pharmacy, and the 21st and Main convenience store that has a floral mural
• use zoning incentives to retain and enhance heritage buildings
• use higher demolition fees as a disincentive to demolish character buildings

18.4 Encourage Retail to Wrap from Main Street onto Some Side Streets

Approved

Retail should be encouraged to wrap around corners from Main Street onto some side streets, where compatible with nearby residents. Landscaped areas for outdoor seating could be provided for use by adjoining businesses such as coffee shops, bakeries, and restaurants.

Percent Agree 75%/75%

People’s Ideas...

• allow retail to wrap around corners and create mini plazas especially where street intersections are off-set or on an angle
• create small shop and café alcoves off the main drag (e.g. Solly’s and Liberty Bakery)
C-2 ‘Mixed-use’ Zoning

C-2 zoning occurs along arterial streets throughout the city, including along Fraser, Main, Cambie, and Oak in RPSC. Generally, the zoning allows 4 storey residential/commercial ‘mixed-use’ projects or 4 storey, all commercial projects. Among the commercial uses permitted are grocery store, drug store, restaurant, furniture store, liquor store, recycling depot, motor vehicle dealer and repair shop, health care office, and social service centre. A recent C-2 zoning review led to changes which improve the look of the lanes, reduce over build of and improve privacy of the lanes, and improve the design of the street front. Height requirements also changed to allow higher ceilings for ground floor commercial spaces (and possibly higher ceilings for the residential floors above).

18.5 Make Commercial Lanes More Lively

Approved

Some shops along commercial lanes should be encouraged to enhance the shopping experience in the Main Street shopping area, subject to analysis of the impacts on adjacent residents, parking, and access to the adjoining commercial and residential uses (i.e. loading, parking, and servicing).

Percent Agree 66%/65%

People’s Ideas...
- put ‘cottage’ industries and live/work spaces in the lanes
- create pedestrian mews where businesses take over lanes
- like the ‘Flower Factory’ with its nursery out back

18.6 Add a Conventional Supermarket

Approved

Supermarkets are important ‘anchors’ for neighbourhood shopping areas. The City should encourage development of a conventional supermarket on Main Street.

Percent Agree 60%/59%

People’s Ideas...
- need a grocery store (e.g. Capers or Choices)
- consider incorporating a grocery store into a residential development (e.g. IGA on Burrard and Nelson)
- locate a grocery store south of 33rd, possibly in the redevelopment of Little Mountain Housing

18.7 Improve Bike Access on Main Street

Approved

Bike access to and through the Main Street shopping area should be improved, including consideration of Bikelanes on Main Street as part of a city-wide commuter network (this would be considered as part of a more detailed plan, to see if it fits with improvements for pedestrians, shoppers, and transit).

Percent Agree 60%/60%

18.8 Provide Additional Housing Near the Main Street Shopping Area

Approved

Main Street shopping area should become more of a neighbourhood centre by providing opportunities for more housing to be built nearby. Additional housing would bring people closer to where they shop or work, and would help support local shops and services. Housing types could range from more apartments around Main Street to more ground-oriented housing within walking distance of Main Street.

Percent Agree 60%/60%

People’s Ideas...
- encourage (through zoning) more mixed use developments with retail on bottom and residential above
- allow some townhouses and condominiums
- encourage new housing, residential mews like on Watson Street

19 Fraser Street

Participants saw the sections of Fraser Street from 16th to 19th and from King Edward to 28th as important neighbourhood shopping areas and potential neighbourhood centres. They saw this area in need of revitalization, but noted progress was being made as some new businesses were moving in. Assets include several popular small grocery and produce stores, and other local-serving and ethnic specialty shops. Problems included traffic speed and poor pedes-
trian crossings along Fraser Street, the narrowness of sidewalks, and the ‘un-friendly’ appearance of some buildings on Fraser Street.

19.1 Strengthen Important Shopping Areas

Approved
The shopping areas along Fraser Street between 16th and 19th and between King Edward and 28th should be strengthened as neighbourhood shopping areas and special community places.

Percent Agree 78%/75%

People’s Ideas...
• recognize Fraser as a very important commercial, social, and residential centre for ethnic groups (e.g. Filipino, Polish)
• protect location of niche businesses
• need more foot traffic to generate activity and attract shoppers
• need more than curb bulges and other improvements to attract businesses to Fraser

19.2 Add a Conventional Supermarket

Approved
Supermarkets are important ‘anchors’ for neighbourhood shopping areas. The City should encourage development of a conventional supermarket on Fraser Street.

Percent Agree 60%/60%

People’s Ideas...
• need a supermarket between 27th and 29th in the Kingsway area
• need a specialty grocery store (not too large)

19.3 Provide Additional Housing Near the Fraser Street Shopping Area

Approved
The Fraser Street shopping area should become more of a neighbourhood centre by providing opportunities for more housing to be built nearby. Additional housing would bring people closer to where they shop or work and would help support local shops and services. Housing types could range from more apartments around Fraser Street to more ground-oriented housing within walking distance of Fraser Street.

Percent Agree 56%/58%

People’s Ideas...
• build rowhouses with connections to shopping areas
• allow a variety of housing types
• design buildings to follow slope of land (e.g. King Edward and Fraser)
• keep and encourage more mixed use developments
• consider multi-family medium density residential development (e.g. rowhouses, small apartment buildings) on some blocks if designed to accommodate commercial or live/work uses at ground level

20 Cambie (16th-19th) & King Edward Canada Line Station

Participants saw Cambie Street from 16th to 19th as an important neighbourhood centre. Assets include the Park Theatre, a variety of restaurants, coffee shops, and supermarkets serving the area. Participants felt the scale of the shopping area and small store frontages added vitality to the street and promoted a pedestrian friendly environment. Some problems identified were traffic congestion and unsafe crossings along Cambie Street.
Building Lines

Building lines are an additional set-back used to preserve the future ‘right-of-way’ for street safety improvements, wider sidewalks, tree planting, or other purposes such as the introduction of a centre median. In many cases, building lines can be traced back to the 1929 ‘Plan for the City of Vancouver’ which included a Major Street Plan that identified major streets and capacities, and established building lines. These were modified in the 1940s, but have remained largely unchanged since the 1950s. When a development site is subject to a building line, building set-backs are measured from this line rather than the property line. These include the width and depth of required yards and building depth. This explains why some newer buildings on Cambie have been ‘set-back’ from adjacent, older buildings resulting in wider sidewalks on portions of the street.

Participants saw the shopping area at King Edward and Cambie (the site of the future Canada Line station) as a smaller scale shopping area. They suggested that new businesses should serve mainly local residents with some oriented to transit-users. Businesses should create more lively streets to help address potential safety issues associated with the Canada Line station. Creating a stronger pedestrian connection between the King Edward Canada Line station and the shopping area between 16th and 19th was also suggested.

20.1 Strengthen Important Shopping Area

Approved

The shopping area along Cambie Street between 16th and 19th should be strengthened as a major neighbourhood shopping area and special community place.

Percent Agree 86%/88%

20.2 Retain the Park Theatre (3440 Cambie)

Approved

The Park Theatre, built in 1930, is an important landmark and adds to the retail vitality of the Cambie Street shopping area. Efforts should be made to retain the theatre in its current location.

Percent Agree 87%/88%

People’s Ideas...
• important to keep the landmark ‘Park’ sign as it lights up the street
• have a local theater that people can walk rather than drive to
• retain the Park Theatre as it can act as a magnet to attract more restaurants and cafes, and brings activity and vitality to the street in the evenings

20.3 Encourage Retail to Wrap from Cambie Street onto Some Side Streets

Approved

Retail should be encouraged to wrap around corners from Cambie Street onto some side streets, where compatible with nearby residents. Landscaped areas for outdoor seating could be provided for use by adjoining businesses such as coffee shops, bakeries, and restaurants.

Percent Agree 71%/70%

People’s Ideas...
• encourage eating areas with outdoor patios around street corners
• increase soft landscaping on side streets
• relocate bike racks around corner
• encourage outdoor patios with eating areas to wrap around corner on to side streets

20.4 Add a Conventional Supermarket

Approved

Supermarkets (like the former Produce City Market) are important ‘anchors’ for neighbourhood shopping areas. The city should encourage a conventional supermarket to locate within the Cambie Street (16th to 19th) shopping area.

Percent Agree 58%/60%

People’s Ideas...
• work to retain markets like Produce City which help make it a ‘Village Centre’
• encourage affordable markets like ‘Thrifty’s Foods’ to locate in the area

20.5 Create a Landscaped Centre Median

Approved

Creation of a landscaped centre median on Cambie Street between 16th and King Edward should be considered, subject to more detailed design, and consultation with area residents, property owners, and merchants.

Percent Agree 56%/60%

People’s Ideas...
• create a landscaped median along Cambie and strengthen the pedestrian linkage between the new Canada Line station (at King Edward) and the shopping area from 16th to 19th
• make it easier to cross Cambie by having a treed centre boulevard
20.6 Provide Additional Housing Near the Cambie Street Shopping Area

**Approved**
The Cambie Street shopping area between 16th and 19th should become more of a neighbourhood centre by providing opportunities for more housing to be built nearby. Additional housing would bring people closer to where they shop or work, and would help support local shops and services. Housing types could range from more apartments around Cambie Street to more ground-oriented housing within walking distance of Cambie Street.

**Percent Agree 50%/58%**

People’s Ideas...
- increase residential density in the area by allowing more residential above retail
- increase density to promote walking, cycling and taking transit, and to support local businesses
- allow more mixed uses like live/work units along Cambie
- provide more housing for seniors around commercial area — easy accessibility to transit, shops, and services
- build affordable housing so young couples can live in the City

20.7 Retain Local-Serving Shopping Area at Canada Line Station

**Approved**
The commercial area along Cambie at King Edward should be a mainly local-serving shopping area and should not be expanded as a result of the Canada Line station.

**Percent Agree 65%/71%**

People’s Ideas...
- no additional shops at the Canada Line Station, keep it quiet and discrete
- keep as a ‘convenience shopping area’
- improve the pedestrian experience by making a comfortable link between the future Canada Line station at King Edward/Cambie and the principal shopping area between 16th and 19th

20.8 Provide Additional Housing Near the Canada Line Station

**Not Approved (Uncertain)**
The Cambie Street shopping area at King Edward should be enhanced as a local shopping/Canada Line station area by providing additional housing to bring people closer to where they shop or work, to support local shops and services, and to increase ridership on rapid transit. Housing types could range from more apartments around Cambie Street to more ground-oriented housing within walking distance of the new Canada Line station.

**Percent Agree 50%/53%**

People’s Ideas...
- keep a residential focus at the Cambie and King Edward Canada Line station
- consider higher density around the Canada Line station
- review urban design of Canada Line stations for opportunities to address scale, height, and massing

**Comment:** This Direction fell just short of receiving majority support in the general survey (49.9%), and did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.7 to 1, random survey: 2.4 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion when additional housing planning occurs in the community. Note that Direction 16.4 Allow New Housing Types Around the King Edward Canada Line Station was classified as Approved, the definition of those housing types will occur when additional housing planning occurs in the community.
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Cambridge (39th - 41st) and Canada Line Station

Participants focused on the commercial area on Cambie from 39th to 41st, but they saw the larger commercial area around Cambie and 41st as a major neighbourhood shopping area and future Canada Line station area. Assets include Oakridge Shopping Centre, several local-serving shops and services, and the Cambie Heritage Boulevard. Problems include traffic volume and speed, poor pedestrian connections, lack of landscaping and the 'unfriendly' appearance of some buildings on Cambie Street. Although Oakridge Shopping Centre is outside of the Vision area, RPSC residents are frequent visitors and Vision participants provided Directions on the proposed redevelopment of the mall.

21.1 Strengthen Important Shopping/Canada Line Station Area

Approved
The shopping area along Cambie from 39th to 41st should be retained and strengthened as a major neighbourhood shopping/Canada Line station area and special community place.
Percent Agree 78%/79%

21.2 Improve Building Design and Character

Approved
The character of the new buildings on Cambie Street from 39th to 41st should be improved through urban design. Building design should promote this area as a neighbourhood centre and Canada Line station area, and reflect the surrounding character of the community.
Percent Agree 77%/81%

3.3 Retain a Supermarket

Approved
The supermarket at Oakridge Shopping Centre is an important ‘anchor’ for the mall and vital asset to the community. The City, in consultation with the community, should ensure that inclusion of a supermarket is a condition of any future redevelopment of the mall.
Percent Agree 82%/87%

21.4 Ensure Public Involvement in the Oakridge Shopping Centre Redevelopment

Approved
Additions or changes to the Oakridge Shopping Centre should contribute to the Vision Directions for this area. The City should ensure the community is involved early (and often) in any significant redevelopment of Oakridge Shopping Centre in both identifying options and in refining specific aspects of the proposal.
Percent Agree 77%/81%

21.5 Provide Additional Housing Near Cambie and 41st Shopping Area/Canada Line Station

Approved
The Cambie and 41st shopping area should become more of a neighbourhood centre by providing opportunities for more housing to be built nearby. Additional housing would bring people closer to where they shop or work and would help support local shops and services, as well as increase ridership on rapid transit. Housing types could range from more apartments near the Canada

People’s Ideas...
• review urban design of Canada Line station — opportunity to address scale, height, and massing
• require Canada Line stations to reflect community character
• prevent ‘ugly’, ‘scary’ station atmosphere
• extend 40th west of Cambie to create a mid-block pedestrian mews
• utilize the median for Canada Line station access and energize the median at this location
Line station to more ground-oriented housing within walking distance of the station.

Percent Agree 60%/61%

People’s Ideas...
• create major nodes for shopping and housing at the Canada Line station
• allow height maximum of 3-5 storeys
• provide more multi-unit housing around the station
• consider higher density and high-rise apartments at Canada Line stations

22 Oak and King Edward (including King Edward Mall)

Participants saw the commercial area at Oak and King Edward as an important local shopping area. Assets include King Edward Mall, several local-serving shops and services, and the King Edward Boulevard. Problems include traffic volume and speed, poor pedestrian connections, and lack of landscaping.

King Edward Mall was built in 1970. This four acre site has been subdivided into three separate parcels, each independently owned. The existing CD-1 zoning on the site does not allow any residential uses to be added. Participants saw the Mall as a welcoming and friendly area for shopping and they valued the shops and services. Many felt the Mall site represented an opportunity for a mixed-use development by adding housing and relocating retail stores onto the King Edward frontage. Participants wanted to protect and enhance King Edward Boulevard, trees on surrounding streets, and the public views to the north. They also suggested some public benefits that might accompany any significant Mall redevelopment such as new public open spaces and community facilities like a youth centre or seniors’ facility.

22.1 Strengthen Important Shopping Area

Approved
Oak and King Edward, including the King Edward Mall and the surrounding commercial area, should be strengthened as a major neighbourhood shopping area and special community place.

Percent Agree 78%/78%

22.2 Provide Additional Housing Near the Oak and King Edward Shopping Area

Approved
Oak and King Edward should become more of a neighbourhood centre by providing opportunities for more housing to be built nearby. Additional housing would bring people closer to where they shop or work, and help support local shops and services. Housing types could range from apartments around Oak and King Edward to more ground-oriented housing within walking distance of the shopping area.

Percent Agree 57%/58%

People’s Ideas...
• provide a variety of housing types for a range of people (e.g. seniors, singles, low income, assisted living, etc.)
• allow infill in RS zones
• allow townhouses along Laurel and 26th

22.3 Provide Additional Housing in the King Edward Mall Redevelopment

Approved
The redevelopment of King Edward Mall should include additional housing, mainly above shops, in order to become more of a focus for the neighbourhood centre. Along with additional housing, there could be a greater variety of retail stores, and additional community facilities and amenities.

Percent Agree 56%/64%

People’s Ideas...
• provide a variety of housing types for a range of people (e.g. seniors, singles, low income, assisted living, etc.)
• encourage residential development on top of retail at King Edward Mall
• create opportunities for innovation in housing and development form
• pull building facades out to the street edge

22.4 Ensure Public Involvement in the King Edward Mall Redevelopment

Approved
Additions or changes to the King Edward Mall should contribute to the Vision Directions for this area. The City should ensure the community is involved early (and often) in any significant redevelopment of King Edward Mall in both identifying options and in refining specific aspects of the proposal.

Percent Agree 75%/75%

People’s Ideas...
• should create a sub-area plan first and conduct multiple levels of review

Building Height

Vision participants discussed a variety of building heights for the King Edward Mall redevelopment, and noted that in all cases new development should be subject to careful analysis of building design and neighbourliness. Often new development seeks additional height and density, and the City considers the request in return for providing additional park, open space, and additional community facilities or amenities for area residents. Existing buildings on the site are all one storey, although the Safeway building reaches a height similar to a two or three storey building.

22.5 Allow Buildings Up to Four Storeys on the King Edward Mall Site

Approved
Buildings on the King Edward Mall site should be low-rise (up to four storeys high). Where appropriate, lower heights should be required when creating a transition down to the lower heights of neighbouring houses, subject to analysis of views, privacy, shadowing and other impacts.

Percent Agree 54%/60%

22.6 Allow Buildings Taller Than Four Storeys on the King Edward Mall Site to Achieve Public Benefits

Not Supported
A carefully situated building, or limited number of buildings, taller than four storeys, should be considered on the King Edward Mall Site, if park, open space, or some other public benefits are provided. Building design and height would be subject to thorough analysis of views, privacy, shadowing, and other potential impacts.

Percent Agree 32%/31%

People’s Ideas...
• allow 4 storey buildings along King Edward but increase height towards the centre of the site
• allow up to 6 storeys along King Edward, or 6-8 storeys with careful design
• allow high-rise buildings on the King Edward Mall site

Comment: This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes outnumbered agree votes in both the general and random surveys. Buildings taller than four storeys on the King Edward Mall Site will not be brought forward for consideration when additional housing planning occurs at the site.

22.7 Consider Surrounding Area When Rezoning King Edward Mall

Approved
When planning the redevelopment of the King Edward Mall site, the potential for change in the surrounding area (single family and institutional areas, including Emily Carr Elementary) should also be considered.

Percent Agree 68%/74%

People’s Ideas...
• consider mixed-use development on Emily Carr
• allow infill in single family areas to add density and provide a transition to the higher density at King Edward Mall
• increase retail area on Oak from King Edward to 16th
• allow mixed-use (e.g. C-2) or multi-family housing on west side of Oak (south of King Edward)

22.8 Retain a Supermarket at King Edward Mall

Approved
The supermarket at King Edward Mall is an important ‘anchor’ for the shopping area. The City, in consultation with the community, should ensure that inclusion of a supermarket is a condition of any future redevelopment.

Percent Agree 84%/87%

People’s Ideas...
• retain food store as an ‘anchor’ — maximum 30,000 sq. feet
• integrate food store into a mixed-use development (e.g. Urban Fare)

23 General Directions for All Neighbourhood Centres

Vision participants suggested a number of different ways to enhance shopping areas. This section deals with general directions that apply to all neighbourhood centres.

23.1 Ensure Continuity of Shops and Services

Approved
In the shopping area, shops and services should be continuous along the ground floor of buildings. Ground floor frontage should not be interrupted by driveways, drive-throughs, parking lots, or building fronts and uses that are not ‘pedestrian friendly’.

Percent Agree 84%/83%

People’s Ideas...
• develop empty lot at 26th and Main as a park or garden
• infill Oakridge Mall plaza to the street to improve public/sidewalk domain
• discourage blank frontages – they are dead space at night (e.g. banks)

23.2 Provide a Range of Shops and Services

Approved
There should be a wider range of localserving shops and services in the shopping areas. Additional auto-oriented services (e.g. gas stations, auto repair) should be discouraged.

Percent Agree 81%/79%

People’s Ideas...
• encourage artisan/clothier retail studios and manufacturing of products on Main
• need new retail anchors to redevelop vacant site at King Edward/ Fraser and Fraser/17th (e.g. Tim Horton’s, Literacy Centre, London Drugs)
• provide more diverse retail services at Cambie and 41st/Canada Line station
• intensify the mix of commercial/office and medical office/service uses at King Edward Mall
• keep mixed use and encourage a range of shops and services, including more multi-cultural businesses that have a local draw (e.g. weekend farmers market, larger hardware store, seafood shop, produce markets on Main)

23.3 Improve Pedestrian Comfort and Safety

Approved
It should be easier and safer for pedestrians to move along and cross major streets, and the condition of sidewalks should be improved.

Percent Agree 89%/92%

People’s Ideas...
• install pedestrian light at Brock School
• slow down traffic and repair sidewalks on Main and Fraser
• narrow the street with curb bulges on Fraser from 16th to 27th
• install pedestrian light at Fraser at 31st, Cambie at 40th, and Cambie at 17th
• use subways to get across Cambie and 41st for pedestrians
• ensure that pedestrian, cyclists and bus connections to Canada Line stations are well designed
• improve pedestrian and bicycle access to Oakridge Shopping Centre
• repair crosswalk at Laurel and King Edward
• reduce scale of the Oak and King Edward intersection, make it more pedestrian and cyclist friendly, and ensure generous sidewalks

23.4 Provide Convenient Parking

Approved

Convenient short-term parking, including curbside parking, should continue to be available for customers to help keep the retail viable and reduce impacts on neighbours. Opportunities for more customer parking in lanes should be investigated.

Percent Agree 80%/85%

People’s Ideas...
• retain parking on both sides of the street at all times, it improves business, makes sidewalks safer and walking from the back lane is very difficult
• provide some customer parking in lanes
• keep pay parking so people park to use local stores not to commute downtown

Possible improvements: more planting, pedestrian comfort, and safety

• allow diagonal parking on Fraser (narrow street by one lane)
• provide more parking and a larger drop-off area around Park Theatre for their patrons
• preserve parking for residents around the core Canada Line station area and provide additional parking near station
• keep surface parking at King Edward Mall as it is good for seniors and people with children

23.5 Create More Attractive Areas

Approved

The appearance of the shopping area should be improved through efforts of private owners and the City (e.g. create outdoor patios, banners, special lighting, bike racks; public notice boards/directory; special paving, drinking fountains). Special effort should be made to encourage public art projects on Main Street.

Percent Agree 86%/88%

People’s Ideas...
• encourage ‘art walk’ activities (The Drift), walking tours, etc. on Main
• get neighbours involved in creating sidewalk art and images (e.g. community art projects), especially along Main
• initiate a street beautification program to strengthen the shopping areas
• improve standards of old buildings and the look of building facades
• need community gathering places — create a small plaza at some intersections
• provide public art money for murals on commercial buildings
• encourage businesses and shops to have more inviting storefronts and window displays
• maintain the pedestrian friendly scale (e.g. step back 2nd/3rd storey) and provide benches, banners and pedestrian lighting
• remove graffiti on vacant stores/buildings immediately
• create open spaces with seating, and provide drinking fountains, public washrooms, etc. on Oak and King Edward

23.6 Protect and Enhance Street Trees/Greening

Approved
Street trees and landscaping contribute to the pleasant character of a street, as well as bringing visual consistency. Existing trees should be kept and maintained, wherever possible. Their impact should be enhanced by adding trees where they are missing as well as in new corner bulges on side streets. Use a variety of strategies to increase the ‘greening’ of shopping areas.

Percent Agree 88%/91%

People’s Ideas...
• need more street trees on Cambie along commercial frontage
• encourage green space improvements (especially near 16th and Fraser) with programs such as Blooming Boulevards and Greenways
• add landscaping and ‘green-up’ the lane behind Fraser commercial
• improve Oak and King Edward boulevards by planting more trees with colour
• encourage more flower boxes around trees, hanging baskets as well as shrubs (beautifies street and adds to pedestrian pleasure)

23.7 Control Sidewalk Merchandise and Displays

Approved
Merchandise displays and sandwich boards on the sidewalk add vitality and interest to the street, but the amount of sidewalk they take up should be limited. They should leave enough room for pedestrians (including wheelchairs and strollers) to pass each other, and should leave more sidewalk space at bus stops and crosswalks where more people gather. The limit should be enforced.

Percent Agree 71%/73%

People’s Ideas...
• encourage sidewalk displays (e.g. Flower Factory on Main)
• enforce bylaws to limit business displays (e.g. sandwich board signs and clothing racks) that impede pedestrian traffic

23.8 Provide Continuous Weather Protection

Approved
There should be continuous weather protection for shoppers in the form of canopies or awnings. Awnings should be designed to look attractive and ensure the sidewalk does not become dark and uninviting.

Percent Agree 62%/68%

People’s Ideas...
• provide boulevard weather protection at 41st and at 40th
• make awning for weather protection deep enough to cover entire sidewalk
• do not allow advertising on awnings, makes awnings look too busy
• ensure some character guidelines for awnings and canopies

23.9 Provide Cleaner Places

Approved
Sidewalks, gutters, lanes, parking lots, storefronts, garbage areas, and loading bays should be kept cleaner and maintained better by both private businesses and the City.

Percent Agree 91%/95%

People’s Ideas...
• make businesses such as The Grind and McDonald’s take more responsibility for the litter they create
• empty overflowing garbage bins in front of the TD Bank at 18th and Cambie (problem on the weekends)
• ensure future Canada Line stations are kept free of litter and graffiti
• install more garbage cans and provide incentives to businesses to clean-up litter and garbage
• clean up vacant buildings and empty lots as well as graffiti and posted flyers
24 Business Associations or BIAs

Business associations are formed by business and property owners in shopping areas. They can also apply to the City to become a Business Improvement Area (BIA). Through a BIA, each commercial property owner pays into a fund that is administered by the BIA and used to benefit the shopping area through promotion, crime prevention, beautification, etc. The City has a staff person to assist in forming associations and BIAs. At present there are no BIAs in RPSC.

24.1 Business Associations or BIAs

Approved

Business Associations and BIAs should be encouraged, with organizational assistance from the City. They should be involved, together with residents, in promoting shopping in their areas and organizing services and activities to attract shoppers.

Percent Agree 66%/66%

People’s Ideas...

• form a BIA for Cambie shopping area — need an identity and name for it
• hold a community promotion event for Cambie area
• encourage businesses on Fraser Street to form a BIA
• ensure that Main Street BIA is developed; the business community on Main is ripe for establishing a BIA

25 Shopping Malls & ‘Big Box’ Stores

Shopping malls are clusters of stores in one development where the stores face inside instead of onto a public street. Malls come in various sizes from quite small (e.g. Il Mercato at Commercial and First) to very large (e.g. Oakridge Shopping Centre). They may be on one or several levels. The bigger the shopping mall, the larger its ‘trade area’ — the distance from which it draws customers.

Under current zoning, internal malls can theoretically locate anywhere in the C-2 zoning that lines the city’s arterial streets. Although few sites are large enough, new sites could be assembled.

There are also different types and sizes of ‘big box’ store. Some are very large and sell a wide range of goods, some specialize in particular types of goods, and are smaller. All these stores draw their customers from a very large trade area. The City has permitted some ‘big box’ stores (usually through rezonings), but has recently adopted policies that restrict these rezonings to portions of Grandview Highway and the Marine Drive frontages. If the ‘big box’ stores are to sell food or clothing, a retail impact study is required. Some smaller specialty ‘big box’ stores have recently located on existing C-zoned strips: Future Shop, Office Depot, Toys R Us, and Mountain Equipment Co-op are all on central Broadway (Oak to Main). Participants in the Vision process acknowledged that existing malls and ‘big box’ stores provide shopping choices for consumers, but were opposed to additional projects, believing they would work against neighbourhood shopping in RPSC.

25.1 Restrict Additional Major Malls or ‘Big Box’ Stores

Approved

Additional major shopping malls, and ‘big box’ stores which sell groceries, clothing, and other daily needs, should not be permitted to locate where they will harm the economic health of the local shopping areas in RPSC.

Percent Agree 72%/72%

People’s Ideas...

• restrict ‘big box’ stores which discourage local purchases, encourage traffic (e.g. Walmart)
• consider ‘big box’ on Cambie north of 41st – with roof top parking (e.g. Mountain Equipment Co-op)
• permit no large format stores (e.g. Home Depot)
25.2 Permit Specialty ‘Big Box’ Stores

Not Supported
Some smaller specialty ‘big box’ outlets (e.g. electronics, toys, pets) might act as positive anchors or attractions if they are located in RPSC’s existing shopping areas. They should be considered if they are designed to fit properly.
Percent Agree 47%/41%

People’s Ideas...
• allow specialty ‘big box’, but not on ground level (i.e. 2nd floor retail like Future Shop on Broadway and Pine)

Comment: This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes outnumbered agree votes in the general survey. Specialty ‘Big Box’ Stores will not brought forward for consideration in further planning.

26 Small Commercial Areas in RPSC

There are several small commercially zoned sites which serve as smaller shopping areas for local residents living in RPSC. These small shopping areas include Oak and 16th, Oak and 41st, and Main and 41st. The C-1 zoning on these parcels allows a mixture of commercial and residential uses. Many participants felt that these sites should continue to provide ground floor commercial uses (such as retail) to cater to the needs of a local neighbourhood. They also felt that improvements could be made to bring in a wider range of local serving shops and services to the areas.

26.1 Support Small Commercial Areas

Approved
The City should continue to support the mixed use/local serving role of C-1 zoned sites in RPSC to meet the neighbourhood shopping needs.
Percent Agree 81%/83%

People’s Ideas...
• liven up the Oak and 16th area with more variety of shops
• keep mixed use developments around these small shopping areas
• ask business owners to maintain trees in front of their stores
• provide more corner stores so there is no need to get into the car to buy milk
Riley Park/South Cambie (RPSC) has several large sites (a full city block or more) that could redevelop within the next 20 years and bring significant change to the community. Some large sites, like TransLink’s Bus Yard on 41st, and Women’s and Children’s Hospital on Oak, already have Council-approved redevelopment policies so future development is more predictable. Most other large sites have no underlying policy or plan to help guide redevelopment. The large sites considered in the RPSC Vision process are:

- RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ – 37th and Heather (3 parcels - 21 acres total)
- St. Vincent’s Hospital – 749 West 33rd (7.5 acres)
- Balfour Block – 18th to 19th and Laurel (2.5 acres)
- Little Mountain Housing – 5299 Main (15 acres)
- King Edward Mall – Oak and King Edward (3 parcels - 4 acres total)

What kinds of uses should be permitted on these large sites? Large site redevelopment represents a key opportunity to act on CityPlan’s housing Direction to increase housing variety in neighbourhoods, and Vision participants supported a variety of market housing on each of the large sites. Additional housing on these large sites could lessen the need to find opportunities for new housing types in existing single family areas. This is consistent with the CityPlan Direction of retaining the low-scale nature of these neighbourhoods. Based on this, no new ‘Vision Direction’ seeking support for market housing on the large sites is proposed. Instead the Vision provides Direction on the introduction of other uses (in addition to market housing) on the large sites.

The following Directions on large site redevelopment are divided into two sections. First, some general Directions that apply to all large sites as they redevelop. Next, more specific Directions for each large site, except for King Edward Mall (see the NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES section for specific Directions regarding King Edward Mall).
27 General Directions for All Large Sites

Community Facilities and Amenities

Given the size and number of large sites, Vision participants expressed concern about impacts from new residents, visitors, and employees on existing and proposed community facilities and amenities. The transit improvements on Cambie and Main, and new community facilities at Riley Park could hasten new development which could outpace, and perhaps over-stress, existing and proposed facilities.

Participants noted that because these sites are large, there is potential to secure additions to, or add new, community facilities and amenities as a condition of rezoning approval. A broad review of community facility and amenity needs would greatly assist in the rezoning negotiation process.

27.1 Conduct a Community Facilities and Amenities Review

Approved

A broad review of existing and future needs for community facilities and amenities within (and nearby) RPSC should be conducted. To assist with the rezoning negotiation process, this review should be conducted prior-to, or in-tandem with, the first rezoning of an entire large site in RPSC.

Percent Agree 82%/80%

People’s Ideas...
• phase in development and require public benefits
• preserve existing benefits and create extra benefits if there is an increase in density
• ensure redevelopment benefits everyone and enhances the community as a whole

Non-market, Affordable, and Special Needs Housing on Large Sites

Vision participants identified the need to provide housing that better matches the diverse needs of the community. Many participants suggested that the large sites provide opportunities to increase the availability of affordable and non-market housing. Special needs housing, especially for seniors and those with mobility or health challenges, was strongly supported.

27.2 Provide Non-market, Affordable, and Special Needs Housing on Large Sites

Approved

Non-market, affordable, or special needs housing should be integrated with the redevelopment of each large site, and could include family and seniors’ housing, accessible units, or care facilities mixed with market housing or other uses on the site.

Percent Agree 66%/66%

People’s Ideas...
• provide more affordable and special needs housing
• develop seniors’ housing right away with three levels of care (independent, assisted, hospice)

Environmentally Sustainable Development on Large Sites

Vision participants noted opportunities to attain a higher level of environmental sustainability in new development on large sites by using a variety of ‘green strategies’. Some strategies are already part of City policy and development practices (e.g. Greenways, Bikeways, mixed-use development). Some are still evolving, such as new building technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The City has already adopted new building standards for its own facilities, and for the future neighbourhood of South East False Creek (home of the 2010 Olympic Athletes’ Village). Participants felt this experience could be applied to redevelopment of large sites in RPSC.
27.3 Require Environmentally Sustainable Development on Large Sites

**Approved**

Each large site in RPSC should achieve the highest level of environmental sustainability possible by incorporating explicit ‘green strategies’ in redevelopment plans, especially related to greenhouse gas emissions.

**Percent Agree 81%/83%**

People’s Ideas...
- encourage green roofs and/or extensive roof gardens
- use green strategies for conservation of energy, water, and landscaping (e.g. solar heating)
- maintain existing mature trees and landscaping
- provide space for community gardens

Traffic and Parking Analysis and Neighbourhood Traffic Mitigation

Vision participants identified traffic and parking impacts as key issues in large site redevelopment. They identified a need for analysis of both the off-site impacts of additional traffic, and the on-site arrangements for circulation, parking, and loading. Participants offered a variety of possible solutions to mitigate or reduce neighbourhood impacts and address on-site demands.

27.4 Conduct a Traffic and Parking Analysis and Provide Neighbourhood Traffic Mitigation for Large Sites

**Approved**

An analysis of potential parking and traffic impacts from the redevelopment of each large site in RPSC should be conducted, and mitigation measures that address these impacts within the surrounding neighbourhood (e.g. local traffic calming) should be provided.

**Percent Agree 83%/87%**

People’s Ideas...
- discourage shortcutting, keep traffic orientation toward arterial streets
- need more parking if density is increased, hide parking underground
- install corner bulges and create strong pedestrian connections around the sites

Public Involvement in Large Site Redevelopment

Significant redevelopment of large sites in RPSC will require rezoning. The rezoning process typically uses a variety of means (e.g. mail-outs, open houses, meetings) to involve nearby residents and the public. Vision participants felt the public should be involved early in planning for the large sites. They spoke of the need for ongoing and meaningful involvement to ensure that residents’ interests are reflected in the development proposals. Participants put particular emphasis on the need to engage the resident tenants of Little Mountain Housing to ensure their voices and interests are included.

27.5 Ensure Public Involvement in Large Site Redevelopment

**Approved**

Each large site redevelopment in RPSC should involve the community, particularly residents and tenants of those sites, early (and often) in identifying options and in refining the proposal.

**Percent Agree 83%/86%**

People’s Ideas...
- consult residents in the planning of the developments
- consult stakeholders, residents on the site, and those who live adjacent to the site
- ensure the public feels that they have been consulted and sees the results of their input
The RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ consists of three sites occupied by three principal buildings. The ‘Fairmont Academy’ building at 4949 Heather is used for training and general offices. It has a federal heritage designation and is also on the City’s Heritage Register which lists pre-1940 buildings that have particular historical or architectural significance. The ‘Administration’ building at 657 West 37th is used as a RCMP headquarters and also has a federal heritage designation. It is not on the City’s Heritage Register, but is on its ‘recent landmarks/post 1940s inventory’. The ‘Operations’ building at 5255 Heather is not recognized on any federal or City register or inventory.

The total area of the RCMP sites is almost 21 acres. The federal government’s Department of Public Works manages the site and is seeking relocation of the RCMP offices. If the federal government does not find another use for the site, it would be offered for sale at market value (in priority order) to the province, the City, and the general public (i.e. private developer). The amount of existing development on the RCMP sites is relatively low in relation to the size of the sites.

Vision participants valued the ‘Fairmont Academy’ heritage building and the landscaped, open space surrounding it. Participants made suggestions for a limited mix of non-residential uses, building heights, and retention of heritage and character buildings. Participants also suggested public benefits such as open space, public access through the site, community gardens, and re-using existing buildings for community facilities (e.g. for a library or seniors’ centre).

28.1 Consider Institutional, Cultural, and Recreational Uses on the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ Site

Approved

Limited institutional, cultural, or recreation uses (e.g. seniors’ centre, community facilities, daycare) should be considered on the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ site (see map for Direction 28.6). New office or retail uses should not be considered when redeveloping this predominantly residential site. Any additional uses should be subject to analysis of traffic, parking and access, and other potential impacts.

Percent Agree 76%/77%

People’s Ideas...

- restrict commercial, office, retail, or school uses on the site
- encourage community-oriented uses, including those for children

Heritage and Character Buildings

Vision participants identified the need to retain the ‘Fairmont Academy’ building at 4949 Heather. Existing City policy already provides incentives (e.g. density bonuses, relaxations of regulations) for retention of this building. Participants also suggested retaining the ‘Administration’ building at 657 West 37th and the ‘Operations’ building at 5255 Heather.

28.2 Retain the ‘Administration’ building at 657 West 37th

Not Approved (Uncertain)

The ‘Administration’ building at 657 West 37th should be retained in the redevelopment of the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ site.

Percent Agree 49%/47%

Comment: This Direction did not receive majority support in the general survey, and did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In both surveys, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 2.9 to 1, random sur-

vey: 2.8 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion when additional planning occurs on the site.

28.3 Retain the ‘Operations’ building at 5255 Heather

Not Approved (Uncertain)
The ‘Operations’ building at 5255 Heather should be retained in the redevelopment of the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ site.
Percent Agree 37%/37%

Comment: This Direction did not receive majority support in the general survey, and did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.6 to 1, random survey: 1.7 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion when additional planning occurs on the site.

Building Height

Vision participants discussed a variety of building heights and noted that in all cases, new development should be subject to careful analysis of building design and neighbourliness. Often new developments seek additional density and height, and the City considers the request if it includes park, open space, and additional community facilities or amenities for area residents. Existing buildings on the site range from approximately four to six storeys high, but existing zoning does not specify maximum building height. In such cases, the City typically considers redevelopment of some new buildings to a similar height as the existing buildings.

28.4 Allow Buildings Up to Four Storeys on the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ Site

Approved
Buildings on the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ site should be low-rise (up to four storeys high). Where appropriate, lower heights should be required when creating a transition down to the lower heights of neighbouring houses, subject to analysis of views, privacy, shadowing, and other potential impacts.
Percent Agree 50%/51%

People’s Ideas...
• allow a maximum of four storeys for new development
• develop with low-rise, ground-oriented townhouses

28.5 Allow Buildings Taller Than Four Storeys on the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ Site to Achieve Public Benefits

Not Supported
A carefully situated building or limited number of buildings, taller than four storeys, should be considered on the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ site, if park, open space, or other public benefits are provided. Building design and height should be subject to a thorough analysis of views, privacy, shadowing, and other potential impacts.
Percent Agree 30%/34%

People’s Ideas...
• allow six to eight storeys
• allow up to twelve storeys

Comment: This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes outnumber agree votes in both the general and random surveys. Buildings taller than four storeys on the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ Site will not be brought forward for consideration when additional planning occurs on the site.

28.6 Consider Rezoning the Area Adjacent to the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ Site

Not Approved (Uncertain)
The single family area on Willow (33rd to 37th – see Map for details) adjacent to the RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ site should also be considered for possible zoning changes when planning for this large site redevelopment.
Percent Agree 50%/51%
Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but did not receive the required support in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (3.0 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion in further planning.

29 St. Vincent’s Hospital Site

St. Vincent’s Hospital opened in 1939 and became a Providence Health Care facility in 1997. In March 2004, St. Vincent’s acute care services were transferred to Mount St. Joseph’s and St. Paul’s hospitals. The residential care unit and Urgent Care were also closed. Providence Health Care has developed a ‘community campus of care’ concept for redevelopment of this 7.5 acre site on the north-east corner of 33rd and Heather. The ‘campus’ concept would include a range of services designed to support healthy aging, together with independent living, complex residential care, rehabilitative services, palliative care, and ambulatory programs. Continuation of care-based, institutional uses on the St. Vincent’s site is supported by City policy.

Vision participants noted this site’s central location and its important role in serving the community. Participants supported redevelopment for more care-based, institutional uses, especially for seniors and the disabled. However, they wanted limits on new commercial or retail uses. A range of building heights was discussed noting that development should respect surrounding scale, views, and the sloping topography. Public benefits suggested by participants included community facilities, public access through the site, open space, and community gardens.

29.1 Limit Office and Retail Uses on the St. Vincent’s Hospital Site

Approved

New office and retail uses should be considered in the redevelopment of the St. Vincent’s Hospital site, but limited to supporting other uses (e.g. gift or coffee shop), and subject to analysis of traffic, parking and access, and other potential impacts.

Percent Agree 69%/69%

People’s Ideas...
• provide a small local retail for seniors in new buildings

29.2 Consider Other Institutional, Cultural, or Recreational Uses on the St. Vincent’s Hospital Site

Approved

New institutional, cultural, or recreation uses (e.g. seniors’ centre, community facilities, daycare, schools) should be considered in the redevelopment of the St. Vincent’s Hospital site, subject to
analysis of traffic, parking and access, and other potential impacts.

**Percent Agree 75%/76%**

People’s Ideas...
- keep hospital use and provide three levels of seniors’ care: independent, assisted, and hospice
- Seniors’ care with possible kindergarten

**Building Height**

Vision participants discussed a variety of building heights and noted that in all cases, new development should be subject to careful analysis of building design and neighbourliness. Often new developments seek additional density and height and the City considers the request if it includes park, open space, and additional community facilities or amenities for area residents. Existing buildings range from four to eight storeys (the tallest is the original hospital building on the south-east corner of the site). However, existing zoning does not specify maximum building height. In such cases, the City typically considers redevelopment of some new buildings to a similar height as the existing buildings.

**29.3 Allow Buildings Up to Four Storeys on the St. Vincent’s Hospital Site**

**Approved**

Buildings on the St. Vincent’s Hospital site should be low-rise (up to four storeys high), except for new buildings replacing the original hospital building (south-east corner at 33rd and Heather) which could be built up to approximately eight storeys.

**Percent Agree 61%/69%**

People’s Ideas...
- design should complement the existing single family area and should not look too institutional
- keep to two or three storey scale of development

**29.4 Allow Additional Taller Buildings on the St. Vincent’s Hospital Site to Achieve Public Benefits**

**Not Supported**

A carefully situated building or limited number of buildings, taller than four storeys, should be considered on the remainder of the St. Vincent’s Hospital site (outside the area occupied by the original eight storey hospital building), if park, open space or other public benefits are provided. Building design and height should be subject to thorough analysis of views, privacy, shadowing, and other potential impacts.

**Percent Agree 38%/38%**

People’s Ideas...
- provide a mix of low and high-rise buildings
- allow four to eight storey buildings
- allow up to twelve storey buildings

**Comment:** This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes outnumbered agree votes in both the general and random surveys. Additional buildings - taller than four storeys - on the St. Vincent’s Hospital Site will not be brought forward for consideration when additional planning occurs on the site. Except as provided for replacement of the original hospital building described in approved Direction 29.3
Balfour Site

The Balfour site, bounded by 18th, Laurel, 19th, and the lane east of Oak, was developed in 1954 by Balfour Properties for rental duplexes. This 2.5 acre site is currently developed to a lower density than what the existing duplex zoning allows. Previous plans for subdivision and redevelopment of this site were controversial and eventually abandoned. There are no current plans to redevelop this site.

Vision participants valued the affordable, family-oriented rental provided by the existing housing on the site. They felt that new, non-residential uses were not appropriate for the site and that new development should respect the scale of the surrounding single family housing. Some new housing types were suggested and the need for better utilization of on-site open space was identified. Limited public benefits were identified, and some participants suggested that even if extra public benefits (e.g. social housing) were offered in return for extra density, no additional building height should be allowed.

30.1 Restrict Mixed Use on the Balfour Site

Approved

New commercial or retail uses should not be considered in any redevelopment of the Balfour site.

Percent Agree 64%/64%

People’s Ideas...
• should be single family or duplex, no medium or high-rise development
• do not allow commercial or office uses
• allow traditional and/or courtyard rowhouses

Building Height

Vision participants felt that if this site is redeveloped, building height should be in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood. Existing zoning on the site allows for 2 storey buildings and up to 30 feet in height. Neighbouring single family zoning allows 2 and one-half stores and heights up to 35 feet.

30.2 Limit Buildings to Three Storeys on the Balfour Site

Approved

Buildings on the Balfour site should be limited to three storeys, and about 35 feet, subject to analysis of views, privacy, shadowing, and other potential impacts.

Percent Agree 69%/70%

People’s Ideas...
• maintain existing height
• keep height low at 2 to 4 storeys
• ensure building form is in keeping with the neighbourhood

Little Mountain Housing

Little Mountain Housing is the city’s oldest social housing project, built in 1954. It occupies over 15 acres and currently provides 224 units for singles, couples, families, and seniors. Vision participants highly valued the affordable, non-market, family-oriented housing at Little Mountain, and they noted the many advantages of the site’s location. During the Vision process BC Housing gained ownership of the land and buildings from the federal government. The site’s density was lower than what the apartment zoning would allow (i.e. four storey apartment buildings).

31

Vision participants considered various aspects of site redevelopment. Participants made suggestions regarding replacement of all non-market units, tenant relocation assistance, additional
affordable and special needs housing (e.g. seniors, disabled, or special care needs), non-residential uses (e.g. retail, commercial), and building heights. They identified potential public benefits such as open space, public access through the site, daycare, seniors’ centre, and library. Participants also felt that the single family and apartment area immediately adjacent to the Little Mountain Housing site should also be considered for possible change.

Little Mountain Housing

31.1 Maintain Non-market Housing Units and Provide Tenant Relocation Assistance

Approved
Any redevelopment of Little Mountain Housing should maintain, as a minimum, an equivalent number of non-market housing units. Housing tenants must have relocation assistance and be given priority for new social housing units built on the Little Mountain Housing site.

Percent Agree 67%/68%

People’s Ideas...
• provide both market and non-market housing but do not reduce the amount of non-market housing
• do not dislocate tenants, redevelop in phases to minimize disruption
• consult residents when planning for development

3.2 Consider a Mix of Uses on Little Mountain Housing Site

Approved
New retail and commercial uses should be considered along the Main Street frontage in redevelopment of the Little Mountain Housing site. Limited institutional, cultural, or recreation uses (e.g. seniors’ centre, community facilities, daycare, library) should also be considered. Addition of any uses should be subject to analysis of traffic, parking and access, and other potential impacts.

Percent Agree 70%/74%

People’s Ideas...
• place commercial uses on Main
• provide opportunities for a diversity of small businesses (builds community)
• allow retail/services such as medium sized grocery store, medical services, and library on Main frontage

Building Height

Vision participants discussed a variety of building heights and forms. They noted that in all cases, new development should be subject to careful analysis of building design and neighbourliness. Often new development seeks additional density and height, and the City considers the request if the proposal includes park, open space, and additional community facilities or amenities for area residents. Existing height regulations on the Little Mountain site allow up to four storey buildings.

31.3 Allow Buildings Taller Than Four Storeys on Little Mountain Housing Site to Achieve Public Benefit

Not Supported
A carefully situated building, or limited number of buildings, taller than the currently permitted four storeys, should be considered on the Little Mountain Housing site, if park, open space, or other public benefits are provided. Building design and height would be subject to thorough analysis of views, privacy, shadowing, and other potential impacts.

Percent Agree 36%/38%
People's Ideas...
• support low rise but perhaps taller buildings could be built toward the centre of the site
• may have to increase heights to achieve a mix of housing types, but must be sensitive to surrounding single family housing
• allow eight storeys to help keep the streets wide and provide more green space
• allow up to 12 storeys

*Comment: This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes out numbered agree votes in both the general and random surveys. Buildings taller than four storeys on the Little Mountain Housing Site will not be brought forward for consideration when additional planning occurs on the site.*

31.4 Consider Rezoning the Area Adjacent to the Little Mountain Housing Site

*Approved*
The single family and apartment area (south of 33rd and west of Main — see Map for details) adjacent to Little Mountain Housing should also be considered for possible zoning changes when planning for redevelopment of the Little Mountain Housing site.

*Percent Agree 55%/57%*
Vision participants felt that well maintained public parks and open spaces, mature trees, and landscaped street boulevards and medians are an important part of the overall character of Riley Park/South Cambie (RPSC). The Vision Directions in this section deals with parks and public open space, school grounds, streets, lanes, and views.

PARKS, STREETS, LANES, & PUBLIC PLACES

The diagram shows the parks and public open space within the Riley Park/South Cambie area.
Parks & Public Places, Streets, Lanes, and Views

Parks are very important for recreation, beauty, and refreshment. RPSC is fortunate to have a variety of park spaces, including Queen Elizabeth Park, a city serving park that has a variety of elements (e.g. a pitch and putt golf course, gardens, and the Bloedel Floral Conservatory), Nat Bailey Stadium, Cambie Heritage Boulevard, Mountain View Cemetery, a naturalized park area at Oak and 37th, and more conventional playgrounds and play fields. In total, RPSC has 6 parks (not including Queen Elizabeth Park due to its city serving nature) totaling 31 hectares (76.5 acres). In 2001, RPSC had 0.9 hectares (2.0 acres) of ‘neighbourhood park’ for every 1,000 residents. This ratio is below the city average due to Queen Elizabeth Park not being included in the ‘neighbourhood park’ definition. School grounds totaling 18 hectares (44 acres) are also important public spaces.

Streets and lanes typically take up about 30% of a community’s land area, and make an important contribution to the image of an area. The Park Board provides and maintains street trees, and has a program to plant them in all suitable locations. The City also has a ‘Green Streets’ program which encourages residents to landscape traffic circles and corner bulges that are installed for traffic calming.

In 1989, the City began to protect selected public views that development threatened to block. The protected views are mainly from within the downtown or from Central Broadway and False Creek area looking north toward the mountains. In addition, limited public views north are protected from Queen Elizabeth, John Hendry, and Clark Parks.

Other Directions related to PARKS, STREETS, LANES AND PUBLIC PLACES are found in the TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION, NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES, and LARGE SITES sections.

32.1 Develop More Usable Parks and School Grounds

Approved
Park design, appearance, and uses should be more varied in order to serve a diverse population. School grounds should also be attractive, usable community spaces.

Percent Agree 87%/91%

People’s Ideas...
• offer games in park landscaping (e.g. checker board), design and build more creative play toys for kids, and provide exercise equipment in parks (e.g. like Burnaby Central Park)
• provide a covered area for Tai Chi, weddings, and weather protection from the rain
• provide guides and maps for visitors
• build elevated planting beds with viewing benches in convenient locations and also build community gardens at waist level
• plant native plant areas and more wild areas in parks for education and enjoyment
• make school grounds more park-like with more trees and grassy areas and a school ground gardening programs should be developed
• add lighting to playing fields so that people can play at night
Mountain View Cemetery

Mountain View Cemetery was established by the City in 1886. By 1986 the cemetery had expanded to 43 hectares (106 acres) located between 31st and 43rd, west of Fraser. Mountain View has a number of structures on the Vancouver Heritage Register including the Vancouver Crematorium (5505 Fraser), two grave markers, and a war memorial. The cemetery contains the remains of over 145,000 Vancouverites.


The Mountain View Cemetery Master Plan is a long-term project that divides the cemetery into 12 ‘neighbourhoods’ to be developed in phases spanning at least 25 years. The Plan has three main components: memorialization and interment options, landscaping and infrastructure improvements, and redevelopment of the buildings. Plan development included extensive public consultation with stakeholders and neighbours of the cemetery.

Implementation of Phase 1 was approved by City Council in 2004. In Phase 1 several existing buildings will be replaced by the Customer Service Building, the Operations Centre, and the Celebration Room. Phase 1 also includes infrastructure, landscape, and memorialization improvements. To guide long-term redevelopment, City Council rezoned the site to a comprehensive development (or CD-1) zone.

Mountain View Cemetery is an important public open space in RPSC. As it becomes an active business operation there will be neighbourhood impacts to be addressed. Also, further enhancement of Mountain View Cemetery as a public open space should respond to both area residents and visitors.

32.2 Involve the Public in the Implementation of the Mountain View Cemetery Master Plan

Approved
There should be significant public involvement in the implementation of the Master Plan and in the ongoing operations of Mountain View Cemetery.
Percent Agree 72%/73%

People’s Ideas…
• conduct public consultation about the location of buildings and service yards to reduce impacts on residents
• redevelopment should address neighbours’ concerns about noise from cemetery operations

32.3 Enhance Mountain View Cemetery

Approved
Mountain View Cemetery should be further enhanced as a public place during redevelopment.
Percent Agree 68%/70%

People’s Ideas…
• encourage planting memorials instead of markers
• encourage park-like elements in the cemetery and perhaps include the old stream as an element
• revamp the area around the WW1 memorial, perhaps build a walkway to it with lighting similar to that in Victory Park
• encourage historical preservation by having walking tours of the cemetery and restoration of grave markers
• establish tree identification tours
• encourage community involvement in the space while being sensitive to memorial park use
32.4 Improve Safety In and Around Parks

Approved
Safety in and around parks should be improved. Park use, design, and maintenance should take safety further into account. Safety improvements (e.g. lighting) should be sensitive to adjacent neighbours.

Percent Agree 84%/90%

People’s Ideas...
• provide more lighting at night in parks
• design parks and school grounds to discourage ‘hanging out’
• provide and encourage more after hours activities in parks, especially in Queen Elizabeth Park and school grounds, to increase security
• provide some type of security presence, uniformed security or on-site care takers

32.5 Improve Maintenance of Parks

Approved
Park grounds, structures, and facilities should be better maintained.

Percent Agree 76%/81%

People’s Ideas...
• make improvements to the bike trails on the park site at 37th and Oak, which are not maintained and cause safety concerns
• address weedy, unsightly, and uneven playing field in Grimmett Park

32.6 Control Dogs in Parks and Public Places

Approved
Parks and public open spaces should be shared between dog owners and non-dog owners. On-leash areas and off-leash times should be observed. More should be done to ensure dog owners clean-up after their dogs and keep their pets under control when off-leash.

Percent Agree 77%/82%

People’s Ideas...
• enforce the no dog off-leash regulations in Mountain View Cemetery
• provide plastic bags for dog owners to clean up after their pets in parks and in Mountain View Cemetery
• include an off-leash dog park in the Riley/Hillcrest Masterplan, perhaps build enclosed areas for dogs to play in
• need more enforcement of on-leash area in parks and better defined off-leash areas with more signage
• start dog waste management initiative in Queen Elizabeth Park (e.g. special containers, waste system)

32.7 Greening and Beautifying Public Streets

Approved
Streets should continue to be pleasant green links that connect the neighbourhood by:

• protecting existing boulevards and street trees, and planting new trees wherever possible
• encouraging residents to extend private gardening into the space between the sidewalk and the curb
• encouraging residents to landscape traffic circles and curb bulges
• beautifying with benches and public art
• landscaping all medians.

Percent Agree 85%/90%

People’s Ideas...
• provide benches and sculptures along street medians, and add banners and baskets to beautify public streets
• encourage a variety of landscaping along public streets (e.g. public gardens, and curb side plantings done by the community)
• provide seating areas and water fountains along streets, particularly those with hills
• develop more traffic circle community gardens
• promote community projects like ‘blooming boulevards’ to plant native plants
• bulges should have seating areas, public art, and bike racks
• plant big trees along arterial streets

Cambie Heritage Boulevard

Cambie is an important route linking Downtown to Queen Elizabeth Park and the Fraser River. City Council designated the Cambie Street central boulevard between King Edward and Marine Drive as a heritage landscape in 1993. This means City Council must approve any proposed changes to the boulevard. The boulevard’s heritage values include its history, urban design, and landscape features. With its hundreds of shade, ornamental, and coniferous trees (some dating back to the ‘20s and ‘30s), Cambie Heritage Boulevard is one of the City’s finest examples of a living urban forest and heritage landscape.

32.8 Preserve the Cambie Heritage Boulevard

Approved

Cambie Heritage Boulevard is a historic and characteristic element of RPSC. It should be preserved as a public place in the community and the existing trees should be kept and maintained, or replaced where needed.

Percent Agree 84%/86%

People’s Ideas…
• ensure no trees are cut down from the boulevard
• preserve the Cambie Heritage Boulevard when the Canada Line goes through
• control landscaping to prevent view blockage on the boulevard

Country Lanes Program

The City has developed an alternative to the traditional asphalt lane. This approach was tested in 2002 and was found to provide residents with a lane that slows traffic, is attractive, and is environmentally responsible.

Country lanes feature two strips of concrete as a driving surface. Around these strips is ‘structural grass’ to support vehicles and prevent rutting and soil compaction. Under this is a gravel and soil mixture that allows drainage and a base for the grass. Environmental benefits include recharging groundwater which reduces peak flows into the ocean and rivers. Increased vegetation in the lane filters storm water, improves air quality, and helps combat the ‘heat island effect’ which can raise temperatures in built-up areas. The ‘country lane’ was approved by City Council in 2004 as an option for the Local Improvement Program.

32.9 Encourage More Greening of Residential Lanes

Approved

Many lanes in RPSC are unattractive and uninviting for pedestrians and cyclists, and are not environmentally friendly. Residents should be encouraged to pursue alternatives to fully paved lanes, to allow for more greenery and more permeability for storm water. Ensure these alternatives are available to homeowners when they vote on lane improvements.

Percent Agree 77%/78%

People’s Ideas…
• encourage green laneways and retrofit for greater rain water permeability in lanes
• encourage ‘positive people activity’ in lanes (e.g. promote pedestrian and bike use)
• clean and maintain lanes
• lower fences to encourage neighbour interaction, better for safety and lane appearance
• encourage backyard/lane gardening and plant trees
32.10 Preserve Views

**Approved**

Views to the north shore mountains and downtown Vancouver, from public places like Mountain View Cemetery, and north/south streets should be protected, without the loss of trees. Viewpoints should be made more enjoyable.

**Percent Agree 86%/90%**

People’s Ideas…
- provide benches and rest areas in view areas
- make view across Mountain View Cemetery more accessible, it is underutilized because the area is uninviting
- preserve views of the north shore mountains from north/south streets (e.g. Cambie and Main)
- control landscaping to prevent view blockage

View from Queen Elizabeth Park

---

**Q.E Park**

The top of Queen Elizabeth Park is the highest point in the city, at 167m (505 ft) above sea level. From the lookouts, visitors have a 360 degree view of the Vancouver skyline. The Park receives nearly 6 million visitors a year who marvel at its superior standard of garden plantings.
Vision participants identified many environmental issues, including the need for residents and businesses to be more involved in actions that promote a healthier environment and cleaner community. Participants also suggested ways to encourage community awareness of, and participation in, the many City programs and services which already address environmental issues.

Vision participants discussed ways to improve environmental practices in the home and in the community. They examined the role that individuals, the community, the City, and other levels of government should play in improving the environment. The Directions are grouped into three categories: actions that can be taken by individuals and businesses (with City support); actions that require a joint community/City effort; and broad actions that require co-ordination with other levels of government.

Directions that would enhance the environment can also be found in the PARKS, STREETS, LANES, AND PUBLIC PLACES, TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION, and LARGE SITES sections.

**Automatic Garbage Collection, Recycling, and Composting**

The City collects garbage and yard compost from ‘single family’ residences, including most properties with up to four units. Large items such as old fridges and hot water tanks can be recycled at the Vancouver South Transfer Station and Recycling Depot on West Kent Avenue North. Recycling services are also provided to all residential properties in Vancouver. Materials collected include paper, plastic, metal, and glass. The City also subsidizes backyard composters and apartment worm composter bins. In the last decade, these programs (combined with others in the region) have helped reduce the amount of residential garbage sent to the landfill by approximately 50%.

Automated garbage and yard trimming collection was initiated in 2006 (containers are emptied using a mechanical arm on the truck). There are a number of advantages associated with this system: no need to buy replacement garbage cans or plastic yard trimmings bags; containers are more animal resistant than conventional garbage bags or cans; and fees increase with container size thereby encouraging waste reduction and recycling.
Energy and Water Conservation

The City has taken actions to reduce energy use and conserve water. City-Plan and the City’s land use policies promote complete communities with jobs close to home, thereby reducing fuel consumption for travelling to work. The Transportation Plan gives priority to pedestrians, cyclists, and transit-users over those using the private automobile. By-laws and building code regulations require buildings to be more energy and water efficient. Other City initiatives include: supporting the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) BC Steering Committee to establish a green building rating system for the Vancouver region; retrofitting over 24,000 street lights and indoor lighting fixtures with more energy-efficient lamps; piloting the collection and use of landfill gases to generate heat and electricity; conducting trials with emerging technologies such as alternative fuels, electric cars, and hybrid-electric vehicles; and investigating alternative technologies such as fuel cells. The City also supports public and school education programs on energy and water conservation including promoting community ‘water-wise’ conservation measures, recycling options, and natural gardening practices.

33.1 Take Action to Reduce Waste, Increase Recycling and Composting

Approved

Individuals and businesses should take the initiative (with City support) to decrease waste and increase the amount they recycle/reuse materials and compost. They should also use more environmentally friendly products.

Percent Agree 91%/95%

People’s Ideas...
• choose items that have less packaging
• turn yard waste (e.g. leaves and grass clippings) into compost/mulch
• encourage business customers to properly dispose of containers (e.g. McDonalds)
• host community garage sales and swap meets
• encourage manufacturers to use plastics and packaging that can be easily recycled

33.2 Take Action to Conserve Water and Energy

Approved

Individuals and businesses (with City support) should act to conserve water and energy.

Percent Agree 85%/91%

People’s Ideas...
• encourage the use of rain barrels vs. watering, make access to rain barrels easier (e.g. at community centres or have them delivered to residents)
• limit lawn sprinkling, obey water restrictions
• install water meters on all houses (user pay)
• install low-flush toilets and shower heads that conserve water

33 Environment

At Home and at Work

Vision participants discussed many different measures to improve environmental practices by both individuals and businesses. These ideas included increasing personal efforts to reduce waste, increase recycling and composting, using environmentally friendly products (i.e. products that are less damaging to the environment than competing mainstream products), as well as measures to conserve water and energy.
In the Community

Vision participants discussed a number of ways the community and the City can work together to improve the environment. Areas of collaboration include keeping the community clean, expanding recycling and composting, and collecting and recycling hard-to-dispose-of items. Other suggestions include encouraging sustainable development, supporting local/organic food production, controlling urban noise, restoring streams, and reducing storm water runoff.

33.3 Clean-up the Community

Approved

The community and the City should work together to keep RPSC clean and litter free. These efforts should include:

• encouraging co-operative efforts by the community to solve garbage, litter, and cleanliness issues
• enforcing regulations when needed, including the use of fines and penalties
• adding more waste disposal receptacles, community notice boards, and poster cylinders on utility poles in strategic locations
• improving education and access to information about the services and programs offered by the City.

Percent Agree 93%/95%

People’s Ideas...

• provide ‘contact info’ stickers on garbage dumpsters so people can report illegal dumping
• need better enforcement and removal of graffiti
• encourage pet owners to pick-up after their dogs
• install more garbage and pet waste containers with animal proof lids in Queen Elizabeth Park, Mountain View Cemetery, bus stop locations at 37th, Fraser, Hamber Park, Cambie, and Main

• create designated places for community notices to be posted (e.g. easy peel areas); and increase enforcement against people posting on utility poles
• promote public education on the ‘do’s and dont’s’ of garbage disposal

33.4 Expand Recycling and Composting

Approved

The community and the City should continue to identify ways to expand recycling and composting programs, including developing partnerships with other agencies and businesses.

Percent Agree 89%/91%

People’s Ideas...

• encourage materials from houses slated for demolition to be re-used/scavenged
• hold community ‘trash/trade day’ to exchange/sell clothing, furniture etc.
• increase community awareness on the existing recycling programs and depot sites
• provide community accessible composters (e.g. at community centres)
• encourage schools to organize neighbourhood recycling fund raising events
• have the Vancouver School Board initiate recycling programs in all schools
• add a fee to recycling programs to fund research and development for uses of recycled materials

Controlling City Noise

Noise from construction sites, commercial and industrial sites (fans, music, power equipment, garbage trucks, amplification equipment, parties, and dogs) are regulated by the City’s Noise By-law. Hours of operation and acceptable levels of noise from a variety of sources are outlined in the By-law. Exceptions for special events (i.e. parades, festivals, races) and construction work outside the specified hours (where it is impossible or impractical to comply) can be made. Penalties for non-compliance range from $100 to $2,000. For information about the Noise By-law or who to contact for a particular noise problem, call the Vancouver Environmental Health Division. For ‘after-hours’ noise complaints call for Police assistance at 911.
33.5 Reduce Urban Noise

Approved

The community and the City should explore ways to further reduce urban noise from sources like loud music, leaf blowers, late night parties, traffic, and lawn mowers. This could include a review of existing by-laws and more enforcement.

Percent Agree 76%/76%

People's Ideas...
- regulate the noise level for lawn mowers and leaf blowers
- restrict the number of commercial gardening machines
- review, tighten, and enforce the Noise By-law
- use manual push lawn mowers

33.6 Collect and Recycle Hard-to-Dispose-of Items

Approved

The community and the City should explore opportunities for residents to safely and easily discard and/or recycle hard-to-dispose-of items such as household hazardous wastes and bulky household items.

Percent Agree 88%/91%

People’s Ideas...
- have a hazardous waste truck (noted on the recycling schedule) visit each community throughout the year to collect materials like gyprock, paint cans, and asbestos
- provide more accessible drop-off sites for materials and furniture recycling, small appliances, etc.
  (e.g. maybe at Queen Elizabeth Park or Nat Bailey Stadium, community centres)
- promote information about hazardous waste disposal

Sustainable Development

The City of Vancouver is frequently cited as one of the most livable cities in the world. The challenge is how to sustain that livability as Vancouver grows. In 2002, City Council adopted a set of ‘principles for sustainability’ to evaluate City programs, policies, and practices. Sustainability is achieved through individual and community participation, and requires integrated decision-making that takes into account economic, ecological, and social impacts. City initiatives include the establishment of the Office of Sustainability, the Cool Vancouver Task Force, Vancouver’s Food Policy Council, as well as providing leadership in developing green building guidelines and piloting the development of South East False Creek and the 2010 Olympic Village as a sustainable community.

33.7 Encourage Sustainable Development

Approved

The community and the City should encourage all new development, including renovations and additions, to adopt more sustainable practices and ‘green strategies’ such as storm water management, energy and water use reduction, alternative energy sources, green roofs, and water recycling.

Percent Agree 84%/86%

People’s Ideas...
- introduce an environmental point system to encourage builders/developers to ‘go green’, and the points could be applied toward a possible tax break
- develop building codes to allow ‘green roofs’
- establish a fund to pay for energy reductions in large buildings (public and private), with the owner repaying the money with energy savings, thereby sustaining the fund
- implement financial/tax incentives for homeowners who install energy reduction systems and environmental alternatives, such as solar power
Community Gardens
Community gardens are public lands where neighbours come together to grow fruit, flowers, and vegetables. Typically, these gardens have many small plots tended by individuals or families. Plots are often supported by common facilities like compost, water, storage sheds for garden tools, and even gathering places, greenhouses, and shared garden areas (e.g. fruit orchard or berry patch). Gardens are often fenced to keep out dogs, but the public is welcome to enter and visit.

The Park Board supports community gardens by giving assistance in searching for land, formalizing user agreements, developing environmental educational programs, and gathering basic information on garden development and operation.

Vancouver’s Food Policy
In 2003, City Council directed staff to develop a just and sustainable food system for the City. This means integrating food production, processing, distribution, and consumption with the environmental, economic, social and nutritional health of the City and its citizens.

In July 2004 the Vancouver Food Policy Council was elected and has begun to work in partnership with community organizations and the City to act as an advocacy, advisory, and policy development body. Projects such as the creation of local food purchasing policies, assessment of grocery store accessibility, and reviewing the potential for distribution of unconsumed food were identified. Work also began to reshape urban food policy which includes supporting local initiatives such as farmers’ markets, community gardens, community and school kitchen programs, and special projects such as Southeast False Creek’s Urban Agriculture Strategy.

33.8 Grow More Food Locally
Approved
The community and the City should encourage more food to be grown and distributed locally, which could include the development of more individual and community gardens, and the planting of fruit trees on public and private property.

Percent Agree 74%/73%

People’s Ideas...
• develop a program where people without a garden can help seniors with gardens that they can’t manage anymore
• provide space on each block for residents to grow their own fruits and vegetables
• plant fruit trees on school properties for kids to harvest
• encourage residents to plant their own fruits and vegetables
• create a sustainable park space (e.g. plant fruit trees, community gardens)

Improving Water Quality and Conservation
The Park Board and Engineering Services have cooperated to create biofiltration systems to cleanse storm water at the Hastings Park Pond and Lost Lagoon in Stanley Park. Both systems collect run-off water and clean it using plants and soil systems before discharging it. Both facilities offer aesthetic and environmental benefits. Also, the City’s sewer system is being converted from a combined system (storm and sanitary sewer flow together in one pipe) to separate pipes for each. This reduces mixed overflows that discharge sanitary waste into surrounding water bodies.

Daylighting Streams
Since the turn of the century, many Vancouver streams were diverted and filled in as a result of logging and the building of homes and streets. Only small fragments of the original streams remain. Many residents want to bring back parts of these streams or create new ones as a reminder of Vancouver’s natural history. Daylighting streams provides an educational tool for environmental stewardship, a symbol of our natural history, an aesthetic community amenity, and an enhancement of our natural environment.

33.9 Restore Old Streams and Reduce Storm Water Runoff
Approved
The community and the City should support initiatives to daylight culverted streams (restore natural open water channels) and reduce stormwater runoff.

Percent Agree 76%/76%
People's Ideas...
- reduce water runoff by encouraging water percolation (e.g. create rain gardens, gravel areas away from houses with plants to absorb rain runoff)
- encourage the planting of drought tolerant plants
- daylight Brewery Creek along St. George and the old stream in Mountain View Cemetery as part of its redevelopment

Air Quality
In recent years, the City has taken initiatives to improve the air quality for its residents. In 1990, City Council created the Task Force on Atmospheric Change to study climate change as it relates to global warming and ozone depletion. It recommended specific actions that the City could take to reduce its contributions to climate change, including the burning of major fossil fuels. City Council actions include the adoption of transportation plans which have strategies to find alternatives to the single occupant vehicle, provide Greenways and Bikeways, and partner with regional transit and transportation authorities to improve commuting options.

Work from the recent Cool Vancouver Task Force established the Corporate Climate Change Action Plan (2003). The Action Plan provides further leadership and co-ordination of corporate and community emission reduction initiatives in the City.

Working with other Levels of Government
While the City can play an important role in building a healthier environment for its citizens, Vision participants recognized that other levels of governments must work together to change laws that would improve the environment. The City advocates and supports regional, provincial, and international environmental policy initiatives.

33.10 Working with Other Levels of Government

Approved
The City should provide leadership and partner with the regional, provincial, and federal governments to preserve and enhance the environment, including:
- supporting the development and use of environmentally friendly products
- adopting additional measures to increase water and energy conservation
- incorporating more sustainable practices with their own operations
- adopting measures to improve air quality including tougher emissions standards
- encouraging the development and use of alternative energy sources.

Percent Agree 82%/84%

People's Ideas...
- convert City vehicles to use alternative fuels
- encourage alternative energy sources for homes and sell back the excess to the grid
- use environmentally friendly buses
- develop stronger air pollution standards for autos and trucks
- encourage manufacturers of commercial gardening equipment to build them quieter
- install aircraft noise monitoring devices at problem locations and work with Transport Canada to mitigate problems
- work with other levels of government to support and promote alternative energy sources (e.g. solar, wind, energy efficient homes, lighting, fuel cells, geothermal heating) in facilities such as community centres and pools

Smart car - fewer emissions
The City regularly provides information to, and consults with, residents and groups on many different types of decisions, in many different ways. Examples of current processes include:

- local improvement petitions for new curbs and sidewalks
- referendums on the three year Capital Plans
- public processes for planning programs and rezonings
- advisory committees to City Council like the Bicycle Advisory Committee and the Advisory Committee on Seniors' Issues
- ongoing outreach to youth as part of the Civic Youth Strategy
- notification letters on development proposals
- the City’s homepage on the Internet
- some park planning processes.

Public input is important to the City. Its recent initiative to improve public involvement (i.e. the Public Involvement Review) has resulted in:

- publications like the Newcomers Guide to City Services and a Civics Manual for high school students
- Community Web Pages which expand the City’s website to give the public more information (www.vancouver.ca/community_profiles)
- improvements to various City processes (such as notifications concerning development/rezoning proposals, and traffic management initiatives)
- improved structures for City Council’s advisory committees
- multicultural outreach and translation guidelines.

Vision participants felt public involvement is very important when dealing with many community issues, and it is referenced in several Directions in this Survey. Participants suggested improving public involvement with regard to transportation and transit, new community facilities, new single family houses, and redevelopment of large sites and malls (i.e. King Edward Mall and Oakridge). Participants also suggested the need for ongoing public involvement in Vision implementation.
34 Community Involvement in Decision Making

34.1 Community Involvement in Decision Making

Approved
RPSC residents should have greater, and timelier, input into decision making about changes in their community. Community involvement should be included in major initiatives like the redevelopment of large sites, the implementation of ‘master plans’ (e.g. Riley/Hillcrest and Mountain View Cemetery), and the introduction of Canada Line rapid transit stations. It should also be part of recurring decisions such as changes to streets and traffic patterns, the provision of facilities and services, and the review of development proposals.

Percent Agree 87%/92%

Peoples Ideas…
• need a process for ongoing community review of development

34.2 Community Involvement in Vision Implementation and Monitoring

Approved
Community residents should be involved with the City in the implementation of Vision Directions, and in monitoring and evaluating how well implementation actions work toward achieving Vision Directions.

Percent Agree 87%/91%
Rezoning Policy

Following the Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision

1. About Zoning in General

1.1 How Zoning Works

The Zoning and Development Bylaw is the main way the City controls development – new buildings, additions to existing buildings, or changes in the use of buildings and land.

There are different zoning districts, labelled by letters and numbers. For example RS-1 covers most of Riley Park/South Cambie’s single family areas and C-2 zones cover the larger shopping areas. Every lot in a zoning district is governed by the same regulations and guidelines. The regulations are contained in a District Schedule. They control the kind of activities (uses) that may take place, such as office, retail, dwelling, or manufacturing. District Schedules also control various quantitative aspects of the development including the maximum height of buildings, the position of building on the lot (yards and setbacks), the amount of total development (floor-space or density), and the amount of parking required.

In addition to the District Schedule with its regulations, some zones also have design review, using Design Guidelines. Design review looks at qualitative factors such as style or character, the materials used, or the landscaping. Legally, districts with design review are structured to have two types of projects: those that may go ahead without design review (often called ‘outright’) and those that are subject to design review (often called ‘conditional’ or ‘discretionary’) because they receive additional density, or approval of a conditional use, in return for meeting the design guidelines.

Another type of district is the CD-1 or Comprehensive Development district. Many of these are tailored to a specific site, such as Children’s and Women’s Hospital. Other CD zones cover a broad area, such as First Shaughnessy or the Downtown. This tool is used where a typical District Schedule and Guidelines approach is not suitable.

1.2 How Zoning is Changed

Anyone may apply to alter the zoning – property owner, resident, or the Director of Planning. However, only City Council may actually adopt or change zoning or guidelines. Staff analyze and process applications and then make recommendations to City Council. During processing there is always public notification and some consultation. A formal Public Hearing is always required at the end of the rezoning process before City Council decides if the zoning will change.

Because rezoning is time-consuming and expensive, City staff usually advise potential applicants before they make an application whether or not staff would ‘consider’ the rezoning (that is, fully process it), rather than quickly reporting it to Council with a recommendation to refuse the application. Staff give this advice based on existing City plans and policies, including Community Visions.
2. Rezoning Under the Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision

Making some of the Riley Park/South Cambie Vision Directions happen will require rezoning or amendments to zoning. For most, additional area planning will be required before any zoning changes would be considered, and individual rezonings would not be considered prior to this planning (section 2.2 below). However, there are some cases where individual rezoning could be considered without additional area planning (section 2.1 below). Note that ‘considered’ refers to being taken into the system for processing, it does not necessarily mean that the applications will receive support from staff or approval from City Council.

2.1 Additional Area Planning Not Required Before Rezoning

Rezoning applications for the types of projects listed below could be considered without additional area planning because they further adopted city-wide policies, would further an adopted Vision Direction, or are normal practice in the public interest. Most are ‘site specific’ rezonings on individual sites. There would be community consultation in each case. In considering these rezonings, staff would look at not only the needs of the project but also how it relates to its existing surroundings, and to the future of the area as described in the Community Vision.

Table 2.1: Additional Area Planning Not Required Before Rezoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project that Could be Considered for Site Specific Rezoning</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Retention Projects&lt;br&gt;- involving retention of buildings on the Vancouver Heritage Register (also Vision Direction 13.1)</td>
<td>City-wide policy to encourage retention of heritage resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social or Affordable Housing Projects&lt;br&gt;-non-profit projects, housing agreement projects, special needs residential facilities (SNRFs)</td>
<td>City-wide policy to encourage housing for lower income and special needs residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note on definitions</strong>&lt;br&gt;Housing agreement: a contract between the City and developer to guarantee some of the housing units as rental or low income, etc. SNRFs: housing and support services for people with special needs including the elderly, children in care, the mentally or physically handicapped, people with substance abuse problems, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Demonstration Projects (HDP)&lt;br&gt;-in order to be considered as an HDP, a project ‘must demonstrate a new housing form in the neighbourhood, improved affordability, and a degree of neighbourhood support; any increase in land value beyond the normal profit allowed by the City’s standard bonussing process, must be converted into improved affordability’ (January 3, 1996 City Council report)&lt;br&gt;-in addition, in Riley Park/South Cambie, any HDP proposals would need to conform to Vision Directions about type, location, scale, etc.</td>
<td>City-wide policy to permit demonstration of new housing types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional uses&lt;br&gt;Projects focusing on expansion, downsizing, or reuse of publicly owned or non-profit institutional, cultural, recreational, utility, or public authority uses</td>
<td>Normal City practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping amendments; zoning text amendments&lt;br&gt;- initiated by the Director of Planning to update, correct, or make minor revisions to District Schedules or Guidelines</td>
<td>Normal City practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.1 Additional Area Planning Not Required Before Rezoning (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project that Could be Considered for Site Specific Rezoning</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Riley Park/South Cambie:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to Existing CD-1 Zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as per Vision Direction 14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as per Vision Direction 15.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adding a Conventional Supermarket on Main, Fraser, &amp; Cambie</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as per Vision Directions 18.6, 19.2, and 20.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retain a Supermarket at Oakridge Shopping Centre &amp; King Edward Mall</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as per Vision Directions 21.3 and 22.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as per ‘General Directions for All Large Sites’ 27.1 - 27.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as per King Edward Mall Vision Directions 22.3, 22.4, 22.5, 22.7, and 22.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as per St. Vincent’s Hospital Site Vision Directions 29.1, 29.2, and 29.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as per Balfour Site Vision Directions 30.1 and 30.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as per Little Mountain Housing Vision Directions 31.1, 31.2, and 31.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- as per RCMP ‘Fairmont Complex’ Vision Directions 28.1 and 28.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note that rezoning of this site should also take into account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three Directions classified as ‘Uncertain’(28.2, 28.3 and 28.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as they had more community support than opposition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oakridge/Langara Policy Statement (1995)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites within Riley Park/South Cambie that are not addressed in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Vision because the Oakridge/Langara Policy Statement allows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for site specific rezonings of these sites, i.e., the TransLink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Bus Barn’ Site, identified sites along Oak, Willow, and Cambie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 37th and 41st, and the ‘Reserve Sub Area’ on 41st between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambie and Willow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.2 Additional Planning Required Before Rezoning

The Riley Park/South Cambie Vision Directions listed below require additional planning study before rezoning occurs. For some Directions, the study would cover a portion of Riley Park/South Cambie; others might be city-wide in scope. The types of things that would be studied could include the size, height, locations, and design of developments, traffic and parking, parks and green space, service needs, developer contributions to costs, phasing, and so forth. Planning studies would be initiated by the City, but might be undertaken by City staff, consultants, community members, or a combination. In all cases, there would be community consultation throughout the study.

Timing and priorities for these studies, as well as other aspects of implementing the Visions, will be determined with community input, as well as through City Council consideration of available resources and competing work priorities. Individual site rezonings will not be considered in advance of the planning, other than as noted in Section 2.1 (above).
### Table 2.2: Additional Planning Required Before Rezoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riley Park/South Cambie Vision Direction</th>
<th>Possible Types of additional planning study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design of New Single Family Homes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 Design of New Single Family Houses</td>
<td>Mini-program to make design review available in interested areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 Public Involvement in Review of New Single Family House Design</td>
<td>More detailed planning and consultation involving single family zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3 Improve Quality and Sustainability of Single Family Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Older Character Buildings and Heritage</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2 Retaining Other Character Buildings</td>
<td>Specific planning study on feasibility of this in RPSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3 Retain Character Buildings on Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Street Policy Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2 Review Policy for Main Street</td>
<td>More detailed planning to review zoning and other policies for Main from 16th - 33rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible New Housing Types</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1 Allow More Infill</td>
<td>More detailed planning for specific areas of Riley Park/ South Cambie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.2 Allow More Duplexes</td>
<td>Detailed local planning and consultation of housing options in a City initiated process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3 Allow Some Cottages or Small Houses on Shared Lots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Directions classified as ‘Uncertain’ identify housing types (15.4, 15.5, and 15.6) which had more community support than opposition, and could be the subject of more community discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible New Housing Locations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1 New Housing Types on Corner Lots or Irregular Subdivision Areas</td>
<td>More detailed planning for specific areas of Riley Park/ South Cambie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3 New Housing Types Around Parks and Community Centres</td>
<td>Detailed local planning and consultation of housing options in a City initiated process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.4 New Housing Types Around King Edward Canada Line Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5 New Housing Types North of 41st Canada Line Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Directions classified as ‘Uncertain’ identify housing locations (16.1 and 16.6) which had more community support than opposition, and could be the subject of more community discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shopping Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.8 Provide Additional Housing Near Main Street Shopping Area</td>
<td>More detailed planning for the areas around the Riley Park/South Cambie shopping areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.3 Provide Additional Housing Near Fraser Street Shopping Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.6 Provide Additional Housing Near Cambie Street (16th – 19th) Shopping Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5 Provide Additional Housing Near Cambie and 41st Shopping Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.2 Provide Additional Housing Near Oak and King Edward Shopping Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Other

The sections above provide guidance for most rezoning inquiries. However, there may be rare sites for which development under the existing zoning would involve the loss of features which the community, in its Vision, views as assets. The prime example is trees and landscaping, but in some cases buildings or structures may also be valued (but not qualify as heritage). In these cases, rezoning that would maintain the assets may be considered. Further, this will apply only to large sites that were in single ownership at the time of the Vision adoption. Finally, achieving Vision Directions would remain the focus while considering the rezoning.
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Riley Park/South Cambie Vision Highlights

- **Vision Area Boundary**
- **Arterial streets**: improve for pedestrians, transit users, and residents
- **Main Street, Fraser Street, Cambie (16th - 19th) & King Edward Canada Line Station, Cambie (39th - 41st) and Canada Line Station, and Oak & King Edward**: enhance as shopping areas - more attractive, cleaner and greener
- **Parks and school grounds**: improve for more diverse activities and enhanced safety
- **Other zones**: Note: boundaries approximate

** ALSO:**
Community Services and Facilities: expanded facilities (2010 Olympics) and more programs and affordable services for seniors, youth and families

Safety & Crime Prevention: more individual, community and City effort; address youth crime and support Community Policing Centre

Community Involvement in Decisions: more effective and timely
The following information has been extracted from 2 sources: the Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision and a report adopted by Council on July 27, 2000 on conditional use applications in visioned areas. For a complete set of Council-approved Vision Directions for Riley Park/South Cambie, please refer to the “Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision” document which is available free from the internet at vancouver.ca/visions or from the Planning Department (604.871.6126) at a cost.

1 COMMUNITY VISION: GENERAL DESCRIPTION
The Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision applies to the area outlined on the map below.
The Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision describes the kind of community people want Riley Park/South Cambie to become over the next 10 to 20 years. The Vision illustrates how CityPlan directions (adopted by City Council in 1995), should be implemented in Riley Park/South Cambie. Over 90 Vision Directions cover topics like: transportation; new housing; shopping areas; safety and services; and greening and garbage.

The Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision will be used by City Council and staff to help guide future planning, to set priorities for capital projects, to direct City programs and services, and to make decisions affecting the community.

2 REZONING POLICY
For the most part, additional area planning will be required before any zoning changes will be considered. Individual rezonings will not be considered prior to this planning, except in the following circumstances: heritage retention projects, social or affordable housing projects, institutional uses, seniors low-rise housing or small scale projects, large sites, and sites within Oakridge/Langara Policy area. Please refer to page 82 of the Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision for more information.

3 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS UNDER EXISTING ZONING
Generally, development is anticipated to continue under existing zoning regulations, with development applications processed as usual, since such development will not significantly contradict adopted Vision Directions.

The exceptions are some conditional uses in commercial zones located in neighbourhood shopping areas identified by the Vision as areas for active, pedestrian-friendly shops and services. (See map and notes below.) Conditional uses in these zones that provide auto access from the street frontages and/or parking facilities in front of buildings, and/or buildings without storefronts, would, if permitted at grade along the shopping area street frontages identified below, contradict these policy directions. The zoning regulations require that, in considering conditional uses, account be taken of “all applicable policies and guidelines” adopted by Council. Consequently, new proposals of conditional uses in these locations that are inconsistent with the Vision Directions, while they will be considered individually, will generally not be supported. Prospective applicants are encouraged to seek early advice from the Community Visions Implementation team.
SHOPPING AREAS IDENTIFIED IN
THE RILEY PARK/SOUTH CAMBIE COMMUNITY VISION

Relevant Vision Directions for these areas may be found in the Riley Park/South Cambie Community Vision in the following sections:

- Section 18 – Main Street Shopping Area;
- Section 19 – Fraser Street Shopping Area;
- Section 20 – Cambie (16th-19th) Shopping Area and King Edward Canada Line Station;
- Section 21 – Cambie (39th-41st) Shopping Area and Canada Line Station; and
- Section 22 – Oak and King Edward Shopping Area (Including King Edward Mall).