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THAT Council direct the Director of City Plans to report back on an action plan to implement and monitor the Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy Vision.
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Vision Highlights

Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy Today

ARKS residents value the area’s single family neighbourhoods, views from public places, and shopping areas. The area’s parks offer a variety of open spaces and many are heavily used, as are community facilities like the community centre, pool, library, and ice rink. The Vision seeks to maintain and upgrade these community assets.

The ARKS Vision also seeks to retain the historic and mature character of the area and to further improve the community. Key Vision messages include:

Make Streets Safer

Arterial streets in ARKS should be easier to cross, safer to walk and drive along, more livable and attractive, while continuing to carry commuters through the area. Several secondary arterial streets should be reclassified to neighbourhood collectors and more local streets should have traffic calming. Buses should be more frequent, comfortable, and convenient and they should be given more priority on streets. Shuttle buses should be used to provide more flexible local service between key destinations. There should be extensive public consultation with ARKS residents on the future of the Arbutus Corridor.

Improve Walking and Biking Routes

Encourage greater use of pedestrian and cyclist routes in ARKS and improve safety at intersections. Residents should initiate Neighbourhood Greenways on popular walking and biking routes. The speed limit should be reduced to 40km/hr on local streets.

Improve the Environment

The community and the City should work together to keep the area clean, reduce waste, expand recycling, and improve water and energy conservation. All new development should adopt more sustainable building practices, there should be more food grown and distributed locally, along with a ban on smoking in public places.

Enhance Community Safety

Individuals, the community, and the police should all increase their efforts to create a safer community. The Community Policing Centre should be further strengthened and supported by the community. There should be more actions taken to reduce youth crime and patrols by police on foot and bicycle.
Expand Recreation Facilities and Services

Recreation and library facilities in Kerrisdale should be expanded and upgraded and there should be more public recreation facilities in Arbutus Ridge and Shaughnessy. Maple Grove Pool should be retained and upgraded. Programs and services for seniors and youth should be expanded.

Enhance Parks, Streets, Lanes, and Public Places

Parks and school grounds should be improved to allow for more diverse activities and more parks should be provided in poorly-served areas. Incorporate Ravine Park into a new greenway connecting Kerrisdale Village and Arbutus shopping areas. There should be more opportunities for community gardens and the community should have greater involvement in the design and stewardship of parks.

Maintain and Enhance Single Family Neighbourhoods

Most single family areas should be kept to retain the basic character of ARKS. Design review for new houses should be introduced in areas without design control zoning, and there should be more public involvement in the review of new single family house design. Character housing should be retained by allowing multiple conversion dwellings on large lots and incentives should be developed to encourage retention of character and heritage buildings.

Add New Housing Opportunities

Locate new housing types on large lots, on or near arterial roads, and around shopping areas. Some small developments designed for seniors should be considered near parks, shopping, transit, and services to allow seniors to stay in the community as their housing needs change.

Create Neighbourhood Centres and Enhance Local Shopping Areas

Kerrisdale Village, 33rd and MacKenzie, and Macdonald and Alamein should be enhanced to serve as the heart of their surrounding neighbourhoods. The commercial area at 16th and Macdonald should be considered for limited expansion on the south side of 16th Avenue. A new neighbourhood centre should be created at the Arbutus Shopping Centre with stores located closer to Arbutus Street. Commercial streets should be improved to make them more convenient, safe and comfortable. There should be a range of shops and services, improved pedestrian safety, additional convenient parking, more street trees, more attractive store fronts, and cleaner streets and lanes. Kerrisdale Village should add a supermarket and a public plaza.

Improve Community Involvement in Decision making

Residents should have more and timelier input into decision making about changes in their community, ranging from major initiatives like the planning of the Arbutus Corridor, to recurring decisions relating to street or traffic changes.
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 Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy (ARKS) want it to become over the next 10 to 20 years, and how CityPlan Directions should be implemented in ARKS. 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 ARKS. 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 2600 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 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.
Topics Not Included in the Vision Directions

The Vision Directions cover the topics that were identified at the community workshops and public meetings as important for the community.

For some topics that were not addressed at the workshops, there are city-wide policies already in place that will continue to apply in Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy. Examples are policies on non-market housing for lower income households, special needs residential facilities, and heritage preservation. These are described in ‘sidebars’ within this document. Where rezoning is required, community consultation will take place on a project specific basis.

For any other topics not included in the Vision Directions, the City will still need to consult before major changes are made in the community.

Vision Directions

Introduction

This section presents the Vision Directions grouped into eight themes, with directions for 27 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 ARKS 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: Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy”).

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 Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy. The area has two of the city’s busiest streets in terms of both car and truck traffic. Granville and Oak carry between 40,000 to just over 50,000 vehicles per 24-hour period. Many of ARKS arterial streets are used for truck travel: Vancouver’s Transportation Plan estimated that Marine Drive carries over 400 trucks per day; Oak, Granville, Arbutus/West Boulevard, Macdonald/MacKenzie, and 41st each carry 200 trucks per day. In 2003, Oak and 41st had the highest number of motor vehicle collisions in ARKS (185), followed by Granville and 41st (132), and Granville and King Edward (119).

The Vision addresses a number of transportation issues in ARKS including traffic volumes and congestion; truck traffic, particularly trucks servicing redevelopment at UBC; specific intersections; and improvements for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users. Many of these Directions are described below, others are in the NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES or PARKS, STREETS, LANES, AND PUBLIC PLACES sections.

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

- **primary arterials**: the busiest streets in ARKS — King Edward, 41st, Marine Drive, Arbutus/West Boulevard (16th to 41st), Granville, and Oak
- **secondary arterials**: less-busy streets where pedestrians, bikes, and transit should be encouraged — 16th, Marpole/15th/Wolfe/Douglas, West Boulevard (41st to 51st), 49th, and Macdonald (16th to King Edward)
- **streets proposed to be removed from the arterial network**: Quesnel (King Edward to 27th) and MacKenzie (27th to 41st), West Boulevard (51st to 61st) and Angus (61st to Marine Drive), Puget (King Edward to 33rd) and Larch (33rd to 41st), Macdonald (41st to Marine Drive), 33rd (Oak to MacKenzie), and 57th (Oak to Marine Drive).
1 Primary Arterials

(King Edward, 41st, Marine Drive, Arbutus/West Boulevard (16th to 41st), Granville, and Oak)

King Edward, 41st, Marine Drive, Arbutus/West Boulevard (16th to 41st), Granville, and Oak will continue to be primary arterials used by traffic travelling across the city and region. All except King Edward are truck routes. All are transit routes (including a small portion of Marine Drive). King Edward, 41st, Arbutus/West Boulevard (16th to 41st), and Granville have been designated in the Transportation Plan as having potential for ‘increased priority for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit’. Traffic volumes, speeds, truck traffic, and noise can make these streets difficult to walk along, live on, or to cross. 41st is the ‘Main Street’ for Kerrisdale Village and has special needs for pedestrians crossing to reach its many retail stores. Both Marine Drive and 41st play a significant role in providing access to UBC for both car and truck traffic, with the accompanying problems regarding safety and amenity for pedestrians and homeowners who live along these arterials (also see Directions in the NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES section of the Vision).

Marine Drive: primary arterial needs more and safer pedestrian crossings

1.1 Improve Conditions and Safety on King Edward, 41st, Marine Drive, Arbutus/West Boulevard (16th to 41st), Granville, and Oak

Approved

The conditions and safety for residents and pedestrians on King Edward, 41st, Marine Drive, Arbutus/West Boulevard (16th to 41st), Granville, and Oak should be substantially improved by:

- adding and upgrading pedestrian crossings and sidewalks
- reducing traffic speed and noise
- providing more education about and enforcement of traffic rules and regulations
- pursuing design solutions to reduce traffic impacts, and
- reducing the adverse impacts of trucks on neighbourhoods.

Percent Agree 75%/78%

People’s Ideas...

- improve pedestrian crossing opportunities: more pedestrian-activated signals, median refuges, curb bulges, grade separated crossings, employ crossing guards to shorten waiting times
- reduce maximum size of trucks permitted to use residential truck routes
- use noise absorbent material when resurfacing noisy streets
- make Kerrisdale Village a ‘pedestrian priority area’, especially at East and West Boulevards
- restrict hours of truck use, restrict their use to inside lanes, and limit use of engine brakes along Marine Drive and 41st
- add crosswalks or median refuges on Marine Drive (e.g. at Larch, Yew, 45th, 49th, and the Arbutus Corridor), and set minimum distances between crosswalks
- assess the impact of street widening of Marine Drive on local residents and on area traffic congestion
City Transportation Plan
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 Secondary Arterials
(16th, Marpole/15th/Wolfe/Douglas, West Boulevard (41st to 51st), 49th, and Macdonald (16th to King Edward)
16th, Marpole/15th/Wolfe/Douglas, West Boulevard (41st to 51st), 49th, and Macdonald (16th to King Edward) are secondary arterials. Macdonald is a truck and transit route, West Boulevard and 49th are transit routes. West Boulevard, 49th, and Macdonald are 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, especially along West Boulevard.

2.1 Improve Conditions and Safety on 16th, Marpole/15th/Wolfe/Douglas, West Boulevard (41st to 51st), 49th, and Macdonald (16th to King Edward)
Approved
The conditions and safety for residents and pedestrians on 16th, Marpole/15th/Wolfe/Douglas, West Boulevard (41st to 51st), 49th, and Macdonald (16th to King Edward) should be substantially improved by:
• adding and upgrading pedestrian crossings and sidewalks
• reducing traffic speed and noise, and
• providing more education about, and enforcement of, traffic rules and regulations.
Percent Agree 73%/74%
People’s Ideas...
• need pedestrian crossings on East and West Boulevard at 47th (near Magee High School), along 49th from Arbutus to Marine, and on 49th at Balsam (to improve access to Maple Grove Park)

3 Redesignate to Collectors
Quesnel (King Edward to 27th) and MacKenzie (27th to 41st), West Boulevard (51st to 61st) and Angus (61st to Marine Drive), Puget (King Edward to 33rd) and Larch (33rd to 41st), Macdonald (41st to Marine Drive), 33rd (Oak to MacKenzie), and 57th (Oak to Marine Drive)

These streets are now secondary arterials which carry relatively low traffic volumes and pass through predomi-
nantly residential neighbourhoods. Quesnel and MacKenzie serve as both truck and transit routes, West Boulevard and Angus as bus routes within ARKS. Quesnel and MacKenzie are located on the boundary between ARKS and Dunbar, and Angus and 57th on the boundary with Marpole.

The Transportation Plan proposes, and Vision participants supported, their reclassification to neighbourhood collectors. As a neighbourhood collector, a street 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. To achieve reclassification requires neighbourhood support, so streets which are located on the boundary between ARKS and other neighbourhoods will require further discussion with residents living outside of ARKS. 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 Designation of Some Secondary Arterials

The City should change the designation of the following streets from secondary arterial to neighbourhood collector to ensure these streets are not widened to increase the number of traffic lanes or the amount of car or truck traffic they carry:

**Approved**

a) Quesnel (King Edward to 27th) and MacKenzie (27th to 41st)

Percent Agree 54%/61%

**Approved**

b) West Boulevard (51st to 61st) and Angus (61st to Marine Drive)

Percent Agree 57%/57%

**Approved**

c) Puget (King Edward to 33rd) and Larch (33rd to 41st)

Percent Agree 56%/58%

**Approved**

d) Macdonald (41st to Marine Drive)

Percent Agree 53%/58%

3.2 Improve Conditions and Safety on Streets with the Potential to be Redesignated to Neighbourhood Collectors

**Approved**

e) 33rd (Oak to MacKenzie)

Percent Agree 51%/59%

**Not Approved (Uncertain)**

f) 57th (Oak to Marine Drive)

Percent Agree 48%/52%

Comment: Direction 3.1(f) 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: 1.7 to 1, random survey: 1.9 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. An examination of the distribution of votes for both surveys found that respondents in the neighbourhood adjacent to the street (bounded by 49th, Oak, 57th, Angus and Marine Drive) supported the Direction: 64% agree, 28% disagree.
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• reducing traffic speed and noise
• providing more education about, and enforcement of, traffic rules and regulations, and
• reducing the adverse impacts of trucks on neighbourhoods.

Percent Agree 72%/72%

People’s Ideas...
• use traffic circles and stop signs when downgrading from arterial to collector
• prohibit parking for 1/2 block on Larch north of 41st

4 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).

Traffic calming can be put in place using one of three approaches:
• a neighbourhood-wide traffic calming plan
• property owners pay for a non-diversionary traffic calming device
• City funded traffic calming on streets with problems confirmed by measurable criteria.

The Vision supports more traffic calming.

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 65%/68%

People’s Ideas...
• need comprehensive traffic calming plan for area south of 41st
• slow traffic around York House, Little Flower Academy, and Shaughnessy School
• address traffic congestion around schools, especially at Kerrisdale and Point Grey Schools
• enforce existing 50 km/h speed limit
• address traffic issues on 42nd just outside the Kerrisdale Community Centre
• need 4-way stop to slow traffic and enhance pedestrian safety around 45th and Yew, provide stop signs at East Boulevard and 50th, 52nd, and 54th

Raised crosswalk: traffic calming to slow cars

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.

4.2 Allow 40 km/h Speed Limit on Local Streets

Approved
The City should continue to encourage the province to move quickly to amend the Motor Vehicle Act to allow the City to reduce the speed limit on local streets to 40 km/h.
Percent Agree 54%/58%
4.3 Pursue Traffic Demand Reduction Measures

Not Approved (Uncertain)

More should be done to reduce auto-trips taken by residents of ARKS. Create and/or adopt from other areas programs and measures that get people walking, biking, or taking transit to local destinations, and link trips that would usually be taken individually.

Percent Agree 52%/52%

People’s Ideas...

• organize walking or biking school bus to discourage drop-off by car
• limit parking around schools, provide parking only for car-pools at UBC, use family trip-reduction plans, and adopt more user-pay measures for car drivers

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (2 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.

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. Instead, its 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 a regional body named 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.

The Vision Directions address how to make transit use more attractive.

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 65%/64%
People's Ideas...
• dedicate bus lanes through commercial areas to reduce delays
• allow signal priority for buses at intersections
• provide bus bulges and boarding spaces on transit-oriented streets where road space is available

5.2 Increase Frequency of Bus Service

Approved
The City should consult with TransLink to increase bus frequency — including adding more express routes — to quicken service. Attention should be paid to north-south connections in ARKS.
Percent Agree 70%/74%

People's Ideas...
• reduce number of bus stops during rush hour to increase frequency and reduce transit times, and add express routes (especially along Arbutus, and Macdonald/MacKenzie)
• alternate express and regular buses

5.3 Provide Shuttle Buses

Approved
TransLink should use shuttle buses to provide more flexible local service to and from key destinations like Kerrisdale Village, Kerrisdale Community Centre and Library, and Arbutus Shopping Centre.
Percent Agree 57%/60%

People's Ideas...
• use taxi-buses with flexible, demand-responsive routes to connect to regular city bus system
• use smaller buses in off-peak hours (especially on 49th)
• provide shuttles between shopping areas

5.4 Improve Taxi Service

Not Approved (Uncertain)
The number of taxis permitted in the city should be increased to improve local service, and further broaden transportation alternatives to the private automobile.
Percent Agree 36%/42%

People's Ideas...
• increase the city’s taxi fleet (number of licenses) and incorporate into overall transit plan
• provide more taxis/private shuttles

Comment: This Direction did not receive majority support in either the general survey or random surveys. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.3 to 1, random survey: 1.8 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.

Bus bulge: helps bus priority, more boarding space

Bus Routes
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, and trash cans.

Percent Agree 66%/71%

People’s Ideas...

• provide quiet transit through Kerrisdale (trolley bus/street car), cleaner buses, mail boxes, and news vending machines at bus stops
• post timetables and route maps and provide garbage cans at bus stops
• provide washrooms at major transit stops

5.6 Extensive Public Consultation when Planning for the Arbutus Corridor

Approved

Assuming the Supreme Court of Canada decides that the City has the authority to regulate the development of the Arbutus Corridor for commercial and residential use. In 2000, after a public hearing process, the City of Vancouver enacted the Arbutus Corridor Official Development Plan (ODP). The Plan designates the land in the Arbutus Corridor for transportation, including rail and transit, and for greenways.

The CPR subsequently challenged the Arbutus Corridor ODP in BC Supreme Court. In the initial decision in 2002, the Court ruled that the Arbutus Corridor ODP was invalid and set it aside. The City appealed that decision and the BC Court of Appeal affirmed the City’s authority to enact the Arbutus Corridor ODP. The CPR appealed the decision of the BC Court of Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada which upheld the Arbutus Corridor ODP which designates it for transportation and greenways uses.

5.7 Review Transit Fares and Promote Ridership

Approved

TransLink should consider ways to encourage greater ridership including special promotions and a reduction in the fare schedule.

Percent Agree 70%/68%

People’s Ideas...

• provide free rides on Canada Day
• provide ‘U-pass’ for Vancouver residents — add cost to property taxes — and run ‘U-passes’ all year round
• decrease bus fares for seniors and youth
• extend time limits for transfers
• provide a ‘family rate’ for families travelling together on transit

5.8 Local Involvement in Transit Decisions

Approved

There should be more local involvement in transit decisions.

Percent Agree 72%/66%

People’s Ideas...

• make those most affected by TransLink decisions part of the decision making process

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 the experience of nature, community, and city life. 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

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 (the Ridgeway route is nearing completion); 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 can be provided where a Bikeway crosses a busy street.
**Bikelanes** are marked lanes (minimum 1.5m 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.

Exact routes and designs of future city-wide Greenways, Bikeways, and Bikelanes are determined partly through input from the Community Vision but are usually followed by further, more detailed consultation with local residents and businesses.

**6.1 Improve Greenway and Bikeway Routes**

*Approved*

Greenways should link major walking destinations within and outside of ARKS and provide safe crossings at major streets. While the existing Ridgeway Greenway, and the Angus/Cypress, Mid-town, and Marine Bikeways are important community assets, improvements must still be made to encourage greater use of pedestrian and cyclist routes and facilities, and improve safety at intersections.

**Percent Agree 72%/72%**

**People’s Ideas...**
- narrow traffic lanes on Marine Drive to expand Bikelane and sidewalk
- provide better signage directing cyclists to Bikeways
- provide buffer between vehicles and bicycles on Marine Drive – remove cars parking in bikelane
- provide more traffic calming on bike routes especially on 57th to deal with school traffic
- show alternative routes to avoid steep hills and other barriers (e.g. 45th instead of 37th for steep sections)
- provide an east-west Greenway along King Edward or 16th
- consider 43rd or 45th as a good biking and walking route
- add a route for cyclists near 41st (e.g. 40th or 42nd)

**6.2 Initiate Neighbourhood Greenways**

*Approved*

ARKS residents should initiate Neighbourhood Greenways on frequently used walking and biking routes within the area (shown on the map). A Neighbourhood Greenway running between Kerrisdale Village and Arbutus Shopping Centre and incorporating Ravine Park should be investigated.

**Percent Agree 68%/74%**

**People’s Ideas...**
- extend trail along Ravine Park to 41st shopping area

**6.3 Provide General Walking and Biking Improvements**

*Approved*

The frequently used walking and biking routes within ARKS shown on the map should have additional greening and other types of improvements, including:
Funding Sidewalks

In 2004, City Council committed to completing the sidewalk network on all streets in Vancouver. A priority list of sidewalk/street types was established: transit routes, arterial streets, pedestrian collector routes, higher zoned streets, and local residential streets. Construction and reconstruction of sidewalks and improvements to residential streets and lanes is generally cost shared by the City and the adjacent property owner. In order facilitate the completion of the sidewalk network, the City decreased the property owner share for new sidewalks and increased the owner’s share for street and lane improvements.

Heavily utilized sidewalks that are seriously in need of repair, like sidewalks in neighbourhood shopping areas, now may be reconstructed by the City (without the approval of property owners) when the full costs of reconstruction is borne by the City.

- installation of sidewalks on streets without sidewalks and improved maintenance of existing streets and sidewalks,
- better pedestrian and bike crossings of arterials, and
- beautification of streets and sidewalks (e.g. tree-lined streets, landscaping, flowers, benches, special paving, and lighting).

**Percent Agree 72%/73%**

People’s Ideas...
- install signals at major intersections on well-used but non-designated routes

6.4 Provide and Repair Streets and Sidewalks

**Approved**

Streets and sidewalks in ARKS should be provided or repaired where necessary. **Percent Agree 77%/82%**

People’s Ideas...
- fix sidewalks on west side of 5900 block Balsam
- improve condition of sidewalk and pavement on Elm, Larch, 43rd, Balsam, Angus, and Connaught
- pave and calm MacKenzie between 33rd and 41st
- provide sidewalks on East Boulevard between 52nd and 57th
- fix the pavement along MacKenzie, Blenheim, and East Boulevard (49th to 57th)

6.5 Provide Bike Parking and Racks

**Approved**

Bike parking and racks should be more readily available in ARKS, particularly at major destinations like Kerrisdale Village. **Percent Agree 64%/67%**

People’s Ideas...
- provide bike racks in visible areas – easy to access and monitor – in areas around Kerrisdale Village, on buses, and in schools, parks and commercial areas

6.6 Develop Bikelanes along 33rd and MacKenzie

**Approved**

Bikelanes along 33rd and MacKenzie should be considered as part of a city-wide commuter network (this would be considered as part of a more detailed plan, to ensure that it was safe and that it fits in with the City’s overall network of biking routes). **Percent Agree 59%/57%**

People’s Ideas...
- provide Bikelanes on secondary arterials with bike parking
- dedicate land for Bikelanes
- install Bikelanes near all elementary and secondary schools
- separate Bikelanes from car lanes
Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy (ARKS) has a diverse population with many languages, ethnic backgrounds, income levels, and ages. These demographic factors create challenges to understanding and meeting people’s safety, recreational, and social service needs. Out of the broad range of services and service providers within ARKS, the Vision Directions concentrate on 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 involved in 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. ARKS is served by the Pacific Spirit Community Health Centre which is situated at 2110 West 43rd.

### 2001 Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>ARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>546,000</td>
<td>40,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1981 - 2001 Population Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>ARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### English Mother Tongue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>ARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chinese Mother Tongue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>ARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>ARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$42,026</td>
<td>$60,901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent Low Income Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>ARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Single Parent Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>ARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2001
Community Policing Centres

Community Policing Centres (CPCs) are places where the police and community volunteers engage in the delivery of crime prevention programs. When provincial funding for CPCs was withdrawn in 2003, a new model for community policing was adopted by the City to address the financial shortfall. The 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 population. The centres rely on support and cooperation from local residents, businesses, the police, and the City. The Kerrisdale Oakridge Marpole (KOM) CPC at 5655 Cambie services ARKS, along with Riley Park, South Cambie, Oakridge, and Marpole.

7 Community Safety

In 2001, both the rate of property crimes and the rate of crimes against people in ARKS were lower than most of the city’s local areas. Within ARKS, Shaughnessy’s property crime rate was slightly higher than in Arbutus Ridge and Kerrisdale.

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 and vehicles more burglar and theft resistant, and getting to know their neighbours.

Percent Agree 84%/87%

People’s Ideas…
• do not bring valuables to the community centre or library
• remove valuables when leaving the car and display ‘no valuables’ sign on vehicles
• install security cameras, motion sensor lighting, and gates to protect your home
• report suspicious behaviour to the police, especially in the back lanes
• get a ‘vacation’ buddy to check on your home when away
• hold more block parties to promote communication between neighbours

7.2 Support the Community Policing Centre and Community Policing

Approved

The Community Policing Centre (CPC) serving ARKS should be further strengthened and supported by the community. The CPC should expand the Block Watch Program, recruit more volunteers, and do more outreach in the community (especially to newcomers).

Percent Agree 80%/80%

People’s Ideas…
• publish newsletter about safety issues
• conduct meetings with local residents and newcomers about crime prevention in community centres, schools, and businesses
• hold regular safety fairs in the community centre
• recruit a Chinese speaking coordinator to get the Chinese involved as volunteers
• encourage Block Watch captains to connect better with newcomers
• locate a satellite station of the CPC at the community centre or major commercial areas to distribute information and recruit volunteers

7.3 Community Actions to Reduce Crime

Approved

The CPC, the City, the Police Department, the community centre, business groups, schools, and local neighbourhood groups should strengthen crime prevention efforts. These efforts should include improved lighting in low-visibility areas, strengthening community con-
nections and partnerships, and wider use of crime prevention and education programs.

People’s Ideas…
- get neighbourhood associations to organize more crime prevention activities (e.g. volunteer night patrols)
- post signs in the community centre reminding people to take care of their own belongings or designate a ‘safe’ area for depositing valuables
- provide better lighting on the streets and lanes (e.g. prevent lights from being overshadowed by tree limbs), install emergency phones
- extend opening hours of Kerrisdale stores into the evening (to make streets brighter and safer and provide support when there is danger)
- encourage dog owners to be involved in the pooch patrol program

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 safety concerns and needs.

Percent Agree 85%/85%

People’s Ideas…
- improve response to ‘break and enter’ 911 calls
- need to provide bilingual Chinese police to help the residents of ARKS

Youth Crime

Very few youth are engaged in crime. Youth already make an important contribution to improving the community. However, a range of youth crime and youth activities made residents feel unsafe: loitering, bullying, feeling threatened by groups of teens, vandalism, graffiti, and open drug use, etc. The Vision Directions support more youth-based activities and initiatives.

7.5 Prevent Youth Crime

Approved
Youth crime should be prevented through the co-ordinated efforts of schools, police, community organizations, and other groups working with youth. Initiatives could include additional facilities and programs in parks, community centres, and schools to provide alternatives for youth.

Percent Agree 83%/79%

People’s Ideas...
- offer more free drop-in recreation activities and after school clubs to reduce crimes of opportunity and vandalism by teens
- develop sense of ‘community’ responsibility in youth
- integrate new students into the student body (i.e. have a ‘buddy system’)
- have high schools sponsor an evening event about the problem of bullying

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.
Alcohol and Drug Services in ARKS

In ARKS, alcohol and drug services are provided through Westside Addiction Services Centre, located at the Pacific Spirit Community Health Centre (2110 West 43rd). It offers counselling, public education, home detox and methadone maintenance, needle exchange, and support groups for alcohol and drug addiction. A counsellor from this centre works with students and staff at Point Grey, Prince of Wales, and Magee Secondary Schools, delivering alcohol and drug education and prevention programs.

Many Vision participants recognized that illegal drug use does occur in ARKS, often out of sight in the home or at school, and requested that residents be consulted when facilities are proposed to address this important problem.

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 implement the City’s Drug Prevention Policy (e.g. needle exchanges, local treatment centres, and other facilities), they must include extensive consultation with the local community.

People’s Ideas...
- add more floors to existing building to increase space
- provide bikes, treadmill, and Kaiser weight equipment for people over 55
- build bigger gym and update gym equipment (better spacing of equipment)
- organize early morning fitness walking group
- hold workshops on community history and heritage, and provide tours and explanatory pamphlets
- add advanced sewing class to the program schedule

8.2 Provide More Public Recreation Facilities in Arbutus Ridge and Shaughnessy

Approved

More public recreation facilities should be provided in Arbutus Ridge and Shaughnessy by building new facilities for members only.
Neighbourhood Houses
Neighbourhood Houses are volunteer-driven and operated community service agencies. They work with the local community to develop innovative programs and services to meet the changing needs of a diverse population. Nine neighbourhood houses are located in the City but there are none in ARKS. Although neighbourhood houses are partially funded by the City, most of their funding is from other levels of government, and is directed to disadvantaged or at-risk residents. City capital and operating funding for such facilities is directed to neighbourhoods most in need.

Vision participants considered that the addition of a neighbourhood house would increase the level of social and cultural services in ARKS. It could promote more opportunities for different groups in the community to meet and initiate creative programs specific to the changing needs of the community.

Aquatic Facilities Review
The current Park Board policy is to provide an indoor pool for approximately every 50,000 people. There are currently nine indoor pools to serve the city’s population of about 550,000 people. Most pools are rapidly reaching the end of their practical service life and a decision is required about their replacement. The Park Board has completed a major study of existing pool facilities and future options. It recommended a renewal plan including one large-scale ‘city-wide’ destination pool, two expanded community pools providing features such as therapy, longer length, or outdoor swimming, and four neighbourhood pools focusing on swim lessons, fitness, and training. The recommended location for the City’s new destination pool is at Riley/Hillcrest Park in Riley Park/South Cambie. The plan includes redeveloping the Kerrisdale Pool as a ‘neighbourhood pool’ (serving the immediate neighbourhood), and maintaining Maple Grove Pool for long-term operation.

or extending the use of existing facilities for recreational purposes.

Percent Agree 55%/57%

People’s Ideas…
• locate a community centre or neighbourhood house in or near Arbutus Shopping Centre
• need a community centre in the Shaughnessy area with a swimming pool near Quilchena Park
• encourage sharing facilities with churches

8.3 Establish a Neighbourhood House in ARKS

Not Approved (Uncertain)
A neighbourhood house should be established in ARKS to help meet the changing social and cultural needs of the community.

Percent Agree 38%/38%

People’s Ideas…
• bring people of different backgrounds to work together and build stronger connections
• offer more multicultural programs, and welcome newcomers
• create a year round neighbourhood house facility in the lawn bowling building in Elm Park

Comment: This Direction did not receive majority support in either the general survey or random surveys. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.4 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 in further planning.

8.4 Upgrade and Expand Kerrisdale Pool

Approved
Kerrisdale Pool should be upgraded and expanded to better meet the needs of the community.

Percent Agree 63%/65%

People’s Ideas…
• build a new pool with waterslide next to existing pool
• need a larger pool with a hot tub and cleaner changing room
• need a sauna, spa, and whirlpool (could help people with arthritis and the disabled)
• need warm enough water for young children (at least 31C)
• incorporate new filtering technology in new pool facilities

8.5 Retain and Upgrade Maple Grove Pool

Approved
Maple Grove Pool should be retained and upgraded as a valuable recreational community resource.

Percent Agree 64%/68%

Maple Grove Pool

8.6 Retain and Upgrade Kerrisdale Arena

Approved
Kerrisdale Arena should be retained and upgraded to better meet the needs of the community in ARKS.

Percent Agree 69%/72%

People’s Ideas…
• rebuild the rink, and keep open throughout the year
• serves many youth living along the Boulevard
• is a valuable resource in ARKS for possible future development
8.7 Provide More Child Care Services

Not Approved (Uncertain)

More child care services such as daycare should be provided in the community centre and by other local organizations to meet the needs of families and children in the community.

Percent Agree 52%/52%

People’s Ideas...
• need more public daycares in ARKS
• support more local licensed daycare centres
• add child care facilities in community centre during school vacations
• start a group like US Moms (single moms collaborating for services)

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (3 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.

8.8 Improve Programs and Facilities for Youth

Approved

Improve and create more programs and facilities for youth, with special attention to interaction and partnerships between youth and seniors.

Percent Agree 66%/68%

People’s Ideas...
• organize programs to integrate seniors and youth by partnering with other government agencies such as the Ministry of Human Resources
• introduce youth activities to promote diversity and awareness between different cultures
• canvas youth for activity ideas that will serve them in their adult lives (e.g. job search skills, on the job training)
• need organized volunteer activities for youth
• need tables and games in youth room at Kerrisdale Community Centre
• find out opinions of shy and ESL kids
• use area from 37th to 38th along West Boulevard as a youth activity centre to serve Point Grey Secondary students
• need tennis and basketball courts at Maple Grove Park

8.9 Expand Programs and Services for Seniors

Approved

Expand programs and services for seniors, especially at Kerrisdale Seniors’ Centre. These programs and services should be available to people with a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Percent Agree 67%/66%

People’s Ideas...
• organize programs such as hiking, chess and singing, and provide services such as raking leaves
• consider a senior drop-in area with Mandarin-speaking staff
• find an effective way to attract multilingual volunteers for seniors’ centre

8.10 Celebrate Multiculturalism

Not Approved (Uncertain)

Create opportunities for neighbours to meet and celebrate cultural diversity in ARKS.

Percent Agree 54%/55%

People’s Ideas...
• hold cultural dances, block parties, and an international food fair in the community centre

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but was .3% short of the required support in the random survey to be classified as Approved (54.7%). In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (3.5 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.
9 Library Facilities and Services

The Vancouver Public Library operates the Kerrisdale Branch Library at 2121 West 42nd. It is located in the lower level of the Kerrisdale Community Centre. Established in 1943, it was rebuilt in 1963 and renovated again in 1991 and 2001. Currently the Library Board has no plan to renew or re-locate this library.

9.1 Kerrisdale Branch Library

Approved

The Kerrisdale Branch Library should be upgraded and expanded at or near its current location.

Percent Agree 76%/77%

People’s Ideas...
• increase library size because of high usage
• relocate library so it can be at ground level but locate close to community centre
• need a children/youth area and a reading room

9.2 Improve Kerrisdale Branch Library Services

Approved

The services of Kerrisdale Branch Library should be modified to better serve the public based on a review of factors such as collections, installation of a book drop, availability of Internet access, programming, service to non-English speakers, and opening hours.

Percent Agree 73%/74%

People’s Ideas...
• open Kerrisdale Library on Wednesdays
• enhance website to highlight new and popular books
• order more Chinese newspapers, books, and magazines

10 Services for Newcomers and Immigrants

The City and other service providers in ARKS deliver a wide range of services. Participants felt more programs and information about programs should be provided to newcomers and immigrants to better meet their needs and increase their participation.

10.1 Provide More Programs and Services for Newcomers and Immigrants

Not Approved (Uncertain)

More programs and services should be provided for newcomers and immigrants in ARKS.

Percent Agree 50%/47%

People’s Ideas...
• provide programs or services through partnership between community centres, churches, ISS, SUCCESS and MOSAIC
• help immigrants/newcomers including the Chinese, Koreans, and Japanese to know more about the community including opportunities to volunteer
• provide Mandarin workshops on computer skills and ‘Canadian living’ for newcomers
• locate suggestion box to encourage newcomers to express what they need
• create opportunities to practice English in social settings (not just having ESL classes)
• provide more Chinese programs (e.g. singing programs in Cantonese/Mandarin in Kerrisdale Community Centre)
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. It was .3% short of a majority in the general survey, and in both surveys, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 2.3 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 in further planning.

10.2 More Information about Programs and Services

Approved
More information about services provided by the City and other service providers should be readily available, especially to newcomers to the community.

Percent Agree 59%/59%

People's Ideas...
• provide an information centre for newcomers in community centre to raise awareness of available services
• provide a notice board with information about community groups
• create multi-language information materials on garbage, clean up, and conservation issues
• create list of phone numbers for city services so that citizens know where to go for information (e.g. fridge magnets, telephone books)
• provide Chinese translation at community events
• have an online multilingual (Chinese) community webpage
Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy (ARKS) has a mix of mature, residential neighbourhoods. Ranging from the estates of First Shaughnessy, to the character areas of Kerrisdale, to the post-war suburb of Arbutus-Ridge, most of the community is made up of neighbourhoods of single family homes. Higher density housing is clustered around Kerrisdale Village with its mix of four storey and twelve storey apartments, and around Arbutus Shopping Centre with its townhouses and four to six storey apartments. Apartments can also be found along Oak between 16th and King Edward (with some housing units above stores), and at 41st and Oak (which includes some specialized housing for seniors).

The Vision identifies aspects of existing housing which should be maintained in the future while supporting some initiatives to help accommodate the existing population in ARKS as their housing needs change over time.

Vancouver’s Zoning By-law

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 ARKS are zoned RS-1, RS-3, RS-3A, RS-5, RS-6, and FSD (First Shaughnessy District). 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 applicants face 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 ARKS 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.

11.1 Maintain Most Single Family Areas

Approved

In order to retain the basic character of ARKS, 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 13.4, 15.1 – 15.9, 15.11, 16.1 – 16.6, 18.17, and 20.13).

Percent Agree 86%/84%

People’s Ideas...

• retain single family houses as they are attractive to all types of households
• keep single family houses because they can be affordable rental housing for small families

12 New House Design

New houses frequently replace older ones. Currently about two-thirds of the single family zoning in ARKS has review of external design elements which affect visual appearance, character, and landscaping. The other one-third of the single family area (located mainly in the north-west and south-east of ARKS) has zoning with no design review. Here, the zoning only regulates the height, yard sizes, total floorspace, and garage size of new houses. 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, and supported some level of design review for those neighbourhoods currently without it.

12.1 Design Review for New Single Family Houses

Approved

Most areas in ARKS 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 able to obtain it with sufficient community support.

Percent Agree 80%/76%

People’s Ideas...

• build new houses in traditional styles
• require all houses to go through design review
• fit houses into the overall streetscape
• allow more modern looking housing and encourage imagination in design
• allow for diversity where everyone builds what they want
• need better design rather than just ‘fitting in’
12.2 Public Involvement in the Review of New Single Family House Design

Approved

In areas with design review of new single family homes, the City should explore alternative methods for improving public involvement in the review of new or substantially renovated single family houses, including some form of community-based design panel or advisory committee (e.g. First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel).

Percent Agree 66%/66%

People’s Ideas…
• use Shaughnessy’s Design Panel as a model for other areas
• need neighbourhood input on house design
• have mandatory consultation with neighbours who sign-off on design
• have feedback meetings between neighbourhood groups and the City about recent approvals
• do not give veto power to neighbours when approving designs

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

The First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel is an advisory body to City Council made up of fourteen members, mostly residents but including professionals from the design, heritage, and development communities. Its primary purpose is to preserve and protect the heritage and special character of the First Shaughnessy District. It is authorized to make recommendations regarding development matters within First Shaughnessy District to the City. It does not have the authority to approve or refuse projects or make policy decisions.

13 Retaining Heritage

ARKS contains many significant areas of heritage and character buildings. From its inception in the early part of the last century, First Shaughnessy has held a special place in Vancouver as the home for many of its grandest homes and gardens. Kerrisdale also began its development at the turn of the 20th Century, while Arbutus Ridge was built largely during and after WWII.

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. ARKS has 120 buildings on the VHR, 60% of them located in First Shaughnessy District. The VHR also lists 3 heritage ‘streetscapes’ (groupings of buildings of heritage merit) in ARKS: the 2000 block of West 36th, the 6100 block of Macdonald – east side, and the 2600 block of Marine Crescent – west side.

Heritage ‘parks and landscapes’ are also listed including King Edward Boulevard, Maple Grove Park, and along West 16th in Shaughnessy Heights.

Vision participants spoke of their appreciation of First Shaughnessy as an important heritage area, and their support for the Official Development Plan (or ODP) as a means to protect its character (see MORE INFO - First Shaughnessy District in this section). They also identified the need to find additional means to retain heritage and character buildings in other parts of ARKS, including allowing the conversion of existing character single family homes into multiple conversion dwellings.

13.1 Support for First Shaughnessy Official Development Plan (ODP)

Approved

The First Shaughnessy ODP should be retained and supported as an important policy to encourage the retention of the heritage buildings, landscaping, and the estate-like image of the area.

Percent Agree 78%/78%

13.2 Retain Buildings on the Vancouver Heritage Register (VHR)

Approved

For buildings listed in the VHR, the City should encourage retention by implementing additional incentives which are suitable in ARKS.

Percent Agree 78%/77%

People’s Ideas…
• need incentives to save smaller heritage houses (e.g. allow infill housing)
13.4 Multiple Conversion Dwellings (MCDs)

Approved

Character housing should be retained, and housing variety increased, by allowing more MCDs on large lots. The MCDs should be designed to retain the look of the original building, and have adequate parking. Adequate community facilities (parks, schools, etc.) and services for the additional population should be provided.

Percent Agree 61%/63%

People’s Ideas…
• should be developed on 50’ lots, with adequate parking, or on corner lots
• preserve character of existing houses and neighbourhoods by allowing MCDs
• appropriate for large lots with large houses, good heritage preservation tool

Multiple Conversion Dwellings (MCDs)

A Multiple Conversion Dwelling, or MCD, allows an existing dwelling to be converted to two or more individual units. MCDs have been used to promote the retention of existing neighbourhood character. Since each new housing unit uses less land and is smaller than a new single family house, they are also generally more affordable. The units may be side-by-side, front-to-back, or up-and-down. Each housing unit can be individually owned.

MCDs provide many of the features of a single family house including access to yards, individual entrances, garages, and enough floorspace to meet the needs of a family. They are currently permitted in First Shaughnessy District and on a few lots in other parts of ARKS. They are also common in Kitsilano (north of Broadway) and Mount Pleasant (south and east of City Hall).

13.3 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.

Percent Agree 74%/71%

People’s Ideas…
• provide seed money for upgrading and give tax relief
• need incentives to keep some older houses (e.g. allow infill housing, give tax breaks, sell development rights)
• need special incentives to retain smaller buildings
14 Changes in CD-1 Zones

Some developments in ARKS 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 quite vague and general. In addition, older CD-1 sites were 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 ARKS

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 72%/72%
Vision participants looked at the future housing needs of ARKS 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 ARKS existing residents will create about 1,250 (8%) 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 ARKS. Of course, people will continue to move to Vancouver from elsewhere and some will move into ARKS, 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 only 3-5% of single family houses 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 also be built along the major arterial streets and above stores in the commercial areas. In total, the capacity under existing zoning stands at over 3,200 more housing units, meeting the overall future housing demand. However, about two thirds of those housing units are rental suites in single family houses (usually in the basement) and one third in additional apartments (mostly above shops). 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’). In addition to meeting the changing housing needs of existing residents, it was felt that regional sprawl would be reduced by providing additional housing opportunities in Vancouver.
Addressing Possible Impacts of New Housing

Vision participants generally felt that there was a need for new types of housing that are better suited to meeting future housing demands within the community. However, residents were concerned about possible impacts of additional housing such as increased traffic and parking demands, loss of neighbourhood character, and the need for more transit service. 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 new housing.

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 firefighting access. As a result, small lot infill is most feasible when built with a new main house.

Status: Infill is already allowed in parts of ARKS such as the First Shaughnessy District. It has also been permitted for over 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

Housing variety should be increased in ARKS by allowing more infill housing than is currently permitted, provided it is:
• designed to fit into the single family area, with good 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 56%/55%

People’s Ideas…
• prefer fee simple (individual ownership) to strata title (with common property and strata council)
• desirable for keeping heritage buildings
• can allow extended families to live close together

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but was .3% short of the required support in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In the random survey,
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Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy Community Vision

More Planning and 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 how more planning and consultation about housing would take place is provided by the Kensington – Cedar Cottage (KCC) Community Vision. The KCC 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). 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 near Kingsway and Knight. Based on this, a Kingsway and Knight ‘Housing Area Plan’ was drafted and later approved by City Council. The zoning to allow the housing types has been approved by Council.

the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (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 housing planning occurs in the community.

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 ARKS and are common in other areas like Kitsilano (north of West Broadway).

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

- 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 56%/54%

People’s Ideas.
• allow duplexes as they exist now in single family areas and do not disturb character
• need more single family houses and duplexes

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (1.9 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.

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 for a typical single family house. A walkway between the front units would provide fire-fighting 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 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 being free-standing and having a size suitable for families.

15.2 Allow More Duplexes

Not Approved (Uncertain)

Housing variety should be increased in ARKS by allowing more duplexes than are currently permitted, provided they are:
• designed to fit into the single family area, with good landscaping
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

Not Approved (Uncertain)

Housing variety should be increased in ARKS by allowing some cottages or small houses on shared lots, provided they are:

• designed to fit into the single family area, with good 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 53%/54%

People’s Ideas...

• redevelop large sites into cottages with green courtyard
• increases affordable/low cost housing opportunities
• gain some advantages of single family housing (e.g. good design features) with some loss of privacy

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but was .9% short of 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 (1.9 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.

Fourplex and Villas (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 a single family home (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, parents whose children have left home, and seniors comfortable with stairs.
15.4 Allow Some Fourplexes and Villas (six units)

Not Supported
Housing variety should be increased in ARKS by allowing some fourplexes and villas (six units), provided they are:
- designed to fit into the single family area, with good 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 40%/42%

People’s Ideas...
- must be complimentary to existing neighbourhood character

Comment: This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes outnumbered agree votes in the general survey. Fourplexes and Villas (six units) will not be brought forward for consideration 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: ARKS has no traditional rowhousing.

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

15.5 Allow Some Traditional Rowhouses

Not Approved (Uncertain)
Housing variety should be increased in ARKS by allowing some traditional rowhouses provided they are:
- designed to fit into the single family area, with good 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 45%/49%

People’s Ideas...
- allow no more than 4 to 6 dwellings in one rowhouse complex and only one complex per block
- vary setbacks for light, views, gardens, and parking

Comment: This Direction did not receive majority support in either the general or random surveys. In both surveys, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 2.3 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 feature 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 ARKS by allowing some courtyard or carriage court rowhouses, provided they are:

- designed to fit into single family areas with good 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 46%/46%**

People’s Ideas...

- shared courtyard very attractive for kids to play in safely
- preferred by older singles and couples who spend more time at home and place a higher value on outdoor space

**Comment:** This Direction did not receive majority support in either the general or random surveys. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.4 to 1, random survey: 1.4 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.
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: ARKS has existing four storey apartments along Oak (between 16th and King Edward) and near 41st, and around Kerrisdale Village and the Arbutus Shopping Centre.

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 Approved (Uncertain)
Some additional four storey apartments should be permitted in ARKS, provided they are:
• designed to be compatible with adjacent residential and commercial buildings, with good landscaping
• located in select areas and built as small projects rather than 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 42%/41%

People’s Ideas...
• redevelop apartments in areas where current housing has no redeeming features (i.e. lack of green space, poor design, poor construction)
• good for seniors-supported living (e.g. with daily meal program, an emergency monitoring and response system, help with housekeeping and laundry, and social and recreation activities)

Comment: This Direction did not receive majority support in either the general or random surveys. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.1 to 1, random survey: 1.1 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.

Six Storey Apartments

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

Status: ARKS has some six storey apartments around Arbutus Shopping Centre and the RM-3 zoning around Kerrisdale Village permits this type of apartment.

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.

15.8 Allow More Six Storey Apartments

Not Supported
Some additional six storey apartments should be permitted in ARKS provided they are:
• designed to be compatible with adjacent residential and commercial buildings, with good 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 28%/29%
People’s Ideas…
• good for seniors’ housing in areas near neighbourhood centres
• can lead to increased accessibility (with the provision of elevators) with increased density
• increase the amount of green space with increased density

Comment: This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes out numbered agree votes in both the general and the 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 cost. Because of their increased height, many units enjoy views. Units may be rental or strata-titled. Each unit is usually on a single level and accessible by elevator.

Status: ARKS has ten to twelve storey apartments around Kerrisdale Village. This type of housing is also found in parts of South Granville (north of 16th).

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

15.9 Allow More Twelve Storey Apartments

Not Supported
Some additional twelve storey apartments should be permitted in ARKS 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 good 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 26%/27%

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

Any New Housing Types

This section described the housing types which Vision participants felt would be attractive to existing ARKS 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, and Twelve storey Apartments) in the Directions listed above?
Percent supporting at least one new housing type 47%/54%

Comment: This Direction is not classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) 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 56%/55% supported Infill (15.1).
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 nearby, 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 types housing outlined in the previous Directions, options include additional traditional apartments and smaller scale seniors’ homes (including conversion of larger older homes). These projects would be purpose-built for seniors and some would provide for different levels of care.

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. 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.

15.11 Seniors’ Housing

Approved

Some small developments designed for seniors should be considered near parks, shopping, transit, and services to allow seniors to stay in the community as their housing needs change.

Percent Agree 78%/82%

People’s Ideas...

• need seniors’ assisted living and extended care in close proximity to services
• locate near shops, coffee houses, etc.
• need more seniors’ accommodation: low-income, rental
16 New Housing Locations

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

The response to this Survey will be the first step in determining if and where new housing options should be considered in ARKS. For the general locations supported by the community, there will be a subsequent planning process with significant public consultation before asking City Council to consider any broad rezoning from what is currently permitted in the area. The planning process would work with residents to look at the specific types of housing which may be permitted, the demands for community facilities and services generated by any additional population, the plans to address any parking or traffic impacts generated by a possible change, and the more detailed design and siting aspects of new forms of housing.

In each of the 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 near shopping areas/neighborhood centres.

New Housing Types on Large Lots

Some Vision participants felt that new housing types should be permitted on large lots. This option would:

• allow change to take place gradually, and on lots which would otherwise likely redevelop to larger single family homes under existing zoning
• provide housing in locations that would be attractive to families with children, working couples, and seniors
• 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 Large Lots

Approved

New housing types should be permitted in ARKS on large lots, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation.

Percent Agree 55%/60%

New Housing Types Around Schools

Schools can be an important focal point for a community. Younger children are generally escorted to school and parents tend to be involved in school events. High schools can be an important location for teen activities. Vision participants developed the option of locating new or additional housing types within a few blocks of schools. This option would:

• provide more housing suitable for families with children in locations with direct access to schools
• make walking to school a more viable option
• meet the needs of single parents
• leave large areas of single family housing unchanged.

16.2 Allow New Housing Types Around Schools

Not Approved (Uncertain)

New housing types should be permitted around schools in ARKS, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation.

Percent Agree 51%/53%

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 (2.1 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 Larger Parks

Parks are attractive to most people. Vision participants felt new housing around larger parks would be appropriate when the amount of private open space associated with the new housing type is limited. This option would:

- allow ready access to places where exercise is possible 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 Larger Parks

*Not Approved (Uncertain)*

New housing types should be permitted around larger parks in ARKS, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation.  
*Percent Agree 49%/54%*

**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 considered approved. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.6 to 1, random survey: 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 housing planning occurs in the community.

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).

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

Not Supported
New housing types should be permitted in scattered locations throughout the single family areas of ARKS, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation. Percent Agree 36%/37%

Comment: This Direction is Not Supported because disagree votes out numbered agree votes in both the general and random surveys. New Housing Types Scattered Throughout the Single Family Areas will not be brought forward for consideration when additional housing planning occurs in the community.

New Housing Types On or Near Arterial Roads
Most of the arterials in ARKS (Oak, Granville, Arbutus, 41st, Marine Drive, King Edward, and West Boulevard) are lined with single family homes. Some exceptions exist where residential and commercial (mixed-use) zoning is in place along Oak and West Boulevard. Vision participants identified arterials as a location for other housing types to be located on or near. 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
• shield, to some extent, adjacent single family homes from the noise of arterial traffic as the new housing types (with good construction practices like double-glazed windows) and their landscaping act as a buffer
• leave large areas of single family housing unchanged.

16.5 Allow New Housing Types On or Near Arterial Roads

Approved
New housing types should be permitted on or near arterial roads in ARKS, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation. Percent Agree 51%/61%
New Housing Types Near Shopping Areas

A variation of new housing on or near arterial roads is to allow some additional housing near the shopping areas in ARKS. These locations would:

- provide convenient access to transit for residents without cars
- provide convenient access by walking, biking, or taking transit to shops and services
- support local shops and services with additional population
- shield to some extent, adjacent single family homes from the noise of traffic as the new housing types (with good construction practices like double-glazed windows) and landscaping act as a buffer
- leave large areas of single family housing unchanged.

16.6 Allow New Housing Near Shopping Areas

**Approved**

New housing types should be permitted near shopping areas in ARKS, subject to detailed planning and impact mitigation.

**Percent Agree 66%/68%**

Support for New Housing in at least One Location

The Directions above identify locations which Vision participants felt made sense for new housing types to accommodate the changing needs of ARKS residents as they age. In order to get a clear picture of how many people support new housing in any of the locations, this Direction asked if respondents supported any of 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 (On Large Lots, Around Schools, Around Parks, Scattered Throughout the Single Family Area, On or Near Arterial Roads, or Near Shopping Areas)?

**Percent support at least one housing location 42%/52%**
Housing Affordability

Housing affordability was a significant concern of Vision participants. They developed Vision Directions that include proposals for additional conversions, infill, cottages, duplexes, fourplexes, 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 units 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 in ARKS except to those with high incomes, 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:

- directly funding affordable housing with money approved in Capital Plan plebiscites
- leasing City land, in some cases at substantial discounts, to non-profit housing sponsors who build housing funded by the B.C. 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 senior government funding for non-market housing.

Comment: This Direction is not given a classification 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 (55%/60% supported New Housing Types on Large Lots, Direction 16.1).

17 Housing Affordability

Housing affordability is a major concern in ARKS. 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. Participants felt that people should be able to stay in the community as they age and that a range of housing is needed to meet the needs of a community of diverse ages, incomes, backgrounds, and occupations.

17.1 Housing Affordability

Not Approved (Uncertain)
The City should urge senior governments to reinstate programs that fund non-market housing and to develop new initiatives that will increase non-market housing in ARKS, including co-ops.

Percent Agree 47%/45%

People’s Ideas…
- ensure no exclusive social housing complexes

Comment: This Direction did not receive majority support in either the general or random surveys. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.3 to 1, random survey: 1.2 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion in future planning.

17.2 Integrating Market with Non-Market Housing

Not Approved (Uncertain)
Projects or proposals that provide non-market housing should also include a share of market housing.

Percent Agree 43%/40%

People’s Ideas…
- ensure larger variety of units, rental and co-ops
- provide more opportunities for families with kids
- need safe, social housing, especially for women and children

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: 1.2 to 1). As a result, this Direction is classified as Not Approved (Uncertain) and remains on the table for consideration and public discussion in future planning.
Vancouver’s CityPlan contains some key directions to develop ‘neighbourhood centres’ which can 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 also contain 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.

Previous Community Visions have sought to create these neighbourhood centres in and around key shopping areas while improving the shopping areas, making them more convenient, safe, comfortable, and enjoyable places to visit and to shop.

ARKS Vision participants developed some ideas to strengthen an area they felt was already a neighbourhood centre – the Kerrisdale Shopping Area or ‘Kerrisdale Village’. They also suggested making some significant changes to the Arbutus Shopping Centre so that it becomes more of a neighbourhood centre for ARKS residents. They also looked at some of the small local shopping areas that dot ARKS: 33rd and MacKenzie, 16th and Macdonald, and Macdonald and Alamein. They suggested ways to make these areas more convenient, safe, comfortable, and enjoyable places to shop, with some limited opportunities for additional housing.

Participants also proposed limiting additional ‘big box’ stores, supporting business associations, and retaining the existing C-1 zoning for the other small shopping areas in ARKS.
18 Kerrisdale Shopping Area
(‘Kerrisdale Village’)

Kerrisdale Village encompasses the commercial areas along 41st from Larch to Maple, 42nd from Yew to Maple, and along East and West Boulevard from 37th to 49th, plus the surrounding apartment area. Participants saw 41st Avenue as the heart of the Village, especially the intersection of 41st and Yew. Assets include the small scale stores in the area, a London Drugs as an anchor store, as well as the trees, banners, and other improvements sponsored by the Kerrisdale Business Improvement Area (BIA). Problems included traffic speed and congestion (especially at 41st and West Boulevard), truck traffic along 41st, and the lack of a public square or gathering place.

18.1 Enhance Kerrisdale Village as an Important Shopping Area

Approved
Kerrisdale Village should be enhanced as a major neighbourhood shopping area and important community place.

Percent Agree 78%/80%

People’s Ideas…
• retain the size and shape of the shopping area

18.2 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 that are not ‘pedestrian friendly’.

Percent Agree 82%/83%

People’s Ideas…
• need more shops along East Boulevard from 41st to 45th

18.3 Provide a Range of Shops and Services

Approved
There should continue to be a wide range of local-serving shops and services in the shopping area.

Percent Agree 81%/86%

People’s Ideas…
• use the area from 37th to 38th along West Boulevard as a youth activity centre to serve Point Grey Secondary students
• encourage stores that appeal to younger people
• add additional services or a theatre to the area adjacent to the community centre and Kerrisdale Centennial Park
• need an Office Depot type of store to support home businesses
• encourage wine bars, more outside patio seating, and/or a jazz club
• consider tax burden on small business when pursuing policy to have a wide range of shops in neighbourhood centres

Local shops and services
18.4 Discourage Additional Auto-oriented Services

Approved
Additional auto-oriented services (e.g. gas stations, repair shops, etc.) should be discouraged in the shopping area.
Percent Agree 63%/66%

People’s Ideas…
• do not allow gas stations anywhere in Kerrisdale Village

18.5 Add a Supermarket

Approved
The City, in consultation with the neighbourhood, should work with supermarket owners to identify, assemble, and rezone a site for a moderately sized supermarket with adequate parking provided.
Percent Agree 65%/66%

People’s Ideas…
• provide a supermarket to ‘anchor’ the neighbourhood shopping area
• need a supermarket in the area (IGA at 41st and Dunbar is too far away)
• use the area south of 43rd along West Boulevard as a potential grocery store site
• put the supermarket in an underutilized area (e.g. north or south of 41st along West Boulevard)
• need a medium-sized supermarket like ‘Urban Fare’ or ‘Choices’ - closer to 15,000 sq. ft.

18.6 Improve Pedestrian Safety

Approved
Safer crossings for pedestrians in the business area should be provided, especially at 41st and West and East Boulevard.
Percent Agree 75%/76%

People’s Ideas…
• provide a mid-block crossing between Yew and West Boulevard on 41st
• construct raised crosswalks at East and West Boulevard on 41st
• provide a crossing on West Boulevard at 39th

18.7 Improve Bike Access for Kerrisdale Village

Approved
Bike access to and within Kerrisdale Village should be improved.
Percent Agree 54%/56%

People’s Ideas…
• need better bike access to centres like Kerrisdale Village
• have a route for cyclists off 41st – perhaps 40th or 42nd
• need a separate lane for cyclists along 41st

18.8 Control Sidewalk Merchandise

Approved
Merchandise displays and sandwich boards on the sidewalk add interest and vitality on 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 70%/64%

People’s Ideas…
• retain current limits, leaving 5’ clear pathway for pedestrians
• create more energy by keeping narrow sidewalks
• remove signs from sidewalks

18.9 Provide Weather Protection

Approved
There should be continuous weather protection for shoppers in the form of canopies or awnings.
Percent Agree 57%/57%

People’s Ideas…
• put awnings in front of busy areas like bus stops

18.10 Protect and Enhance Street Trees

Approved
The existing street trees contribute to the pleasant character of the street. These trees should be kept and main-
Building Lines

Building lines are an additional setback used to preserve future road and boulevard widening or to preserve open space. 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 their capacities, and established building lines. These were modified in the 1940s, and 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 from the property line. These include the width and depth of required yards, and building depth. This explains why some newer buildings on 41st have been ‘set-back’ from adjacent, older buildings resulting in wider sidewalks on portions of the street.

Percent Agree 84%/87%

People’s Ideas…
• provide more trees on both sides of Yew near 41st
• plant taller, bigger trees around community centre on 42nd
• ensure that trees and other greenery do not block business signs/advertising

18.11 Improve Design of Awnings

Approved

The design of awnings should be improved. A set of awning guidelines should be considered for Kerrisdale Village.

Percent Agree 56%/57%

People’s Ideas…
• have the Kerrisdale BIA adopt some guidelines for the design of the awnings and have them enforced by the City.
• give awnings a consistent look

18.12 Create a More Attractive Area

Approved

Local merchants and owners, through the Kerrisdale BIA, have significantly improved the area’s appearance with banners, colourful lightpoles, a landmark clock, decorative trash receptacles and newspaper box screens, a signature Kerrisdale sign, bus shelters, and decorative pedestrian lighting. The appearance of Kerrisdale Village should be improved through efforts of private businesses and the City (e.g. create outdoor patios, attractive landscaping, banners, special lighting, bike racks, public notice boards/directory, public art, special paving, drinking fountains), retaining its ‘village’ character.

Percent Agree 78%/78%

People’s Ideas…
• retain character of Kerrisdale Village: ‘villagy’ with specialty shops, small storefronts, character build-

ings (e.g. Bill Chow Jewellers), and lower heights of buildings
• allow people to retain the siting of their shop on the street if they redevelop (i.e. ignore the building line)
• apply building lines to allow for sidewalk boulevards, benches, and plantings
• increase plantings, baskets of flowers on boulevards on 41st
• provide more benches on West Boulevard and on 42nd outside of London Drugs
• create a pedestrian mews between Vine and the west end of 40th
• beautify and make more functional the London Drugs mews with more plantings, benches, and tables (to have lunch), and redesign the back lane
• provide more attractive sidewalk treatment and landscaping when side streets intersect with shopping streets
• use the intersection of 41st and the Boulevards, and 41st and Yew, to increase the character of this area with increased sidewalk width, corner bulges, brick pavers, landscaping, and other treatments

18.13 Create a Public Plaza or Gathering Space

Approved

A public plaza or gathering space should be created in Kerrisdale Village for people to ‘meet and greet’, perform, and relax; with community arts, community services, and extensive landscaping and trees.

Percent Agree 57%/58%
18.14 Provide A Cleaner Place

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 81%/80%

People’s Ideas…
• clean up lane south of 41st at London Drugs
• clean up area around McDonald’s at 41st and East Boulevard
• need bigger garbage cans on 41st
• deal with garbage spill around dumpsters in back lanes
• get high school kids to help clean up areas in Kerrisdale

18.15 Provide Convenient Parking

Approved

Short-term customer parking, including curbside parking, should be available to support local businesses and reduce impacts of parking on local streets adjacent to the shopping area.

Percent Agree 78%/78%

People’s Ideas…
• provide more underground parking for shoppers and community centre users
• encourage side angled parking with landscaping
• provide more parking off of 41st
• provide more signage for free public parking

18.16 Address Crime and Nuisance Behavior

Approved

Crime and nuisance behavior such as graffiti and aggressive panhandling should be addressed through community-based prevention and more enforcement by police and security people. The Kerrisdale BIA should assist in doing this.

Percent Agree 82%/82%

People’s Ideas…
• provide more police presence or liaison with BIA or residents to deal with safety issues, using a bilingual officer/volunteer who can speak Chinese

18.17 Provide Additional Housing on Edges of Kerrisdale Village

Not Approved (Uncertain)

Provide additional housing in Kerrisdale Village along the edges of the existing shopping and apartment areas to support the shopping area and to allow more people to live close to where they work or shop. Housing types to consider would be small scale (including fourplexes and rowhouses), and would replace the less affordable single family housing. Any housing redevelopment should be designed to ‘fit in’ with the single family area, and have good landscaping.

Percent Agree 48%/50%

People’s Ideas…
• allow triplexes, row houses to be built around the Kerrisdale area (e.g. around Larch Street and 41st and ensure that they are affordable)
• address increased traffic and congestion problems with increased density
• provide more diversity of housing forms and more landscaping

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:
1.7 to 1, random survey: 1.9 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.

19 Arbutus Shopping Centre
(‘Arbutus Village’)

Arbutus Shopping Centre is located off of Arbutus north of Nanton. There is multi-family residential housing in the area immediately to the north and west of the centre. Vision participants saw the opportunity to create a possible future neighbourhood centre (Arbutus Village) in place of the existing shopping centre. Shops would be relocated closer to Arbutus Street, and a new internal shopping ‘street’ would replace the existing surface parking lot (with parking largely placed underground). Apartments would be built above those shops (‘mixed-use development’), and new apartment buildings would be built in place of the existing mall, overlooking Arbutus Village Linear Park. Pedestrian and bike pathways would connect parks, schools, and Kerrisdale Village with the new neighbourhood centre.

Should redevelopment occur further south of the shopping centre, Vision participants suggested extending mixed use developments down the west side of Arbutus as far as the existing small commercial area at Arbutus and Valley.

19.1 Create a New Neighbourhood Centre (Arbutus Village)

Approved

The creation of a neighbourhood centre (Arbutus Village) should be considered at the Arbutus Shopping Centre. In future, stores should be relocated closer to Arbutus Street, incorporating shops, cafes, and services on the ground floor. A new internal shopping ‘street’ with benches, trees, and greenery should replace the existing surface parking lot, with parking largely placed underground. Pedestrian and bike pathways would connect parks, schools, and Kerrisdale Village with the new neighbourhood centre.

Percent Agree 57%/64%

People’s Ideas…
• redevelop Arbutus Shopping Centre with more urban, street-oriented development
• convert parking lot space into new internal shopping street and bring commercial area out to Arbutus
• could be developed more like a market place with a farmers’ market, artist displays, cafés, etc.
• serve the growing Asian population with stores open later, a night market, etc.

19.2 Provide Additional Housing at Arbutus Village

Not Approved (Uncertain)

The new neighbourhood centre at Arbutus Village should include additional housing types, complemented by additional community services and amenities. Apartments would be built above shops on Arbutus Street and on the new internal shopping street to add housing diversity and support the shops in the new centre. New apartment buildings would be built in place of the existing mall, overlooking Arbutus Village Linear Park.

Percent Agree 47%/49%

People’s Ideas…
• bring commercial area out to Arbutus with residential above, courtyard space in behind
• increase density provided that the shopping centre is improved
• allow mixed use development to increase density and improve commercial activity

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: 1.8 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 shopping centre site.

19.3 Extend Shopping Area South of Arbutus Shopping Centre

Not Approved (Uncertain)
Should redevelopment occur south of the shopping centre, consider extending residential/commercial 'mixed use' developments down the west side of Arbutus as far as the existing small commercial area at Arbutus and Valley.
Percent Agree 47%/50%

People’s Ideas...
• extend ‘mixed use’ residential/commercial south along Arbutus to connect Arbutus Shopping Centre with commercial area at Arbutus and Valley
• redevelop retail at Arbutus and Valley as mixed use residential/commercial

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: 1.8 to 1, random survey: 2.9 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.

19.4 Create a Public Plaza or Gathering Space

Not Approved (Uncertain)
A public plaza or gathering space should be created in Arbutus Village for people to ‘meet and greet’, perform, and relax; with community arts, community services, and extensive landscaping and trees.
Percent Agree 49%/53%

People’s Ideas...
• should incorporate some sort of community meeting place like an outdoor bandstand in the new development

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: 1.8 to 1, random survey: 2.9 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.

19.5 Ensure Continuity of Shops and Services

Approved
In any redevelopment of the shopping centre, shops and services should be continuous along the ground floor of buildings. Ground floor frontage should not be interrupted by drive-throughs, parking lots, or building fronts and uses that are not ‘pedestrian friendly’.
Percent Agree 69%/69%

19.6 Provide a Range of Shops and Services

Approved
There should be a wide range of local serving shops and services in the shopping area.
Percent Agree 72%/76%

People’s Ideas...
• lower the rents to attract more small shops and more diversity of stores
• retain a liquor store and a post office in any new development
• consider a farmer’s market, pub/restaurant, barbershop, or men’s clothing store on the site
• add a T and T supermarket and other Chinese stores
• need a community centre or neighbourhood house, and provide children’s programs and tutoring
• need to have more interactive seniors’ activities in the mall
• restrict financial or real estate institutions because they tend to decrease commercial activity in an area

19.7 Discourage Additional Auto-oriented Services

Not Approved (Uncertain)

Additional auto-oriented services (e.g. gas stations, repair shops, etc.) should be discouraged in the shopping centre.

Percent Agree 48%/54%

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: 2.6 to 1, random survey: 3.1 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.

19.8 Retain a Supermarket

Approved

The supermarket is an important anchor for the shopping area. Any redevelopment plans for Arbutus Shopping Centre should include a supermarket.

Percent Agree 86%/89%

People’s Ideas…
• must keep a supermarket in order for the shopping area to be successful

19.9 Improve Pedestrian Comfort and Safety

Approved

It should be easier and safer for pedestrians to cross Arbutus and it should be more enjoyable to walk and bike along routes to and from the shopping centre.

Percent Agree 77%/80%

People’s Ideas…
• enhance Yew as the north/south pedestrian corridor connecting the shopping centre with Ravine Park, Prince of Wales Park, and Prince of Wales Secondary
• install a pedestrian signal at Arbutus and the internal east/west street envisioned for Arbutus Village
• focus on walkways and Bikeways to the shopping centre – there are many great quiet ways to walk to the centre
• create a Bikeway from Kitsilano to Kerrisdale linking shopping areas including Arbutus Village
• co-ordinate all push lights to have the same timing (e.g. pedestrian lights take too long to change at Arbutus and Nanton) – if not it leads to unsafe jay walking

19.10 Street Trees and Greening

Approved

Street trees should be planted on Arbutus and along any newly created internal shopping street in Arbutus Village.

Percent Agree 82%/84%

People’s Ideas…
• create and maintain green space with cooperation between
merchants, business associations, and residents
• keep and/or create green space in any new development

19.11 Provide Weather Protection

Approved
There should be continuous weather protection at the shopping centre in the form of canopies or awnings.
Percent Agree 61%/58%

People’s Ideas…
• awnings should be aesthetically pleasing and should extend over the sidewalk, so as to not drip on pedestrians

19.12 Create a More Attractive Area

Approved
The appearance of the shopping area should be improved through the efforts of the developer, tenants, private business, and the City (e.g. create outdoor patios, attractive landscaping, banners, special lighting, bike racks, public notice boards, public art, special paving, drinking fountains).
Percent Agree 74%/73%

People’s Ideas…
• create an old town feel to the new development
• should look something like the Ambleside Shopping Street in West Vancouver

19.13 Provide Convenient Parking

Approved
Short-term customer parking, including curbside parking, should continue to be available to support local businesses and reduce impacts of parking on local streets adjacent to the shopping centre.
Percent Agree 82%/81%

People’s Ideas…
• address concerns about underground parking – theft, seniors safety, discouraging shoppers
• ensure that there is still ample above ground parking

19.14 Address Crime and Nuisance Behavior

Approved
Crime and nuisance behaviour such as graffiti and break-ins at the shopping centre should be addressed through community-based prevention and more enforcement by police and security people.
Percent Agree 83%/85%

People’s Ideas…
• involve artists on an art wall – like the IGA wall at Dunbar and 41st
• increase community effort in dealing with vandalism and theft (there are a lot of break-ins in the mall area)
• need more police patrols and regular police presence in the area
• address safety concerns in Arbutus Village Linear Park (e.g. drug dealing, etc.)

20 Small Local Shopping Areas

Participants recognized the importance of three smaller commercial areas in ARKS: 33rd and MacKenzie, 16th and Macdonald, and Macdonald and Alamein. These small local shopping areas could be enhanced by making improvements to the public realm and encouraging increased commercial activity within the boundaries of the existing shopping areas. The existing commercial zoning (C-1) in these shopping areas already permits the mixed-use developments proposed by many Vision participants. Very limited opportunities for more housing were proposed on a few lots immediately adjacent to the shopping areas. Participants also called for a limited expansion (roughly one block) of the 16th and Macdonald shopping area, suggesting that commercial activity be allowed to take place on the south side of 16th as far east as Trafalgar.
20.1 Enhance Important Local Shopping Areas

**Approved**

33rd and MacKenzie, 16th and Macdonald, and Macdonald and Alamein should be enhanced as local shopping areas and important community places. Improvements should be made to the public realm (e.g. more street trees, planted corner bulges, decorative pavers), and more commercial activity encouraged within the boundaries of the existing local shopping area (e.g. on commercially-zoned lots flanking the arterial street, or within ‘live/work’ types of housing units).

**Percent Agree 70%/74%**

People’s Ideas…
- retain small scale of shops at MacKenzie and 33rd
- improve the look of the shopping area at 16th and Macdonald

20.2 Expand 16th and Macdonald Local Shopping Area

**Approved**

Consider a limited expansion (roughly one block) of the 16th and Macdonald local shopping area, allowing commercial activity to take place on the south side of 16th as far east as Trafalgar.

**Percent Agree 59%/55%**

People’s Ideas…
- extend 16th and Macdonald commercial area 1 or 2 blocks
- need commercial activity to fill in gaps at 16th and Macdonald

20.3 Ensure Continuity of Shops and Services

**Approved**

In the local shopping areas, 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 71%/72%**

20.4 Provide a Range of Shops and Services

**Approved**

There should continue to be a wide range of local-serving shops and services in the local shopping areas.

**Percent Agree 73%/76%**

20.5 Discourage Additional Auto-oriented Services

**Not Approved (Uncertain)**

Additional auto-oriented services (e.g. gas stations, repair shops, etc.) should be discouraged in the local shopping areas.

**Percent Agree 53%/49%**

**Comment:** This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In the random survey, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (1.9 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.

20.6 Improve Pedestrian Safety

**Approved**

It should be easier and safer for pedestrians to cross major streets within the local shopping areas.

**Percent Agree 77%/78%**

People’s Ideas…
- improve pedestrian and cyclist safety at 16th and Trafalgar by installing a pedestrian/cyclist signal

20.7 Control Sidewalk Merchandise

**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 66%/66%**
20.8 Provide Weather Protection

Not Approved (Uncertain)
There should be continuous weather protection for shoppers in the form of canopies or awnings.

Percent Agree 55%/50%

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (3.5 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.

20.9 Protect and Enhance Street Trees

Approved
The existing street trees contribute to the pleasant character of the street. These 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 and on side streets.

Percent Agree 80%/83%

People's Ideas...

• plant street trees on the boulevards along Macdonald at Alamein

20.10 Create a More Attractive Area

Approved
The appearance of the shopping areas should be improved through efforts of private businesses and the City (e.g. create outdoor patios, attractive landscaping, banners, special lighting, bike racks, public notice boards, public art, special paving, drinking fountains).

Percent Agree 76%/75%

People's Ideas...

• 'connect' the small local shopping areas via similar public realm treatments (e.g. highlight entry to local shopping area with large corner bulges and decorative pavers creating a 'square')

20.11 Provide a Cleaner Place

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 83%/77%

20.12 Provide Convenient Parking

Approved
Short-term customer parking, including curbside parking, should be available to support local businesses and reduce impacts of parking on local streets adjacent to the local shopping areas.

Percent Agree 79%/79%

20.13 Add Some New Housing at MacKenzie and 33rd, 16th and Macdonald, and Macdonald and Alamein

Not Approved (Uncertain)
Very limited opportunities for more housing should be considered on a few lots immediately adjacent to the local shopping areas at MacKenzie and 33rd, 16th and Macdonald, and Macdonald and Alamein. Housing types could include row houses and duplexes.

Percent Agree 51%/55%

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but was .5% short of the required support in the random survey to be classified as Approved (54.5%). In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (2.9 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.
21 ‘Big Box’ Stores and Shopping Malls

Shopping malls are clusters of stores in one development where the stores face inside instead of onto a public street. 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, some of the old supermarket sites could see proposals for internal malls.

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 stores are to sell food or clothing, a retail impact study is required. Some smaller specialty ‘big box’ stores have recently located on C-zoned strips: Future Shop, Office Depot, Toys R Us, and Mountain Equipment Co-op are all on central Broadway.

Participants in the Vision process, while acknowledging that existing malls and ‘big box’ stores provide shopping choices for consumers, were concerned that additional projects would work against keeping strong neighbourhood shopping at Kerrisdale Village, Arbutus Shopping Centre, and other local shopping areas in ARKS.

21.1 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 existing shopping areas in ARKS.

**Percent Agree 61%/61%**

21.2 Permit Specialty ‘Big Box’ Stores

**Not Approved (Uncertain)**

Some smaller specialty ‘big box’ outlets (e.g. electronics, toys, pets) might act as positive anchors or attractions if they are located in existing shopping areas in ARKS. They should be considered if they are designed to fit in properly.

**Percent Agree 46%/47%**

**Comment:** This Direction did not receive majority support in either the general or random surveys. In both surveys, the Direction received more agree votes than disagree votes (general survey: 1.2 to 1, random survey: 1.2 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.

22 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. Kerrisdale has a very active and successful BIA.

22.1 Encourage 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 69%/70%**
Other Small Shopping Areas
Zoned C-1

There are a few other small commercially-zoned sites which serve as local shopping areas for ARKS residents. They were not extensively examined by Vision participants. They are located at 16th and Arbutus, 41st and Carnarvon, 41st and Granville, 41st and Oak, 49th and Oak, and 57th and East Boulevard. The C-1 zoning on these parcels allow residential/commercial ‘mixed-use’ projects. Some participants felt that these sites should also be enhanced as local shopping areas within the boundaries of the existing commercial areas. Alternatively, these sites could be made available for all-residential redevelopment if they no longer were valued as local shopping areas.

23.1 Enhance Local Shopping Areas

Approved

The C-1 zoned shopping areas at 16th and Arbutus, 41st and Carnarvon, 41st and Granville, 41st and Oak, 49th and Oak, and 57th and East Boulevard should be enhanced as local shopping areas.

Percent Agree 64%/63%

People’s Ideas...

• need a beautification program for 41st and Granville

23.2 Retain Commercial Uses on C-1 Zoned Sites

Approved

The City should retain commercial uses on C-1 zoned sites — and not permit all-residential development — at 16th and Arbutus, 41st and Carnarvon, 41st and Granville, 41st and Oak, 49th and Oak, and 57th and East Boulevard.

Percent Agree 63%/62%
Vision participants noted that the well maintained parks, mature street trees, planted traffic circles, private gardens and landscaping around homes, and the design of public buildings all contribute to the overall character of Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy (ARKS). The Vision Directions in this section deal with parks, school grounds, gardens, streets, lanes, views, and public buildings.
24 Parks, Streets, Lanes, and Views

Parks are very important for recreation, beauty, and refreshment. ARKS is fortunate to have a variety of parks and public spaces. These include historic Shaughnessy streetscapes, a number of heritage trees, the King Edward Heritage Boulevard, Ravine Park, VanDusen Gardens, and more conventional parks, playgrounds, and play fields. In total, ARKS has 21 parks (not including VanDusen Gardens due to its city-serving nature), totalling 44 hectares (109 acres) of park. ARKS has 1.1 hectares of ‘neighbourhood’ park per thousand residents. This is the City standard. School grounds totalling 28 hectares (69 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 which development threatened to block. The protected views are mainly from within the downtown looking outward, and from the Central Broadway and False Creek area looking over the downtown. Except for limited views from Queen Elizabeth, Clark, and John Hendry Parks, public views are not protected elsewhere in the city.

Other Directions related to Parks, Streets, Lanes, and Public Places are in the TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION and NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES sections.

24.1 Develop More Usable Parks and School Grounds

Approved

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

Percent Agree 77%/78%

People’s Ideas...

- build a playground feature in Devonshire Park in Shaughnessy
- provide a designated skateboard park space (locate it in Prince of Wales Park)
- locate an arboretum/info kiosk identifying all the trees in Crescent Park; promote certain trees associated with certain parks
- provide a special area in parks to allow activities for children or neighbours to gather and meet: rain shelters, ‘pagodas’, or picnic areas
- provide more non-commercial activities including chess, trails, skate park, public art and history markers, water fountains, walking paths with places to sit
- encourage greening and beautification of parks with plantings, more trees, and arboretums
- provide play structures for younger and older kids in parks (e.g. taller monkey bars and bigger rings)
- provide playground amenities like they had in old playgrounds (e.g. trolleys, tire swings, teeter totters, etc.)
24.2 Provide More Park and Public Open Space in Poorly-served Areas

Approved
There should be more parks and other open spaces available to the public in poorly-served areas of ARKS.
Percent Agree 68%/66%

People’s Ideas...
• provide more green space or play areas for children between 41st and 57th, Arbutus and Granville
• have one day a month where the golf course is open to the public as a park
• have free admission to VanDusen Gardens one day a month

24.3 Incorporate Ravine Park into a Neighbourhood Greenway

Approved
Ravine Park should be incorporated into a new Neighbourhood Greenway connecting Kerrisdale Village with Arbutus Shopping Centre.
Percent Agree 69%/68%

People’s Ideas...
• improve the lighting in Ravine Park to make it safe at night
• allow for a Greenway/walkway between Kerrisdale Village and Arbutus Shopping Centre using the Ravine Park trail

24.4 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.
Percent Agree 81%/82%

People’s Ideas...
• set back play areas further from street
• provide more police monitoring for parks and school grounds
• provide more lighting for sports fields
• fill in all the holes in parks for safety of children (e.g. Maple Grove and Trafalgar Parks)

24.5 Create More Community Gardens

Approved
Provide more opportunities for the creation of community gardens. Existing community gardens should be preserved and enhanced.
Percent Agree 70%/72%

People’s Ideas...
• encourage community gardens on school grounds for educational and aesthetic purposes
• provide more grants for creating and maintaining community gardens
• negotiate with all major developments for park and community garden space

Community garden

24.6 Encourage Community Involvement in Parks

Approved
Community involvement in the design and stewardship of parks should be encouraged.
Percent Agree 71%/74%

People’s Ideas...
• provide planting opportunities with community management
• encourage garden clubs for community gardens

24.7 Improve Maintenance of Parks

Approved
Park grounds, structures, and facilities should be better maintained.
Percent Agree 67%/64%
People’s Ideas...
• need to better maintain community gardens (e.g. fix broken fences and dilapidated buildings)
• restore the old water fountain in Crescent Park

24.8 Ban Smoking in Public Places

Approved
School grounds, playgrounds and some public places within neighbourhood centres should be designated as non-smoking areas.

Percent Agree 73%/71%

People’s Ideas...
• stop kids from smoking in front of Magee
• make Kerrisdale shopping area a ‘no smoking’ area

24.9 Share Parks and Public Places with Dogs

Approved
Parks should be shared between people with dogs and those without dogs, provided that parks remain safe and tidy for all park users.

Percent Agree 58%/62%

People’s Ideas...
• strictly observe regulations regarding control over dogs
• require all dogs to be licensed and dog owners trained
• provide a training program for owners about tidiness and safety

24.10 Remove Dog Waste

Approved
More should be done to ensure dog owners clean up after their dogs and keep their pets under control.

Percent Agree 85%/89%

People’s Ideas...
• have the dog owners’ association produce educational material on responsible removal of dog waste
• provide bags for dog owners in parks

24.11 Provide More Public Art

Not Approved (Uncertain)
There should be more public art in parks, schools, and other public spaces like the community centre.

Percent Agree 56%/52%

People’s Ideas...
• create a bronze sculpture at the community centre
• promote art work that reflects the history and heritage of the community
• provide public art on 41st
• have public art competitions with schools, ethnic groups, etc.
• encourage murals on blank building walls in locations like parking areas, schools, and the Kerrisdale Community Centre
• create two public art display spaces by bulging East Boulevard at 41st
• position public art to mask construction sites
• use public art in commercial lanes to hide unsightly garbage areas

Comment: This Direction did receive majority support in the general survey, but did not receive high enough agreement in the random survey to be classified as Approved. In the random survey, the Direction received substantially more agree votes than disagree votes (3.2 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.

24.12 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 calming devices (i.e. traffic circles and corner bulges) through the ‘Green Streets’ program

• providing amenities like benches for people to socialize and rest before walking further.

**Percent Agree 84%/87%**

People’s Ideas...

• locate benches and planted areas on King Edward Boulevard and other boulevards and medians

• have a ‘Welcome to Kerrisdale’ sign instead of the billboard on Arbutus at 37th

• provide more education about opportunities to plant gardens, boulevards, traffic circles, etc.

• have public displays highlighting the winners of traffic circle/bulge garden competitions in public areas

• get rid of overhead wires

**Country Lanes Program**

The City of Vancouver has developed an alternative to the traditional asphalt lane. A ‘Country Lane’ uses materials that allow rainwater to infiltrate into the ground while providing a durable surface for vehicles to drive on. The first lane in this pilot project was constructed in the fall of 2002 providing residents with a space that slows traffic, is aesthetically pleasing, and is more environmentally responsible.

The lane features two narrow strips of concrete that provide a smooth driving surface. The area around these strips is planted with grass that is supported below the surface by a hidden grid. This ‘structural grass’ supports vehicles while preventing rutting and soil compaction that would damage grass roots. Under this hidden grid is a gravel and soil mixture that allows for drainage while providing the nutrients and water required for grass growth.

Allowing precipitation to percolate into the ground helps reduce and slow the water that would have otherwise quickly entered the sewers and in some instances flowed into adjacent creeks. This helps recharge groundwater and reduces peak flows into rivers. The increased vegetation in this lane design filters storm water, improves air quality, and helps combat the ‘heat island effect’ that can raise temperatures in heavily developed areas.

The country lane design was approved by Council in 2004 as an option for the Local Improvement Program.

*‘Country Lane’ - an alternative to a paved lane*

**24.13 Greening Lanes**

**Approved**

Lanes in ARKS can be unattractive and not environmentally friendly. There should be alternatives such as country lanes, gravel lanes, etc. that allow for more greenery and more permeability for rain water. A range of alternatives should be offered to homeowners when they vote on lane improvements.

**Percent Agree 74%/76%**

People’s Ideas...

• publicize the country lane program and have the City provide incentives for country lanes

• provide planted areas around parking and garbage areas

• design lanes to encourage foot traffic

• look at alternatives for lane maintenance (e.g. have local groups volunteer)

**24.14 Preserve Public Views**

**Approved**

Views from public places of the water, North Shore mountains, downtown Vancouver, and other panoramas should be protected. Viewpoints should be made more enjoyable.

**Percent Agree 88%/90%**
People’s Ideas...
• preserve the view from Quilchena Park and along the Ridge
• maintain views to the water and mountains
• take into account public views and topography when subdividing land
• promote and build public ‘view spots’

25 Public Buildings

In ARKS, many existing public buildings like schools and the Hellenic Centre (at Arbutus and Nanton) are landmarks and provide many fond memories for residents.

Vision participants felt public buildings and especially schools should meet particularly high design and construction standards because they are heavily used and symbolically important. All designs should be welcoming, easy to access, and have significant landscaping. Residents should also have opportunities to provide input in the development of these public buildings.

People’s Ideas...
• complete seismic upgrades of existing schools
• replace portables with good additions
• create a strong building identity for the Kerrisdale Community Centre and prominent entrance

25.1 Retain Existing Public Buildings

Approved
Existing major public buildings with heritage character should be retained and well maintained, with renovations and additions compatible with the existing building’s style.
Percent Agree 82%/79%

25.2 Develop Well-designed Public Buildings

Approved
New public buildings should be well designed and well maintained. Landscaping should be included in all public buildings and site designs.
Percent Agree 87%/90%

People’s Ideas...
• make schools less institutional in design
• have new buildings ‘fit in’ with surrounding residential character
Vision participants discussed a wide range of topics related to the environment, including transportation, gardening, waste, water and energy, noise, air quality, recycling, and composting. They went on to identify Directions to improve environmental practices in Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy (ARKS). 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 which would enhance the environment can also be found in the PARKS, STREETS, LANES, AND PUBLIC PLACES and the TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION sections.

Automatic Garbage Collection, Recycling & Composting

The City collects garbage and yard compost from ‘single family’ residences and 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.

The City also provides recycling services to all residential properties in Vancouver. Materials collected for recycling include paper, plastic, metal, and glass. The City also subsidizes backyard composters and apartment worm composter bins. In the last decade recycling and composting 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 implemented by late 2006. City-supplied garbage containers are emptied using a mechanical arm on the truck, instead of workers lifting and emptying cans by hand. This system has a number of advantages: no need to buy replacement garbage cans or plastic yard trimmings bags; containers are more animal resistant than conventional garbage bags and cans; and fees increase with container size thereby encouraging waste reduction and recycling.


26 Environment

At Home and at Work
Vision participants discussed many different measures to improve environmental practices by both individuals as well as businesses. These ideas included increasing personal efforts to reduce waste, increasing recycling and composting of waste products, 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.

26.1 Take Action to Reduce Waste and Increase Recycling and Composting
Approved
Individuals and businesses (with City support) should work to decrease the amount of waste going into the landfill. These efforts should include:
• purchasing or manufacturing products with minimal packaging and made from recycled materials
• recycling and reusing more products
• composting.
Percent Agree 89%/88%

People’s Ideas...
• use fewer disposal items (e.g. bring your own dishes, chopsticks and mugs to restaurants for take out, use recyclable lunch boxes, use cloth shopping bags instead of plastic bags)

26.2 Take Action to Conserve Water and Energy
Approved
Individuals and businesses (with City support) should act to conserve water and energy. These efforts should include:
• upgrading energy and water fixtures
• planting drought tolerant plants
• reducing daily water and energy use.
Percent Agree 87%/87%

People’s Ideas...
• obey water restrictions, reduce sprinkling and car washing, limit daily shower times
• use landscaping that doesn’t need a lot of water
• divert and collect rainwater and recycle used domestic water
• install energy efficient lights, water conserving taps and ½ flush toilets
• reduce the use of electricity by using less air conditioning, electric fans or by using screen doors, hanging clothes to dry, turning off the computer when not in use
• buy small, light, and fuel efficient cars, and get rid of any second car

In the Community
Vision participants discussed a number of ways the community and the City can work together to improve the environment. These areas of collaboration include keeping the community clean, expanding recycling and composting, collecting and recycling of hard-to-dispose-of items, supporting local/organic food production, reducing storm water runoff, and improving noise control measures.

26.3 Clean Up the Community
Approved
The community and the City should work together to keep ARKS clean and litter free. These efforts should include:
• encouraging and supporting co-operative community clean-up efforts
• enforcing by-laws and penalties when people and businesses fail to comply with City maintenance standards
• adding more waste disposal/recycling/dog waste units that are more secure and visually appealing in strategic locations
• improving access to information about the services and programs offered by the City.
Percent Agree 94%/94%
**People’s Ideas...**

- encourage the community to work together to monitor problem areas and participate in community upkeep initiatives
- enforce fines on people who pollute in public places (e.g. people who don’t pick up after their pets) and penalize businesses and store owners that don’t keep their side-walks and storefronts clean and maintain their garbage bins properly
- provide additional and/or larger garbage containers at bus shelters at 49th and Arbutus, at 41st and West Boulevard, along East Boulevard, and on school grounds
- need more recycling containers at schools and in shopping areas
- provide multi-language environmental educational material, recycling, and garbage information

### 26.4 Expand Recycling and Composting

**Approved**

The community and the City should continue to identify ways to expand recycling and composting programs, taking care that containers are pest resistant. These efforts should include:

- initiating partnerships with other agencies and businesses to increase recycling and composting
- expanding the recycling program to include all plastics, wax boxes, electronic materials, batteries, tires, and other materials
- encouraging composting by businesses like grocery stores and restaurants.

**Percent Agree 88%/84%**

### 26.5 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 90%/90%**

- have community sites that deal with compost, hazardous materials, and renovation materials
- pick up and recycle medium/large items twice a year and alert the public to the potential for reuse

### 26.6 Promote Good Environmental Practices

**Approved**

The community and the City should work together to promote good environmental practices through education and awareness. These efforts should include:

- encouraging publicity campaigns and demonstration displays
- promoting environmental awards and workshops
- establishing an education centre promoting sustainable practices.

**Percent Agree 81%/79%**

- have the City prepare promotional materials such as signs and newsletters, and work with the media, schools, and community centres to promote good environmental practices
- talk to, and promote awareness among, younger kids to conserve water and resources (e.g. encourage school field trips to the landfill and make environmental classes in schools mandatory)
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**Pesticide Use on Public and Private Land**

In 2004, City Council adopted the Pesticide Reduction Education Program, an expansion of Vancouver’s Grow Natural campaign. As of January 1, 2006, the use of outdoor pesticides on lawns and in gardens was regulated by section 5.17 of the Health By-law. The application of these pesticides, including insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides is restricted. The City’s Engineering Services provide tips on environmental yard and garden care techniques, from building healthy soils to ‘Water Wise’ gardening methods.

**Sustainable Development**

The City of Vancouver is frequently cited as one of the most livable cities in the world. The challenge facing the City 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. In such a city, sustainability is achieved through individual and community participation and requires integrated decision making that takes into account economic, ecological, and social impacts as a whole. City initiatives include the establishment of the Office of Sustainability, the City’s 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.

- have the City host a city-wide competition for the best environmentally friendly gardens and lanes

**26.7 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, and water recycling.

**Percent Agree 73%/77%**

**People’s Ideas...**

- promote and develop incentives, subsidies, tax cuts, or loans for individuals who use energy saving products and developers who use sustainable development practices such as integrating solar power, dual flush toilets, green roofs
- insulate houses and windows, and use building materials that retain heat in the winter and keep cool in the summer
- ban the use of herbicides and pesticides on lawns and gardens

**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.

**26.8 Grow More Food Locally**

**Approved**

The community and the City should encourage more food to be grown and distributed locally, including the development of more individual and community gardens, and the planting of fruit trees.

**Percent Agree 62%/61%**

**People’s Ideas...**

- support locally grown foods through school lunch programs
- organize students to participate in community gardens, establish community gardens along streets and on school property
- choose local products and encourage people to eat organic products

![Farmers’ Market](image)

**Improving Water Quality and Conservation**

The Park Board and Engineering have cooperated to create biofiltration systems to cleanse stormwater at 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 where sanitary waste discharges into surrounding water bodies.
26.9 Stormwater Runoff

Approved
The community and the City should work together to reduce stormwater runoff. These efforts should include:
• promoting ‘green lanes’ (porous pavers, gravel, or grass instead of asphalt)
• removing restrictions on gray water reuse
• limiting the amount of impervious surfaces in new development.

Percent Agree 77%/80%

People’s Ideas...
• provide neighbourhood rain water reservoirs and roof catchments to cistern water for gardening
• allow less paving of front lawns
• create gardens on curbside areas to filter storm water before it goes into the sewage system
• design lanes to be both porous and allow for pick-up of broken glass

26.10 Reduce Urban Noise

Approved
The community and the City should explore ways to further reduce urban noise from sources like loud music, leaf blowers, and lawnmowers, etc. This could include a review of existing by-laws and more enforcement.

Percent Agree 77%/78%

People’s Ideas...
• require sound reduction measures for all buses and heavy equipment
• encourage the use of manual mowers
• enforce Noise By-law on people who play stereos too loud

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 enact laws that would improve the environment. The City advocates and supports regional, provincial, and international environmental policy initiatives.

26.11 Working With Other Levels of Government

Approved
The City should provide leadership and partner with the regional, provincial, and federal government to enhance the environment, including efforts such as:
• adopting additional measures to increase water and energy conservation
• adopting measures to improve air quality including tougher emissions standards
• encouraging the development and use of alternative energy sources
• working with the Airport Authority to uphold its noise control and air quality commitments.

Percent Agree 81%/78%

People’s Ideas...
• tax companies that pollute the environment or create environmentally unfriendly products
• ban non-recyclable containers or impose a surcharge on all non-recyclable plastics
• have the City continue to work with other agencies such as BC Hydro and Translink to improve energy consumption and transit options
• increase funding and establish tax cuts and incentives to develop and use alternative environmental technologies such as electric vehicles
• monitor and work with government authorities to reduce airplane noise
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
- on-going 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 such as a Newcomers Guide to City Services and a Civics Manual for high school students
- Community Web Pages — an expansion of 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/or traffic management initiatives)
- improved structures for City Council’s advisory committees
- multicultural outreach and translation guidelines.

Vision participants considered public involvement to be very important when dealing with a number of community issues, and it was referenced in a number of Directions in the Vision including 4.1 Traffic Calming Programs, 5.6 Extensive Community Consultation When Planning for the Arbutus Corridor, 5.8 Local Involvement in Transit Decisions, 7.3 Community Actions to Reduce Crime, 7.5 Prevent Youth Crime, 7.6 Community Consultation on the Location of Treatment Centres, 12.2 Public Involvement in Review of New Single Family House Design, 18.5 Add a Supermarket, and 24.6 Encourage Community Involvement in Parks. Beyond these references regarding specific issues, public consultation should be the rule respecting all important City decisions affecting residents of ARKS.
27 Community Involvement in Decision Making

27.1 Community Involvement in Decision Making

Approved
ARKS residents should have greater, and more timely, input into decision making about changes in their community on matters ranging from major initiatives like the planning of the Arbutus Corridor or the provision of facilities and services, to recurring decisions relating to street and traffic changes or the review of development proposals.

Percent Agree 89%/85%
Rezoning Policy
Following the Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaugnessy 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 Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaugnessy’s single family areas and C-2 zones cover the larger shopping streets. 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 (floorspace 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 the more 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 Arbutus Village. 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 Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy Community Vision

Making some of the Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy 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 Projects that Could be Considered for Site Specific Rezoning</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Retention Projects - 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 - 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>Note on definitions 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) - 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 bonus sharing process, must be converted into improved affordability’ (January 3, 1996 City Council report) - in addition, in Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy, 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 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 - 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>
2.2 Additional Planning Required Before Rezoning

The Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy Vision Directions listed on page 72 require additional planning study before rezoning occurs. For some Directions, the study would cover a portion Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy; 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>Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy Vision Direction</th>
<th>Possible types of additional planning study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design of New Single Family Homes</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 the Review of New Single Family House Design</td>
<td>More detailed planning and consultation involving single family zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Older Character Buildings and Heritage</strong>&lt;br&gt;13.3 Retaining Other Character Buildings</td>
<td>Specific planning study on feasibility of this in ARKS and other Vision areas supporting similar Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4 Multiple Conversion Dwellings (MCDs)</td>
<td>More detailed planning for specific areas of Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible New Housing Locations</strong>&lt;br&gt;16.1 New Housing Types on Large Lots&lt;br&gt;16.5 New Housing Types On or Near Arterial Roads&lt;br&gt;16.6 New Housing Types Near Shopping Areas</td>
<td>More detailed planning for specific areas of Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Directions classified as ‘Uncertain’ identify housing locations (16.2 &amp; 16.3) or housing types (15.1, 15.2, 15.3, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7) which had more community support than opposition and could be the subject of more community discussion</td>
<td>Detailed local planning and consultation of housing options in a City initiated process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shopping Areas</strong>&lt;br&gt;20.2 Expand 16th and Macdonald Local Shopping Area</td>
<td>Expand commercial/mixed-use zoning between Macdonald and Trafalgar (south side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note that Direction 19.3, classified as ‘Uncertain’, considers a shopping area expansion within Arbutus Village. As it had more community support than opposition it could be the subject of more community discussion.</td>
<td>More detailed planning for the Arbutus Village area in Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6 New Housing Types Near Shopping Areas</td>
<td>More detailed planning for specific areas in Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Directions classified as ‘Uncertain’ identify housing locations near shopping areas (18.7, 19.2, 20.13) which had more community support than opposition and could be the subject of more community discussion</td>
<td>Detailed local planning and consultation of housing options in a City initiated process, or for 19.2 linked to a site-specific rezoning for Arbutus Village (see Table 2.1 – New Neighbourhood Centre at Arbutus Village)</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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Note: boundaries approximate
1 Community Vision: General Description
The Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy Community Vision applies to the area outlined on the map below.
The Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy Community Vision describes the kind of community people want Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy 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 Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy. Over 90 Vision Directions cover topics like: transportation; new housing; shopping areas; safety and services; and greening and garbage.

The Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy 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, and sites within Oakridge/Langara Policy area. Please refer to page 69 of the Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy 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 ARBUTUS RIDGE/KERRISDALE/SHAUGHNESSY COMMUNITY VISION

Relevant Vision Directions for these areas may be found in the Arbutus Ridge/Kerrisdale/Shaughnessy Community Vision in the following sections:

- Section 18 – Kerrisdale (“Kerrisdale Village”) Shopping Area;
- Section 19 – Arbutus Shopping Centre (“Arbutus Village”); and
- Section 20 – Small Local Shopping Areas.