ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Report Date: October 19, 2010
Contact: Neal LaMontagne
Contact No.: 604.871.6964
RTS No.: 06876
VanRIMS No.: 08-2000-20
Meeting Date: November 4, 2010

TO: Standing Committee on Planning & Environment
FROM: Director of Planning
SUBJECT: Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan

RECOMMENDATION

A. THAT Council adopt the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan in Appendix A.

B. THAT Council instruct the Director of Planning to draft District Schedules and Guidelines for the new residential zones outlined in the proposed Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan, and report back for referral to Public Hearing an application to rezone the area as described in the Plan.

C. THAT Council instruct the Director of Planning, the General Manager of Community Services Group, and the Director of Finance, and to bring forward for Council’s approval, a Public Amenities and Infrastructure Financing Strategy to identify and recommend strategies for funding amenities and infrastructure upgrades in the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre area.

D. THAT Council adopt the Public Realm and Transportation Improvement Plan in Appendix B.

CONSIDERATION

E. THAT Council amend the proposed Neighbourhood Centre Plan to include the areas identified in Appendix C in the Transition Zone for the purposes of allowing four-storey low-rise apartments adjacent to Norquay Park.

F. THAT Council amend the proposed Neighbourhood Centre Plan to include the areas identified in Appendix C in the Transition Zone for the purposes of
allowing four-storey low-rise apartments on larger parcels along Earles Street and north of Kingsway.

G. THAT Council amend the proposed Neighbourhood Centre Plan to increase the base building height allowable through rezoning in the Kingsway Rezoning Area from six- to eight-storeys to eight- to ten-storeys and to increase the allowable building density from approximately 3.2 FSR (net) to 3.8 FSR (net).

GENERAL MANAGER’S COMMENTS

The Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan is the culmination of a long, challenging, and very thorough planning process and further implements the policy direction contained within CityPlan and the Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision. The Plan is consistent with Council’s priorities to encourage the building of strong, safe and inclusive communities; enhance environmental protection and sustainability; and promote capital investment for a growing economy.

The Plan is one of a number of important Community Planning initiatives designed to plan for complete neighbourhoods that provide residents with a variety of housing, jobs and services, and to enable new housing options in proximity to major transit infrastructure investments. Other similar programs which Council has considered or will consider include: the Mount Pleasant Community Planning program and the Cambie Corridor Planning Initiative.

Specific to this report, the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan is an important planning initiative designed to:

- Enable new housing options that will provide a greater degree of affordability and variety for families, with housing types that fit within the character of established residential neighbourhoods;
- Support the City’s sustainability priority by encouraging a higher density of housing along a neighbourhood “high” street and in close proximity to a major transit and cycling corridor;
- Encourage the revitalization of Kingsway to support local shops and services, enable local residents to meet daily needs within walking distance, and increase the opportunities to engage in community life; and
- Improve the pedestrian and bicycling experience within the Neighbourhood Centre in general and, especially, along Kingsway.

The consideration items have been proposed since the end of the community consultation process and in part reflect information which acknowledges the change in economic circumstances since the bulk of the work on this Plan was undertaken. The items identify sites for limited but strategic densification which should generate funds to enhance public amenities. Other items identify sites for alternative development forms which could be reasonably accommodated in the Plan area. Staff have put them forward for consideration, recognizing that council will provide direction in terms of additional consultation with the community they feel appropriate.

The General Manager of Community Services RECOMMENDS approval of recommendations A, B, C, and D, and consideration of E, F and G.
CITY MANAGER’S COMMENTS

The City Manager RECOMMENDS approval of recommendations A, B, C, and D, and consideration of E, F and G.

COUNCIL POLICY

CityPlan
On June 6, 1995, Council adopted “CityPlan: Directions for Vancouver” which included the following Directions:

- Neighbourhood Centres to "...provide residents with a variety of housing, jobs, and services" and to “...become the civic, public heart of each neighbourhood…”
- More and More Diverse Public Places to: "...ensure that the number and quality of the city's public places matches the needs of a growing and increasingly diverse population…” and to "... promote lively neighbourhood shopping streets."
- Housing Variety to "...increase neighbourhood housing variety throughout the city especially in neighbourhood centres…” by "planning the types, appearance, and location...best suited to each neighbourhood."

Renfrew-Collingwood Vision
In July 1998, Council approved the Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision which includes Directions that bring CityPlan to the local level. The Vision identified the section of Kingsway between Nanaimo and Earles Street as a key shopping area for improvement, and the area around it for a mix of housing surrounding Norquay Park complemented with additional community amenities and facilities.

Neighbourhood Centre Delivery Program
In April 2006, Council approved the Neighbourhood Centre Delivery Program in the Norquay Village area, to further the Renfrew-Collingwood Vision Directions for shopping area improvements and new housing types.

EcoDensity Charter
In June 2008, Council adopted the EcoDensity Charter and Initial Actions, a commitment between the City of Vancouver and its citizens. The Charter calls for all city-building decisions to consider environmental sustainability as a primary goal, in ways that also foster and support affordability and livability, and that promote strategic, well-managed density, design and land use.

Greenest City
In February 2010, Council adopted the 10 long-term goals outlined in the Vancouver 2020: A Bright Green Future report and directed staff to determine implementation options as part of Vancouver’s goal to be the greenest city in the world by 2020. Although the public consultation for the Greenest City 2020 process is still underway at the time of writing, the implication is clear: to meet the ambitious targets requires the contribution of every City project and process.

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan (the “Plan”) and to recommend actions for its implementation. The Plan is part of the Neighbourhood Centre Delivery Program (NCDP). It proposes new residential zones that
will increase housing choice and a rezoning policy that will encourage redevelopment and revitalization along Kingsway with the intent to support new shops and services. The Plan also proposes streetscape and street network improvements including improved crossings at Kingsway, street geometry and connection improvements, new street trees and furniture, and provisions for new public spaces and community amenities. The Plan exemplifies a ‘placemaking’ approach: it proposes a mix of land uses to promote vitality and vibrancy, strategic densification and increased housing choice, and it proposes public realm enhancements and urban design that respects local themes and context.

The Plan is the product of a very thorough planning process to implement the policy direction contained within CityPlan and the Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision. The Plan is consistent with Council’s priorities to encourage the building of strong, safe and inclusive communities; enhance environmental protection and sustainability; and promote capital investment for a growing economy. Further implementation of this Plan is recommended to follow Council adoption through the development of new District Schedules, design guidelines, a Public Amenities and Infrastructure Financing Strategy, and a more detailed Public Realm program.

BACKGROUND

Terms of Reference

In April 2006, Council approved the terms of reference for the second Neighbourhood Centre Delivery Program (NCDP) in the Norquay Village area. The program was designed to deliver a range of products including the following:

- **A Housing Area Plan**, including the locations and types of new housing as well as measures relating to traffic, parking, utilities, park linkages and greening, and city facilities. The Housing Area Plan comprises one chapter of the proposed Neighbourhood Centre Plan (Appendix A).

- **Housing Zoning and Implementation**, including drafting, testing, and referral to Public Hearing of city-initiated rezonings for new housing and related activities.

- **Shopping Area and Public Realm Plan**, including density, urban design and other development parameters for new development along the Kingsway corridor, as well as a detailed public realm improvement plan.

Study Area

Figure 1 shows the Norquay Village Study Area. The solid outer line shows the final boundary of the Study Area as it has evolved through the planning process and the dashed line shows an area that was, at one point included in the Study Area but was determined to be best addressed through a separate transit station area plan. The Study Area includes a shopping area focused on a 1,300 metre portion of Kingsway between Gladstone Street to the west and Killarney Street to the east, and a housing area that consists of residential neighbourhoods generally located within a five to ten minute walk of Kingsway. This area also generally aligns with the Nanaimo and 29th Avenue SkyTrain stations which are located directly north of the Study Area.
In contrast to the prior Neighbourhood Centre (Kingsway and Knight) which focused land use and density changes only to the areas surrounding the Kingsway shopping area, this Plan includes a land use and density strategy for both the housing and shopping area (completing the ‘hole in the donut’). A primary observation that emerged in the planning process was that Norquay Village required a more holistic approach to place-making, one that encompassed the whole of the Neighbourhood Centre and sought to convert Kingsway from a barrier to a heart and a place that supported informal socialization and creating a distinctive identity for the neighbourhood. This approach, more comprehensive in scope than prior efforts, better addressed local criticisms and new City sustainability directives.

**Existing Zoning**

The majority of the residential neighbourhood is zoned RS-1 with some isolated instances of specialized CD-1 zoning. The typical form of development permitted in the RS-1 zone is a single-family house with a rental suite and a laneway house (if site conditions permit).

Block faces along Kingsway are primarily zoned C-2, a mixed-use residential and commercial zone, which generally allows ground-level retail with three-storeys of residential or office above.

There are also a few Kingsway properties that are currently zoned RT-2. This is a low-scale, residential-only duplex zone that is not consistent with the street’s role as a major commercial arterial.

**Housing Stock**

The RS-zoned parts of the Study Area include approximately 1,900 single-family houses. Including secondary suites, the total number of dwelling units is about 2,850.
There is a mix of housing ages, styles and conditions. There are only about 300 houses remaining in the area that were built prior to the 1940’s, many of which have lost much of their original character over time. There are only two houses in the area that are listed on the Vancouver Heritage Register.

The area has seen significant redevelopment over time, with post-war bungalows built during the 1950’s and 1960’s and ‘Vancouver specials’ that are reflective of the typical single-family construction during the 1970’s, 1980’ and 1990’s.

There are two non-market housing projects in the area and four other residential and mixed-use developments that are currently zoned CD-1.

**Population/Demographics**

According to the 2006 Census, the total population in the Study Area was 10,042 people in 3,635 households. Prominent linguistic groups include Chinese (48 percent of the population by mother tongue), English (27 percent), Vietnamese (4 percent), and Filipino (3 percent).

The median household income in the Study Area in 2006 was $48,646. This is similar to the City-wide average ($47,299).

Population growth in the study area between 2001 and 2006 was 4.5 percent, slightly less than the City average (5.6 percent) and less than the Renfrew-Collingwood area average (8.5 percent) which is atypical as it includes recent growth from the Collingwood Village redevelopment.

**Planning and Public Process**

City staff have been working with community residents on development of the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan since 2006. This process has been comprehensive in scope, with many community-wide, Working Group, and special meetings to identify issues, develop ideas, and refine proposals for this Plan. (These meetings took place in two major phases, as the process was temporarily suspended in 2007 and relaunched in late 2008.) In addition, newsletters, a public survey, a project website, newspaper advertisements (English and Chinese language) and radio advertisements (Chinese language) have been used to communicate with a broader public.

The following table summarizes the numerous events and meetings held as part of the public consultation process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event/Meeting</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off event</td>
<td>March 25, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Charrettes</td>
<td>October 21, 22, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Shopping Area Working Groups</td>
<td>April 18, 19, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 16, 30, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 13, 27, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 12, 26, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 10, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 21, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 13, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 13, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The plan options and draft plan proposals were presented at Open Houses in January/February 2010 (total attendance: 180) and in June 2010 (total attendance: 290). Feedback was solicited via comment forms. (All open house material and comment forms were also available via the project website). Although feedback was diverse, including many voices in opposition, the majority of comments received were supportive of the plan. For the June 2010 Open Houses which presented the draft plan proposals, 107 comment forms were completed: 43 were opposed to the plan, 60 were supportive (40 were supportive in general, 10 were supportive with some concerns, and 10 were supportive but felt the Plan should go further), and 4 were difficult to classify.

It should also be noted that the public planning process has been, in some ways, unusually challenging. Some neighbourhood (and outside the neighbourhood) residents have expressed strongly held opposition to plan proposals presented at Open Houses and other community meetings. One group of residents (self-identified as the Norquay Citizens’ Group) has been
particularly active with neighbourhood-wide flyer distribution (identifying concerns with
densification and ‘mass rezoning’, dramatic neighbourhood change, increased property taxes,
decreased property values, increased crime, residents pushed out of the neighbourhood, and
parking and traffic impacts), involvement with the Working Group, and development of an
alternative plan proposal in mid-2009. For this alternative proposal, Staff reviewed the
alternative thoroughly and incorporated certain ideas while offering to meet with the Group
on several occasions to discuss disagreements. Staff also provided space for the Group to
present their alternative plan at the January/February 2010 Open House

Although in Staffs’ opinion, discontent with the Plan is not widespread or a majority within
the community (based on observed overall public commentary throughout the process),
discontent with the Plan from specific participants has been vocal, and through connections
with groups from other neighbourhoods, contributing to a city-wide impression of difficulties
with the plan process. Staff have had to adapt to ensure the process remained open and
balanced, with all voices feeling comfortable and supported/valued in continuing to
participate. Finally, although there have been many specific challenges, in general, concern
and critique of the planning process has been beneficial and has pushed the planning process
to consider a broader range of issues and ideas.

Multicultural Outreach

A significant part of the public consultation process focused on engaging and consulting with
the larger non-English speaking communities within Norquay Village. The primary focus was on
the Chinese community (48 percent of the community identified Chinese as their mother
tongue in the 2006 census ) ) and engagement opportunities were also extended to other
larger groups including Vietnamese (4 percent) and Filipino (3 percent). Full Chinese
translation was done for all mailouts and newsletters and for all open house boards and
materials. Further Chinese language workshops were held in Norquay Village with residents
and business owners. As well, outreach to the Vietnamese community included meeting with
business owners and hiring an outreach worker to communicate directly with Vietnamese
speaking residents. City staff also worked with a Filipino outreach worker at Norquay
Elementary to organize meetings with Filipino families who have recently moved to Canada.

Neighbourhood Survey and Process Suspension

The Norquay Village public process was suspended in 2007 during and following the civic
strike. In addition to the delay caused by the strike, there were a number of challenges to the
process that led staff to reset, reconsider, and restart the planning effort. One of a number of
confounding features was that this planning process has overlapped with and was widely
understood to be equated with the city-wide EcoDensity Initiative, bringing city-wide
EcoDensity opponents into the debate.

Irregularities in public response to a 2007 survey created further challenges to the initial
planning process. A newsletter with a survey was distributed through the community with plan
proposals for public vote. City staff analyzed the survey results and found several
irregularities. The overall response rate was unusually high and it was apparent that the
results of the general survey varied dramatically from a random control survey that is used to
verify the survey process. In response to the perceived irregularities the City asked an
independent advisor with survey methodology expertise, Mustel Group, to analyze and
interpret the results. Mustel Group identified several critical issues including the following:
- the transmittal of nearly 800 online responses in rapid succession, all with identical answers to the nineteen survey questions;
- the submission of an additional 300 photocopied surveys all having exactly the same answers to the survey questions; and
- evidence of “coaching” as seen in a pattern of responses that spiked or skewed the data in specific questions with subsequent questions left blank (Households in the study area had received flyers from a local opposition group that provided a guide to answering the survey, aligned with inaccurate and misleading information such as incorrect information regarding property tax increases).

Mustel Group’s conclusion was that these irregularities “have had an undue effect on the survey” and that the results “could not and should not be used or interpreted further.”

**DISCUSSION**

The Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan contains policies and proposals for new housing types, a rezoning policy for Kingsway, new public realm and street/sidewalk network improvements, and a strategy for new community amenities. Key objectives of the Plan, which incorporate community directions, ideas and issues identified through the public consultation process, include:

- more affordable homeownership options that will enable the neighbourhood to grow and evolve in balance with respect for established character;
- revitalization of Kingsway to provide local shops and services, accommodate higher density housing, and support social interaction in a vibrant and interesting place that neighbourhood residents can walk to;
- increased housing density in energy-efficient configurations in a walkable neighbourhood with good transit and bicycling connections to help support Vancouver’s Greenest City objectives;
- addition of new gathering spaces and other public amenities that can provide support services for diverse community groups and residents and places for the meetings and events that support community life;
- enhancement of local neighbourhood identity through new public realm improvements to heighten the distinctive and eclectic character of the neighbourhood, and providing unique spaces that fit the evolving nature of the community; and
- a holistic and creative approach to place-making that respects local character while providing an interconnected land use, urban design, and public realm strategy in support of aspirations for a livable and sustainable neighbourhood.

**New Housing Types / Residential Zones**

The Plan represents an important step in fulfilling CityPlan and Community Vision Directions to increase housing variety in neighbourhoods. While the City of Vancouver has sufficient capacity in existing apartment zones to accommodate anticipated population growth, these zones do not provide the type of housing many people are looking for: ground-oriented housing with many of the features of a single family home.

The four new housing zones proposed in the Plan will provide additional capacity for ground-oriented housing and cost-effective low-rise apartments, as well as retaining options for
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rental secondary suites. Together, these zones will enable more affordable alternatives to the single family home, while maintaining many of the desirable qualities of this type of housing. Providing these choices within the City is important to long term growth and sustainability.

_Housing Area Planning Principles_

- Focus on housing options that work with a single lot to provide flexibility for individual property owners and enable organic and incremental neighbourhood change;
- Ensure new housing types fit in with the character of established single-family housing;
- Emphasize new and more affordable ownership options, especially family-friendly options;
- Retain rental housing and secondary suite options;
- Use block characteristics to determine housing type; and
- Retain current options in addition to new options.

_Description of the New Zones_

- **Duplex/Infill/Small House Zone.** This zone applies to those areas of the Neighbourhood Centre that are furthest from Kingsway and where sensitivity to established character is considered to be the most important. This zone would permit infill, “mini-houses”, and/or duplexes in different combinations depending on whether the site comprises one, two, or three typical lots. Infill houses would be permitted only where rear or side yards front directly onto a park or schoolyard (with the intent to provide ‘front-doors’ and ‘eyes on the street’ for parks and schoolyards) or for the preservation of a character house.

- **Traditional Rowhouse Zone.** This zone applies to an area of the Neighbourhood Centre where block and lot configurations are well-suited to this housing type: suitable lots are wider and shallower than the typical Norquay Village lot. The traditional rowhouse fits well on these lots, particularly if two lots can be combined which will allow for 5 rowhouse units. This zone would allow for rowhouses which are similar to a single-family house in regard to height and scale but would also allow for shared side party walls.

- **Stacked Townhouse Zone.** This zone applies to areas of the Neighbourhood Centre in close walking distance and with strong pedestrian connections to Kingsway and to the 29th Avenue SkyTrain. The Stacked Townhouse is a new housing type that would enable three strata-titled units to be stacked vertically in a three-storey townhouse building form. Essentially, the Stacked Townhouse is a type of low-rise apartment but with more characteristics of a ground-oriented housing type (front and rear yard, private open space, height and scale of a single detached house or rowhouse).

- **Transition/Low-Rise Apartment Zone.** This zone applies to the lots across the rear lane from properties fronting Kingsway. The Transition zone enables low-rise apartments (three to four storeys) that provide a physical transition from mid-rise buildings on Kingsway to the ground-oriented housing types in the residential
neighbourhood and provides a more affordable housing option than the ground-oriented types.

**Kingsway Rezoning Area**

The Plan includes a general vision for Kingsway that would allow for mid-rise and mixed-use redevelopment, subject to rezoning approval. The basic building typology for Kingsway is based on a six-storey mid-rise building (in terms of building density) but with variations in height (a basic building of six to eight-storeys with specific allowances for 10 and 12-storey buildings on key sites and 12 and 16-storey buildings on the 2400 Motel site) to create a more varied streetscape, enhance sunlight exposure on the street and sidewalk, and provide more at-grade open space. The additional building height and density will increase the financial viability of redeveloping existing one or two-storey commercial buildings and provide new housing options on a major local shopping street with excellent transit connectivity. Further, the additional building height will enable wider sidewalks which comprise a major component of the public realm strategy to improve the pedestrian environment along Kingsway.

It should also be noted that the financial attractiveness of the increased building density (an approximate density increase of 0.7 FSR) and building height (two to four-storeys) is questionable. Revised financial viability analysis completed by Coriolis Consulting Corp. (Appendix D) shows that, in the current development climate, the existing C-2 zoning is more financially attractive than the extra density and height that can be achieved through the proposed rezoning policy. This is due to several factors: risks and uncertainty of the rezoning process, increased assembly required to achieve the maximum allowable density, familiarity with the C-2 form of development, and the shift from lower-cost woodframe construction to (probable) concrete construction.

**Kingsway Rezoning Area Planning Principles**

- Plan for a mid-rise ‘urban village’;
- Invest in a pedestrian-centric public realm that enhances the identity and distinctiveness of Norquay Village and emphasizes ‘place-making’;
- Maintain a retail focus along Kingsway;
- Apply urban design criteria to ensure that new development is respectful of local context and fits well into the Neighbourhood Centre; and
- Place an emphasis on the ‘2400 triangle’ as a ‘heart’ of the neighbourhood centre.

**Kingsway Rezoning Area Policies**

- **Base Building Typology and Height.** The base building type considered for Kingsway is a six- to eight-storey mixed-use mid-rise building (with variations in height to achieve a varied streetscape and strategic at-grade open spaces). This is an increase from the existing C-2 zoning which permits a four-storey mixed-use building. This additional height can be achieved through two options:
  1) **Without Rezoning.** A six-storey building (without increases in building density above the 2.5 net FSR) will be permitted by the Director of Planning as incentive for wider sidewalks for all properties currently zoned C-2.
2) **With Rezoning.** In the case of rezonings, the six-storey form can accommodate higher building densities (approximately 3.2 net FSR) and additional height. The Rezoning Policy will allow a six-storey building frontage as well as an additional two-storeys setback from the building frontage on one portion of the building with a reduction of height or massing on the other.

- **Special Sites.** In addition, a few select sites are permitted a height increase (with a Rezoning) beyond the six- to eight-storey pattern in exchange for additional at-grade public open space (without an increase in building density above 3.2 FSR (net)):
  - Mid-Block sites (on the north side of Kingsway) for Pedestrian Linkages and Mews (up to 10 storeys)
  - Large sites (greater than 1 acre) for Public Plazas (up to 12 storeys)
  - 2400 Motel site for Major Neighbourhood Gathering Spaces (12 and 16 storeys)

- **Urban Design Criteria.** New development through rezoning will be required to make a positive contribution to the pedestrian environment along Kingsway through wider sidewalks, public plazas, quality character and place-sensitive building materials, creative and high performance building design, weather protection and pedestrian amenities, small-scale commercial retail units, human-scaled architectural detailing, and universal access.

**Special Sites: Eldorado and 2400 Motel**

Two prominent sites located in the heart of the neighbourhood centre are the Eldorado Motor Hotel and 2400 Motel sites. Together, these two sites form the majority of a unique triangle (formed by the intersections of Kingsway, Nanaimo Street, Slocan Street, and E. 33rd Avenue) that has been frequently identified in the planning process as the neighbourhood ‘heart’ and an opportunity to create a ‘catalyst’ for revitalization of Kingsway. Both sites were identified in the Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision as ‘special sites’, with the following direction:

*If redevelopment of the Eldorado Hotel and/or the 2400 Motel is proposed, the City should support new, needed commercial and/or residential uses. Any consideration of such developments should include significant public consultation.*

The Eldorado Motor Hotel site is currently in the process of redevelopment into a high-density residential and commercial development, including a 22-storey tower, two mid-rise buildings, and a 3,500 square foot 39-space daycare.

The 2400 Motel is an operating motel which has been owned by the City of Vancouver as an investment property since 1989. The Plan provides a higher level of detailed planning for the site with the intent to inform a future rezoning.

Key policies that will inform rezoning of the 2400 Motel site include:

- a maximum site density (3.2 net FSR) consistent with the rezoning strategy for the rest of Kingsway;
- taller building heights (two towers: one 16-storey and one 12-storey) to provide a physical transition from the 22-storey tower on the Eldorado site and to allow for more at-grade open space;
- significant sidewalk setbacks along Kingsway (for an approximate total sidewalk width of 35-40 feet);
- an indoor community gathering space, at least 15,000 square feet in size and flexible in use for youth, arts, seniors, and other community services and events;
- a grocery store on the ground floor;
- a major outdoor public gathering space that is south-facing and activated by the ground floor uses of the indoor community gathering space and surrounding retail uses;
- pedestrian accessibility through the site;
- a mandate for creative design solutions, including a creative approach to incorporating heritage elements;
- sustainability requirements as per EcoDensity Action A-2; and
- consideration of housing affordability including potential for rental housing.

The greater expectations for ground-level amenity, open space, and the proposed program of retail and community uses on this site require taller buildings to accommodate the proposed housing.

**Movement and Circulation**

The Plan includes a transportation improvement strategy that focuses on efficient, safe and comfortable movement throughout the Study Area with priorities for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users. This strategy includes a number of new initiatives intended to enhance pedestrian safety and ease of movement, improve bicycle connections through the neighbourhood, and to improve some challenging street connections created by the intersection of different street grids in the Study Area.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Improvements**

The focus for both sidewalk and bicycle networks is to continue to work towards completing the networks especially on key routes to schools, parks and transit and where redevelopment is occurring. For sidewalks, this translates into completing sidewalks on blocks where one or two sides lack complete sidewalks, and adding new connections where missing links impose longer routings.

For bicycles, the most significant bike route improvements will be along Duchess and Wales Street to allow relocation from busy Earles Street. In addition, lane widths are to be reallocated along Kingsway to increase the curb lane widths (providing more space for bicycles) and to match those provided in the Kingsway and Knight Neighbourhood Centre. Further improvements serving Norquay Village are forthcoming in the parallel joint initiative between the City and TransLink to upgrade the B.C. Parkway.

**Pedestrian-Oriented Public Realm Improvements**

To further support the improvement of the pedestrian experience in the Neighbourhood Centre, a detailed Public Realm and Transportation Improvement Plan is included for Council adoption (Appendix B). Highlights of the strategy detailed in this Plan include:

- A new landscaped median on Kingsway between Gladstone and Moss Streets;
- Geometric changes to the intersection of 34th Avenue, Wales Street, Duchess Street and Kingsway, creating an area for seating, an off-street cycling path, special planting, public art, a new pedestrian/cyclist-activated signal, and shorter street crossing distances for pedestrians;
- Installation of small landscaped corner bulges along Kingsway at Gladstone, Clarendon, Rhodes, Moss, and Dundee Streets, to provide shorter street crossing distances for pedestrians as well as improving sight lines for pedestrians and motorists; and
- New streetscape elements including improvements to landscaping and street trees, unique tree grates and sidewalk stamps, additional street furniture, character lighting and public art.

**Transit Improvements**

Norquay Village is relatively well-served by transit, including the SkyTrain Expo Line service (29th Avenue and Nanaimo Stations are accessible within a short walk, cycle, or bus ride to all Norquay Village residents). Bus routes on Kingsway (#19), Slocan/Clarendon (#29 Elliott), and Kingsway/Nanaimo (#25 King Edward) were augmented by the initiation of the #33 service along 33rd Avenue and Slocan linking the 29th Avenue Station with UBC. The #33 service was a change identified in the Vancouver/UBC Area Transit Plan and was implemented in 2008. Existing City-wide policies should continue to guide actions in support of transit. For Norquay residents, workers, and visitors, this means focusing on increasing service, improving transit stop amenities, promoting security, and improving the efficiency and impact of transit services. City staff will continue to advocate to Translink for improvements to the transit system in Norquay Village and elsewhere through future Area Transit Planning.

**Clarendon Connector**

The lack of connectivity in Norquay Village’s street network south of Kingsway has been a longstanding challenge in the community, placing substantial traffic volumes on local streets. In response, and consistent with plans in place since the Expo Line consultations of the mid-1980’s, the City has carried out work planning and acquiring lots for an extension of Clarendon Street from its present T-intersection at 34th Avenue northward to form a similar T-intersection at 33rd Avenue.

The Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre planning process provided an appropriate opportunity to consult nearby residents about the Clarendon Connector. What evolved was a package of measures, mostly traffic calming and pedestrian enhancements, designed to complement the connection and leave the door open for reclassification of Clarendon should that be decided in the future. Community comments were largely supportive of the final package, as it would:

- Relieve several local streets of inappropriate through traffic;
- Improve connectivity for all modes;
- Improve pedestrian and cyclist safety by bulging corners, restricting movements by motor vehicles, and signalizing the new intersection of Clarendon/33rd;
- Provides a direct connection to the proposed community amenities at the 2400 site;
- Improve the efficiency and appeal of the #29 Elliott bus by eliminating circuitous routings involving local streets and a portion of Kingsway; and
- Enhance the public realm with tree planting and other landscaping.

The high levels of support from the Norquay community encouraged staff to recommend as part of the Plan that the City proceed with the full package of improvements which have evolved into the final Clarendon Connector project. A diagram of the proposed Clarendon Connector project is included in this report as Appendix E.

Public Amenities

Amenities, such as recreational facilities, parks and libraries, are important elements of a vibrant and livable community. As part of the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre planning process, the community identified a number of desired (and needed) public amenities which were then translated into a preliminary Public Benefits Strategy with directions and priorities for the delivery of amenities within the neighbourhood.

As part of the implementation phase, the City (in consultation with the community) will develop more detailed strategies for service and amenity improvements and ensure that new development on both City and private land pays a fair share towards public benefits to meet the demands created by the additional population.

Key priorities for new or improved amenities in the Neighbourhood Centre include:

- **Community Gathering Spaces.** The lack of a formal community gathering space within the Neighbourhood Centre was a frequent theme through the planning process. Many needs were identified for this type of space, including space for senior’s programming, children’s activities, meeting space, arts space, and community gatherings such as cultural celebrations. The Plan has identified the opportunity to include a significant community gathering space in the 2400 Motel redevelopment. This space should be flexible in nature to address the diverse needs and priorities of the community (for example, a Neighbourhood House).

- **Renfrew Ravine Linear Park.** There is an opportunity to extend the Renfrew Ravine Park south to create a green pedestrian connection between Slocan Park/29th Avenue and Kingsway. This connection, which runs along an existing Metro sewer right-of-way, will be created as adjacent properties redevelop. In the shorter term, the creation of new pocket parks, community garden spaces, and mid-block pedestrian connections, will be incremental steps toward the long-term objective of a complete linear park. This new park is also well-located to help the City achieve its city-wide objective (and Greenest City target) of increasing access to nature for all residents.

- **Park Extensions.** Opportunities exist to extend General Brock and Slocan Parks to increase their street presence and park accessibility. This can be achieved through selective property acquisition to better connect the parks to neighbouring streets.

- **Other Amenities, Facilities, and Services.** As the neighbourhood continues to grow over time, opportunities to add, expand, or enhance community amenities, facilities, and services will be actively sought. Priorities include additional child care spaces, non market housing, and services for vulnerable populations.

A more detailed public benefits strategy will be developed as part of the implementation of the Neighbourhood Centre Plan. That strategy will consider the impact of increased
population and the mechanisms available to pay for public benefits, i.e. capital expenditures, development cost levies (DCLs) and community amenity contributions (CACs).

Other Planning Considerations

Development Viability and Affordability

Coriolis Consulting undertook an economic feasibility analysis (Appendix D) for the Kingsway Rezoning Area and new residential zone proposals and concluded the following:

- The new housing types are financially viable, although single-family residential housing remains competitive and ‘take-up’ of new housing types is expected to be incremental.
- Development of new housing types is expected to increase development costs marginally over a typical single-family house (on a per square foot cost basis). However, the increase in the number of potential units will improve affordability.
- Along Kingsway, a typical C-2 development is currently more attractive than a rezoning to achieve the additional FSR (up to 3.2 FSR (net)) proposed by this Plan. However, it is noted that this is a generalized assessment and site-specific conditions create different development incentives. Further, over time as the character of the street evolves into a more vibrant, pedestrian-friendly corridor, development economics will shift to better incentivize the higher-densities and heights enabled by this Plan.

More specifically, in regard to affordability, the primary emphasis of this Plan has been on increasing opportunities and access to entry-level ownership while retaining rental options (including secondary suites in all proposed new housing types). Further, as the implementation of this Plan proceeds, through individual rezonings along Kingsway and in development of new District Schedules, consideration of mechanisms to expand market rental housing and provide for new non-market housing will be pursued.

Energy Efficiency and Sustainability

One of the key directions guiding this Plan has been to emphasize sustainability and environmental innovation. As well, this Plan is intended to support and help the City meet its Greenest City targets for a lighter footprint, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and making walking, cycling, and transit preferred transportation options. This Plan supports a more sustainable Vancouver implicitly by planning for strategically higher-density and more energy-efficient development in an area of the city well-served by sustainable transportation options and by accommodating growth in a manner that reduces pressure on environmentally sensitive areas. This represents the bedrock of significantly more sustainable city-building. In addition, this Plan includes the following considerations:

- New development along Kingsway that proceed through rezoning (required for increased building height and density) will be required to conform to the City’s current LEED Gold requirement for rezonings and new buildings will be required to be adaptable for potential future sustainable or shared energy systems;
- New housing options increase the number of units with shared walls for improved energy efficiency and are particularly well-suited to incorporate passive design features including cross-ventilation;
- Front and rear-yard areas are retained in the residential neighbourhood to minimize (or eliminate) any impacts to pervious surface area and to retain opportunities for local food growing;

- New green spaces are planned in the neighbourhood centre to increase access to open space and improve the integration of nature into the community, including new community gardening spaces;

- Enhanced walkability and bicycle connectivity, in concert with access to local and rapid transit, to reduce reliance on automobiles;

- Expanded tree plantings, including street trees and landscaped medians;

- Implementation of the plan through the development of new District Schedules will consider a requirement for minimum LEED points (with either registration or certification) for new housing developments.

As part of the planning process, a district energy feasibility study was completed by Compass Engineering. Although the study did show increased overall energy efficiency through the increased density in the area, there is not currently a viable opportunity to develop a district or neighbourhood energy system. The best opportunity for a shared energy utility would be a horizontal geo-thermal system in Norquay Park but that is not considered viable at this time. However, it is an important consideration of this Plan that new development be designed for potential future hook-up to a shared (or renewable) energy source should feasibility change over time.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

Preliminary investigations have been performed by Engineering staff to determine capacities of existing City Services in the study area. Some existing services will need to be upgraded to meet the increased demand caused by additional density. Strategies for funding and timing construction of these improvements will be explored and recommended in the Public Amenities and Infrastructure Financing Strategy.

- **Water.** The Water Design Branch has reviewed the proposed Norquay Village Draft Plan. The water infrastructure in the area should be able to accommodate the proposed density, however, the water system operation has changed due to Metro Vancouver’s new treatment plant and there are some future transmission main modifications to come.

- **Solid Waste.** The Solid Waste Management Branch reviewed the proposed Norquay Village project. All existing and future buildings in the Norquay Village project will be regulated by the Solid Waste By-law and will adhere to any future amendments that are made to the By-law. Also, the City requires all buildings to provide adequate storage for solid waste generated onsite. Recently, the Solid Waste Storage Facility Design Supplement for Developments and Redevelopments was created to assist developers with proper solid waste storage facility design for new and retrofit buildings.

- **Storm and Sanitary Sewer.** In order to meet the future needs consistent with the Plan, the Sewage and Drainage Design Branch has identified approximately 2,000 metres of sewers in east Norquay that will need to be upgraded in the east basin. The estimated cost of replacing these sewers is $4.1 million. In west Norquay, approximately 11 km of sewers require separation, and the Sewage & Drainage Design
Branch is currently in the process of replacing many of these sewers with larger separated sewers. The Sewers and Drainage branch estimates the cost of replacing these sewers to be about $15 million.

School Capacity

Recent estimates for local schools serving the Norquay Village area show that there is capacity for new students. Further, recent trends for area schools has seen reduced enrolments. However, it should also be noted that the impact of reduced enrolments on the capacity is still uncertain as the Vancouver School Board is in the process of revising school capacities in the consideration of possible closures and other initiatives. Enrolment and capacities numbers are detailed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrolment 2001</th>
<th>Enrolment 2006</th>
<th>Enrolment 2009</th>
<th>Estimated Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Elementary</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham Elementary</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norquay Elementary</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Secondary</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killarney Secondary</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windermere Secondary</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Plan Capacity

The existing population of Norquay Village is approximately 10,200 according to the 2006 census with existing zoning capacity for an additional 1,300 units, accommodating roughly 1,800 people. The draft plan for Norquay includes opportunities for new housing that would result in a population increase above what would be anticipated through redevelopment under existing zoning. Staff have estimated that the net additional capacity in the Plan over 25 years (not full buildout), is approximately 2,500 units, accommodating roughly 5,000 people (7,000 people more than are currently residing in the Neighbourhood Centre).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Stage</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>3,640</td>
<td>10,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Zoning</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Plan (25 year buildout)</td>
<td>7,480</td>
<td>17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Plan (100 year buildout)</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Issues and Concerns

Throughout the public planning process, a number of key issues were voiced by the community and a number of trade-offs have been identified. Following are some of the most
Retention of Single-Family Zoning / Scale of Change

The single-family residential character of the neighbourhood is prized by many residents and the stability of this character through retention of the existing (RS-1) zoning has been prioritized by some. Although the existing zoning does not allow for the proposed new housing types, changing the zoning in all or most of the study area has been characterized by some residents as a ‘mass rezoning’ that will fundamentally alter the character of the neighbourhood.

In response, the Plan will retain key elements of the single-family residential character (front and rear yard areas, building heights and massing at or close to what is allowed under existing zoning, design guidelines to retain local residential character) to ensure new housing types will fit into the neighbourhood. Further, policies are included to maintain the right of individual property owners to develop as they are currently allowed with the existing zoning.

It should also be noted that by planning for new housing types in the neighbourhood centre, the existing RS-1 zoning is maintained for the majority of the surrounding areas. As a whole, RS zoning also remains the predominant zoning for the majority of the city (73 percent of residential land and 42 percent of all parcels).

Staff note that new housing types are supported by the Community Vision and CityPlan. As per the EcoDensity Charter, they represent ‘gentle density’, more affordable housing options, and support the development of a more sustainable and complete community. Further, through the public consultation, there was a high degree of interest and support was expressed for the new housing types. In particular, there was support for flexibility on individual properties and opportunities for alternatives within the neighbourhood.

Property Taxes

Another community concern is that, by enabling more flexibility and development capacity on local properties, there will be an increase in property values (disproportionate to the City-wide average) and therefore in property tax assessments (regardless of a property owner’s intent to sell). In response to this and similar concerns, the City has a program of property tax averaging to mitigate any short-term upward or downward fluctuations in values: property taxes are based on the average assessed value over the past three years. Further, provincial tax deferral programs are in place for seniors (whose incomes are often fixed) and lower-income households who would be adversely impacted by an unexpected property tax increase.

It should be noted that potential property tax increases due to rezoning are not a serious concern for most households. Rather, property tax increases became an issue following the Kingsway and Knight Neighbourhood Centre where the three-year averaging program was not applied due to a City error, an error frequently cited by opponents of the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan. The loss of averaging in combination with increasing values (heightened by strong fluctuations in the residential real estate market) resulted in an unintended (although minor) increase on local property tax bills. On discovering the oversight, the City reapplied the averaging and refunded affected residents. More detailed analysis of the Kingsway and Knight example revealed that property value increases due to rezoning were very minor. Due to the rezoning, it is estimated that increases in property values averaged $26,000 per property which resulted in average annual property tax increases
of approximately $37. For the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre, the three-year averaging program will be applied.

**Parking**

The effect of new development on on-street parking availability is a frequently cited concern. This Plan responds with maintaining standard city parking requirements for most development types (indeed, underground parking required for developments in the Kingsway Rezoning Area should increase supply overall). New housing types will be required to provide one off-street parking space per primary dwelling unit (off-street parking is not required for secondary suites or laneway houses) with equivalencies permitted if at-grade spaces cannot be provided for ground-oriented housing types (for example, with rowhouses or stacked townhouses on narrow lots). Equivalencies can include carshare vehicles and spaces or mechanized parking. Further, these new housing types are located in an area with excellent transit and bicycle connectivity to reduce reliance on on-street parking.

**2400 Motel Site**

Due to the prominence of the 2400 Motel site and its current public ownership as part of the City’s Property Endowment Fund real estate portfolio, many community members advocate for a more publicly-oriented redevelopment of the site and consideration of retaining City ownership of the site. There seems to be a broad agreement that the site should redevelop as a ‘catalyst’ for the new neighbourhood centre with the debate centred on the scale and public nature of development. Many community members argue that the public ownership of the site creates a unique opportunity to use it for public use (e.g. a community centre) or as a low-rise mixed-use development to create a place where community residents can complete many daily errands in one central location. Another key issue is the preference of some community members to retain the site in public ownership and only allow development on a long-term lease basis.

Planning staff have treated this site without regard to ownership and have planned for a redevelopment scenario that includes community gathering spaces and enough development capacity to support the broader commercial revitalization of Kingsway. Also, redevelopment of this site has been planned to enable new higher-density housing in a walkable area with excellent transit connectivity. It should be noted, however, that although the predominant community preference is for a lower height development, the Plan enables two taller building elements (12 and 16-storey towers). This additional height provides a physical transition from the 22-storey tower on the Eldorado site and allows for the same density of development as is allowed on the remainder of Kingsway with increased publicly-accessible open space and on-site community amenity.

**Building Heights and Shadows**

Many community residents have expressed a preference for a low-rise model of redevelopment along Kingsway to better reflect local character (current zoning allows up to four-storeys) and to reduce impacts from building shadows. The six-to eight-storey model included in the Plan has been proposed to enable additional density to meet sustainable community development objectives (higher densities in close proximity to local shopping and services and transit and bicycle connections), to support a greater level of public realm
improvements, and to reflect a neighbourhood centre unique to this particular place in the city. On the Special Sites, variations of height (10 and 12 storeys) are allowed to create more variation and at-grade open space which will have the effect of reducing the perception of building mass and reducing the amount of street and sidewalk space in shadow for long periods of the day.

Shadow studies were completed as part of this plan and show that there are little to no shadow impacts on any proposed ground-oriented housing areas. The diagonal orientation of Kingsway actually permits more height in relationship to shadowing as the shadows fall across the street. There may be shadow impacts on properties in the Transition Zone (properties located across the lane from Kingsway). This condition, however, was considered and deemed acceptable for apartment living. Furthermore, the Transition Zone will encourage innovative design guidelines to retain a high level of liveability.

**Heritage and Character Retention**

Higher densities and new housing types allowed in the proposed Neighbourhood Centre Plan create redevelopment potential throughout the area. Although redevelopment is expected to improve neighbourhood sustainability and affordability, there are concerns about maintaining heritage buildings and character houses.

There are a limited number of heritage listed structures within the Study Area and only two houses listed on the heritage register. However, there are a number of pre-1940 character houses and the community has identified the desire to protect established character housing throughout the Neighbourhood Centre.

This Plan provides incentives for character house retention, most notably by enabling development of rear-yard infill housing and additional FSR allowances to offset incentives of additional FSR through tear-down and redevelopment. Character home retention is not required, however.

**CONSIDERATION ITEMS**

Three consideration items are proposed. The first two respond to further urban design and site viability analysis and recommend consideration of an increase from three-storey to four-storey housing types. The third and final consideration responds to revised financial viability analysis and recommends consideration of increased density (0.6 FSR) and height (2 storeys) allowable through rezoning along Kingsway. The increased density and height are intended to encourage property owners to seek rezoning as an option to proceeding with redevelopment under the existing zoning (C-2).

**Consideration Item E**

Consideration Item E recommends Council consider an allowance for low-rise apartments (up to four-storeys) on lots directly facing Norquay Park. Low-rise apartments along the park frontage would allow for additional housing units in close proximity to a major public amenity and create the potential for an attractive ‘urban’ edge along the park and increased visual surveillance (‘eyes on the park’). Further, if viability of a neighbourhood energy utility in the park improves, there may be an opportunity to connect new units in this location. For planning, design, and sustainability reasons, this consideration is supportable. It should be
noted, however, that these options were not presented to the community in the June 2010 Open Houses and it is for this reason that this consideration is not a recommendation.

**Consideration Item F**

Consideration Item F recommends Council consider an allowance for low-rise apartments (up to four-storeys) in the area located directly north of the Purdy’s site (mostly composed of irregularly large properties). The specific characteristics of the properties in this area (deeper and wider than average) make them unattractive for stacked townhouses or traditional rowhouses and well-suited for low-rise apartments. Also, the location of this area, directly north of a large site included in the Kingsway Rezoning Area (the Purdy’s site), provide the opportunity for low-rise apartments to make a physical transition from future redevelopment along Kingsway. For planning, design, and sustainability reasons, this consideration is supportable. It should be noted, however, that these options were not presented to the community in the June 2010 Open Houses and it is for this reason that this consideration is not a recommendation.

**Consideration Item G**

Consideration item G recommends Council consider an increase in building density (from 3.2 to 3.8 net FSR) and height (from six- to eight-storeys to eight- to 10 storeys for the base and taller on special sites) allowable through rezoning within the Kingsway Rezoning Area. This consideration responds to a revised financial viability analysis completed by Coriolis Consulting (Appendix D) and is intended to encourage redevelopment applicants to seek rezoning instead of proceeding under existing zoning. This analysis shows that the additional density and height proposed by the Plan might not be sufficient to overcome the disincentives of additional construction costs and the increased costs, requirements, and uncertainty of rezoning. Further sensitivity analysis showed that, in maintaining the mid-rise form (less than 10-12 storeys), an allowable building density of 3.8 FSR (net) is required to make the rezoning a financially attractive option to proceeding under existing zoning (less density would be required if a tower form is considered).

Staff believe there are many benefits of seeing a significant ‘take-up’ of the rezoning option (as opposed to property owners proceeding under existing zoning), including more significant achievement of plan objectives such as more housing choice in convenient locations (higher densities in walkable areas that are well-served by transit), revitalization of Kingsway, more support for local businesses, conformance with higher standards required by rezoning (including urban design and LEED requirements), and the increased potential for Community Amenity Contributions (CACs). However, it should also be noted that significant concerns have been voiced by many community members about height and the potential character of Kingsway and that the additional height and density is greater than the plan proposal as was developed through the public consultation process. Further, consideration of additional density and height must also be matched with further urban design analysis to ensure that new development is compatible with the proposed character of Kingsway and allows for a satisfactory transition to the surrounding residential neighbourhoods.

The proposed rezoning policy reflects a balance between community concern about height and character with the desire for revitalization along Kingsway and improved building quality and urban design. However, it is also Staff’s concern that rezoning is not only viable but a financially attractive option in the current development climate (as the Neighbourhood Centre improves it is anticipated that demand for increased density will improve) as well as
ensure that there is potential for CACs to help finance the public amenities and public realm improvements sought by the local community.

Similar to consideration item E and F, for planning, design and sustainability reasons, this consideration is supportable. It should be noted, however, that these options were not presented to the community in the June 2010 Open Houses and it is for this reason that this consideration is not a recommendation.

**NEXT STEPS**

Following adoption of the proposed Plan, further steps are required to fully realize its potential. Primary among these steps are the two major components of the Implementation Plan:

**Zoning By-law Development**

The Neighbourhood Centre Plan proposes four new residential zones that require drafting, testing, and refining new District Schedules and Design Guidelines to implement. The new zoning documents will amend the Zoning and Development By-law to enable new ground-oriented housing to be developed in the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre without requiring rezoning approval. Development of these documents will also include public consultation to ensure they are well-calibrated to community preferences.

**Public Amenities and Infrastructure Financing Strategy**

More detailed work is required to develop a complete Public Amenities and Infrastructure Financing Strategy appropriate to the amount of new development planned in the Neighbourhood Centre. This includes more detailed analysis of Development Cost Levy and Community Amenity Contribution potential and mechanisms to ensure that the local area benefits from new development. Also included in this strategy will be consideration of other funding sources and steps, including Capital Plans, required to finance improvements needed to ensure a complete and sustainable Neighbourhood Centre.

**Placemaking and Public Realm Plan**

In addition to the Public Realm and Transportation Improvement Plan, further work is planned to develop more detailed Public Realm improvements and placemaking guidelines to fully realize the potential of the Kingsway shopping area. Included in this effort will be more detailed work to identify public art opportunities and to develop public realm elements specific to Norquay Village.

**Further Consultation**

Further consultation will be necessary if Council decides to advance any of the consideration items (E, F or G). This consultation would be included as part of the Implementation Plan detailed above and, that in addition, refinement of these general concepts can be undertaken with review of related development proposals.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

New development in accordance with this Plan will require standard City approvals and will be required to pay the appropriate development charges and fees. Public realm improvements along Kingsway are currently budgeted to cost $2.0 million, with $900,000 of
this total being sought through cost-sharing partnerships with TransLink and ICBC. For the Clarendon Connector project, the total cost is estimated at $1.25 million, with $400,000 in cost-sharing being sought from the same partners. As well, some $450,000 may be recouped through the sale of residual property that was required to be purchased for the project. The balance of funding for both these projects will be sought through Council as part of the approval process for the 2012-2014 Capital Plan.

Infrastructure upgrades required by zoning changes are currently estimated at $4.1 million, not including sewer upgrades which may be included in the existing Sewer Separation program. The Public Amenities and Infrastructure Financing Strategy will verify these costs and will provide a strategy for funding the required upgrades.

In addition, implementation of this Plan through the development of new District Schedules and other supporting plans and documentation will require commitment of existing staff resources, supported by consultancies. These resources are available within existing budgets.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

The program is expected to have positive environmental implications as a result of linking development locations to public transit service, application of green building principles and technologies to architecture and urban design, and encouraging mixed-use developments contributing to a complete community.

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

By enabling more housing units to be located on existing lots, the Plan will increase the supply of both new market ownership and rental housing stock and expand the diversity of housing types and tenures to assist in the accommodation of a wide range of households.

CONCLUSION

The Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan is an important step in the implementation of Vancouver CityPlan and the Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision. It will encourage the revitalization of Kingsway and enable new housing types along Kingsway and in the surrounding residential neighbourhood, supporting the development of a complete and sustainable neighbourhood where local residents can live, work, shop, and play while benefiting from a wider choice of more affordable and family-friendly housing types located in close proximity to transit and bicycle connections.

* * * * *
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1.0 Introduction

Norquay Village is the second Neighbourhood Centre planning effort completed in the City of Vancouver and is an important part of the implementation of CityPlan and the Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision. The Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan provides a vision and policy framework for a revitalized Kingsway and for new housing choices in the surrounding neighbourhoods. This plan is the product of a comprehensive and multi-year planning process involving City staff and neighbourhood residents and benefits from many rounds of creative thinking, challenging questions, and careful refinement as a result of the valued collaboration of the local community.

This Plan is a document of this process and a roadmap forward: building on community input and city-wide planning goals to provide policy that will guide decisions on land use, urban design, public realm improvements, and new community amenity investments. By coordinating policy in these areas, the Plan is designed to deliver the following benefits:

- more affordable homeownership options that will enable the neighbourhood to grow and evolve in balance with respect for established character;
- revitalization of Kingsway to expand the variety of local shops and services, accommodate higher density housing, and support social interaction in a vibrant and interesting place that neighbourhood residents can walk to;
- increased housing density in energy-efficient configurations in a walkable neighbourhood with good transit and bicycling connections to help support Vancouver’s greenest city objectives;
- addition of new gathering spaces and other public amenities that can provide support services for diverse community groups and residents and a place for the meetings and events that support community life; and
- enhance local neighbourhood identity through new public realm enhancements (a more beautiful centre), supporting a rich and robust community life, maintaining the distinctive and eclectic character of the neighbourhood, and providing unique spaces that fit the evolving nature of the community.

1.1 Policy Context

CityPlan

Two of the key city-wide directions in Vancouver CityPlan (1995) that form the foundation of this Neighbourhood Centre Plan are:

- To increase neighbourhood housing variety, so that people will have more opportunities to live in neighbourhoods at various ages and stages in their lives. As the region grows, more housing opportunities will mean less sprawl onto farm and green lands as Vancouver takes a portion of the region’s growth; and
- To create lively neighbourhood centres that provide residents with a variety of housing, jobs, and services, and that become the public heart of each neighbourhood. Neighbourhood centres will help the environment by reducing the need to travel long distances from home to jobs and services.

The Community Visions program brings CityPlan to the local level, and enables communities to
determine where and how CityPlan should be reflected in their neighbourhoods. In the Council-approved Renfrew-Collingwood (RC) Community Vision (2004) identified the area around Norquay Park as a key shopping area and future Neighbourhood Centre that could include a greater variety of retail stores along Kingsway, additional housing types, additional community amenities and facilities. The Vision said that housing types could include mixed-use developments on Kingsway (e.g. ground floor commercial with residential above), along with a mix of apartments and townhouses in areas adjacent to Kingsway.

The Neighbourhood Centre Delivery Program (NCDP) was approved by Council in July 2002 as a means to implement these Vision Directions. In November 2005, Council approved the planning of the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre area. In addition to the Plan, which addresses housing, public realm and streetscape improvements, development along Kingsway (the current C-2 area), and a policy framework for the 2400 Motel site, there will be companion documents that work to implement this plan, to be completed subsequent to adoption of the Neighbourhood Centre Plan.

Vancouver 2020: A Bright Green Future

This Plan seeks to conform to all relevant city-wide policy and Council Direction including Vancouver’s effort to ensure a sustainable future and to be the greenest city in the world. At the time of writing, the City has been involved in a broad public discussion on how to implement the goals identified in the Bright Green Future document (adopted by Council in February 2010), including:

- 33% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions
- carbon neutral new construction and improve energy efficiency of existing buildings by 20%
- majority of trips by walking, cycling, or public transit
- 33% reduction in per capita ecological footprint

Achieving these ambitious targets requires broad coordination of all city policy and city building. This plan supports this effort by enabling the development of a diverse, walkable, and interconnected neighbourhood with increased densities within close proximity to major transit and bicycling corridors. New development within the Neighbourhood Centre will meet Vancouver’s building code standards (significantly increasing energy efficiency and reducing greenhouse gas emissions) while increasing density, Vancouver’s ability to sustainably accommodate neighbourhood growth while maintaining the livability of the neighbourhood, and maintaining or increasing permeable land area and stormwater management capabilities.

1.2 Project Context

Located on the east side of Vancouver and centered along Kingsway in the vicinity of Norquay Park, Norquay Village is in many ways a typical East Vancouver residential neighbourhood. Tree-lined streets with single-family houses (many with secondary rental suites) surround Kingsway to the north and south, with the majority of commercial shops and services concentrated on Kingsway itself. Typical lot sizes average around 33 feet in width and most lots are close to or less than the common 120 feet in depth. Parks and elementary schools provide green space and community space throughout the neighbourhood.

On the other hand, Norquay Village has a number of unique features. The neighbourhood benefits from excellent connectivity to the broader city and region (especially central Vancouver) via two major transportation corridors: Kingsway and the SkyTrain/BC Parkway corridor (Nanaimo and 29th Avenue
SkyTrain stations are within close proximity to the northern boundary of the plan. The street network itself is distinctive with three street grids meeting in the centre of Norquay Village creating many angled street intersections and irregular lots, as well as the diagonal orientation of Kingsway itself which creates many opportunities for distinctive ‘flatiron’ corner buildings.

Kingsway, the main commercial ‘high street’ in the Neighbourhood Centre, has a historic role as one of the main highway connections into Vancouver and as a major auto-oriented commercial strip. However, as Kingsway has lost importance as a regional thoroughfare and the locational preferences of regional commercial have changed, the street has lost some of its lustre and retail vitality. One and two-storey commercial buildings with a mix of more recently constructed four-storey mixed-use buildings (residential above retail commercial) form the basic pattern of development along the street. The character of the street itself remains strongly automobile oriented with long blocks and narrow sidewalks - often serving as a barrier to pedestrians than as a shared community heart.

Surrounding Kingsway are residential neighbourhoods characterized primarily by single-family housing (many with secondary suites). The basic character of these neighbourhoods is well-loved by local residents: the front and rear yards, the scale of the houses, the mix of housing styles and ages, and others. However, the current zoning in the neighbourhood is not well-designed to accommodate growth with the exception of secondary suites. Laneway housing is an option in this neighbourhood, however many of the lots are not deep enough and the houses are set too far back on the lot to fit a laneway house. Similar to most Vancouver neighbourhoods, houses in Norquay Village are becoming increasingly expensive and out of range of young families and other first-time buyers.

1.3 Plan Boundaries

The Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre planning boundary has evolved throughout the planning process, beginning with a very rough ‘bubble’ sketch illustrated in the RC Community Vision and finishing with the plan boundary illustrated in Figure 1. Originally defined as the area surrounding the Kingsway shopping area between Nanaimo and Earles Streets, the study area expanded to include the 29th Avenue SkyTrain station area and widened from Nanaimo to Gladstone Street, and again to include the Nanaimo Station Area. These expansions responded to the awareness that the SkyTrain station areas are an important part of the broader neighbourhood context and that there is demand for new housing types close to station areas.

The planning area was later contracted to exclude the station areas. This final revision reflects an understanding that the original Neighbourhood Centre was intended to focus on Kingsway and the surrounding neighbourhood. It is the objective of this plan to develop a Neighbourhood Centre for Norquay Village and the size and extent of the centre is intended to relate to Kingsway and is roughly equivalent to a comfortable 10-minute walk to Kingsway. Further, there is a recognition that to properly plan for those areas surrounding the station areas, a comprehensive approach calibrated to the needs of transit-oriented development and including Translink in the process.
Figure 1: Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Study Area Boundaries
2.0 Plan Framework

The policies and guidelines contained within this Neighbourhood Centre Plan are intended to realize a number of key goals and objectives. These goals and objectives reflect the initial direction contained in the Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision, have been further refined and expanded through community workshops and Working Group meetings into the Community Directions, and have been balanced with city-wide policies and objectives. The result is a comprehensive vision for the future of Norquay Village, reflecting a holistic approach to place-making, that seeks to balance retail revitalization, new housing choices and the development of new community amenities and public spaces with respect for established neighbourhood character and the desire for careful incremental and organic change.

2.1 Community Directions

Throughout the planning process, several themes emerged which have been translated into the Community Directions. These Directions are the result of filtering through a very broad and diverse set of ideas and issues identified by community members and have been used to develop plan proposals and, ultimately, the Neighbourhood Centre plan itself.

1. Strengthen Kingsway as a diverse, vibrant, and walkable neighbourhood ‘heart’ and retail ‘high street’ for Norquay Village.

2. Create an attractive, pedestrian-friendly, and safe streetscapes along Kingsway with wider sidewalks, safer pedestrian crossings, and green buffers.

3. Encourage new development along Kingsway that adds to the diversity and character of Norquay with human scaled buildings and streetscape improvements.

4. Shops and services should be locally-oriented, providing daily goods and services within a comfortable walking distance of residents.

5. Focus higher density development in locations with convenient access to shops, services, and transit.

6. Seek opportunities to create functional and distinctive public spaces to serve as community gathering spaces for neighbourhood activities.
7. Ensure a diversity of housing types, including new, high-quality and sustainably designed family-oriented housing to fit within the character of the neighbourhood.

8. Maintain a strong single-family residential character in key areas of the neighbourhood, including retaining heritage houses.

9. New development should work to protect public views and mature trees.

10. Create a safe, pedestrian-friendly, and traffic-calmed transportation network.

11. New development should bring with it new neighbourhood serving amenities.

12. Ensure that neighbourhood parks are accessible for all neighbours, well-maintained, safe, diverse, and green.

13. Seek opportunities to add and extend green space throughout the neighbourhood. Naturalize and green key corridors and community resources.

14. Emphasize sustainability and environmental innovation.
2.2 Plan Vision

The basic vision for the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre is for a complete community: a place where people have housing choices that meet their needs, where there are local shops and services that provide the goods of daily life, where there are public spaces and places for people to meet and engage in community life, and where people can move easily and without a car to access places to work, play, and shop. Equally important is a plan that respects and enhances the character of the neighbourhood and benefits existing residents. More specifically, the vision for this plan includes:

Objective 1: Focus on the Revitalization of Kingsway as a Local High Street

The desire for more shops and services and, in particular, locally-oriented shops and services, along Kingsway is a primary focus for this plan. There are, however, a number of key issues that limit Kingsway’s capacity to function as a vibrant and cherished local high street. These issues include inadequate sidewalks for enjoyable pedestrian movement and activity (which in turn provides the walk-by traffic for retailers), a lack of ‘critical mass’ of people and activity along the Kingsway corridor, a lack of desirable retail spaces, and the lack of a distinct ‘Neighbourhood Centre’ identity that differentiates Norquay Village from competing areas.

Proposed Strategies

- Density and building form regulations that are better calibrated to the unique local conditions of the street and that support redevelopment of underperforming properties.
- Careful attention to urban design and building quality as well as wider sidewalks (through increased building setbacks) and pedestrian-oriented design features.
- Public investments in street and public realm improvements including street trees, furniture, and artistic elements will reinforce the unique identity of this section of Kingsway.
- Reinforcing Kingsway’s role as the primary retail commercial heart of the Neighbourhood Centre with opportunities for major retail ‘anchors’ on larger sites.
- Recognize the natural neighbourhood ‘heart’ at the triangle formed by Kingsway, Nanaimo Street, and East 33rd Avenue including planning for the 2400 Motel site as a catalyst for the Neighbourhood Centre.
- Plan for a substantial public component on the 2400 Motel site, including gathering spaces, a high degree of public (and in particular pedestrian) accessibility, major retail commercial activity, and opportunities for the general public to enjoy views from the site.

Objective 2: Support the development of new spaces for community gatherings and new public amenities

A major issue identified through the planning process was the lack of community gathering spaces and public amenities in Norquay Village. In response, in addition to the reinvigoration of pedestrian activity along Kingsway that increases the opportunity for informal community interaction, the creation of new spaces is prioritized. These spaces, both indoor and outdoor, are intended to be flexible in use to accommodate the diversity of needs within the neighbourhood (seniors, arts programming, cultural celebrations, community meeting spaces, and others). Other major priorities include expanded green spaces (including a new Renfrew Ravine Park extension) and supportive infrastructure for a complete community (day care, support for seniors, non-market housing, etc.).
Proposed Strategies

- Recognize the potential to create community gathering spaces in the heart of the Neighbourhood Centre and require new indoor and outdoor gathering spaces on the 2400 Motel site should the site go through a rezoning process.

- Incentivize the creation of smaller scale public plazas and other social spaces by allowing increased height (without increased density) on larger sites and strategically located mid-block sites.

- Follow Plan with a detailed Public Amenities and Financing Infrastructure Strategy that can link emerging and established funding sources with identified amenity priorities.

Objective 3: Enable residential neighbourhoods to evolve incrementally and organically

A key principle that evolved through the planning process is that change in residential neighbourhoods should be incremental and organic in nature. In response, this Plan is designed to allow for the redevelopment of a neighbourhood block to take place over several years or decades (typically with many different designers and builders) and ensures that new development does not dramatically reshape the block with homogenous and uniform housing projects. This incremental approach is also more consistent with the historical development of neighbourhoods over time as opposed to a large-scale master plan development.

Proposed Strategies

- Emphasize housing types that can be developed on a single lot basis (or with very minor assembly of two or three lots) and do not provide incentives or requirements for multi-lot assembly.

- Ensure new housing types fit in with the character of the neighbourhood through design guidelines, front and rear-yards, and appropriate building scale and mass regulations.

- Ensure new residential zones provide flexibility for individual property owners, including maintaining the options allowed in the current zoning (house plus secondary suite and laneway house).

- Include incentives for character home retention.

Objective 4: Create more affordable entry-level homeownership opportunities, particularly for families, while retaining the ability to include rental housing options.

This plan emphasizes new housing types that are intended to provide a broader range of ownership options with a specific focus on options that are large enough to accommodate families (at least 1,000 square feet) and have access to outdoor space. The approach to both entry-level homeownership options in addition to the inclusion of new rental addresses some key challenges in the broader affordability spectrum.

Proposed Strategies

- Enable new housing types which increase the allowable number of ownership units on a single parcel (i.e. duplexes, rowhouses, and stacked townhouses).

- Include allowances for rental secondary (or ‘lock-off’) suites in all housing types.
Locate higher densities in convenient locations near transit and bicycling corridors to reduce transportation costs including the ability to opt out of car ownership.

Objective 5: Improve safe and enjoyable pedestrian and bicycle connections while seeking to minimize local traffic impacts

This Plan emphasizes walking, cycling, and transit as priorities for moving throughout the Neighbourhood Centre. Strategic improvements to the sidewalk network, including widening and enhancing the sidewalk along Kingsway are key to the implementation of this plan. Completing the greenway and bike route network though the area will encourage cycling, particularly with improvements to the BC Parkway. Related to this effort are plans to improve some difficult intersections to improve pedestrian crossing and improving the overall efficiency of the local road network.

Proposed Strategies

- Complete the sidewalk network.
- Invest in pedestrian-related public realm improvements including wider sidewalks, street furniture, street trees, and improved pedestrian crossings.
- Seek new mid-block pedestrian crossings at strategic points along Kingsway.
- Connect the city bikeway network through the Neighbourhood Centre along the Duchess Street and Wales Street corridor.
- Plan for a eventual pedestrian and potential bicycle connection along the proposed Renfrew Ravine Park extension.
- Rationalize problematic street network connections to improve the efficiency of the local street network.
- Complete the Clarendon Connector project to reduce impacts from through traffic on local streets.
Figure 2: Residential Neighbourhood Plan Designations
3.0 Residential Neighbourhoods

This section, and the following section on the Kingsway Rezoning Area, comprise the Housing Plan for the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre and specifically addresses the residential neighbourhoods surrounding Kingsway. In general, it is the intent of this plan to enable new housing within the Neighbourhood Centre while preserving as much of the physical character of existing neighbourhoods as possible. In this area, the primary focus is on ground-oriented housing types that are directly compatible with the existing neighbourhood. All housing typologies in this area are designed to visually fit in with the building height, scale and general massing of the established single-family character while offering a greater variety of housing in the neighbourhood.

Higher-density housing options are planned for Kingsway and for a ‘transition’ area located directly behind (across the lane). On Kingsway, this Plan would allow for rezoning consideration for mid-rise mixed-use buildings between four and 12 storeys (except for the 2400 Motel site), as discussed in the Section 4: Kingway Rezoning Area. The transition zone, detailed in this section, allows for three to four storey low-rise apartment buildings that provide a physical transition from the taller buildings along Kingsway to the low-scale of the ground-oriented housing zones.

This Housing Plan strives to bring a large variety of housing options to Norquay Village and improve the affordability of entry-level home ownership (as well as retain rental options in the neighbourhood). It is anticipated that this variety will provide housing with a wide range of relative affordability, ranging from the most expensive (single-family houses and apartment penthouses), down a sliding scale of cost in the form of 1/2 duplexes, traditional rowhouses, 1/3 triplexes, large apartments and small apartments.

The general structure and approach to the residential zones included in this Plan is outlined in the following diagram:
3.1 Existing Conditions / Policy Context

The residential neighbourhoods of Norquay Village include approximately 1,900 single-family houses. Including secondary suites, the total number of dwelling units is about 2,850. In many ways, these neighbourhoods are typical for East Vancouver. The feel and character of the neighbourhood is similar to many neighbourhoods, especially in Renfrew-Collingwood. Densities are typical for this part of the city and housing prices (an average East Vancouver house was listed for over $700,000 in Spring 2010) are likewise similar.

There is a mix of housing ages, styles, and conditions. While there are only about 300 houses remaining in the area that were built prior to the 1940s, many have lost much of their original character over time. The Study Area has seen change and redevelopment over time, with post-war bungalows built during the 1950s and 60s, and ‘Vancouver Specials’ that are typical of single-family construction during the 1970s, 80s, and 90s.

The Study Area also contains a wide variety of block and lot types. Due to this wide range of block and lot structures, a customized housing strategy is proposed. This strategy matches building types with specific lot types to maximize livability and viability. In the area north of Kingsway, street blocks are primarily oriented parallel or perpendicular to the northwest-southeast orientation of Kingsway. Lot dimensions are mostly 33 feet in width with lot depths ranging between 100 to 120 feet. In addition, there are many irregularly-shaped lots which result from the confluence of different street grid orientations. To the south of Kingsway, an eclectic mix of north-south and east-west blocks contain a variety of distinct lot patterns, ranging from 44 by 90 foot lots to larger 50 by 140 foot lots to the typical Vancouver 33 by 120 foot lots. Aside from the more typical blocks and lots, variety in the area includes deeper lots, double fronting blocks (with two streets and no lane), and a pattern of relatively small properties (33 by 90 feet) in the northeast quadrant.

Existing Zoning and Community Vision Policy

Most properties within Norquay Village are zoned RS-1 (One Family Residential) which allows for a one-family dwelling with a building density of 0.60 FSR covering up to 40 percent of the lot. RS-1 also allows a secondary suite in the dwelling that can be rented and a laneway house (where rear-yard are sufficient to meet the guidelines) which can also be rented for a potential total of three families on a single lot. Maximum height permitted is two and one-half storeys and 31 or 35 feet.

In regard to Community Visions, the R-C Community Vision recognizes the value of residential neighbourhoods and contain directions to maintain and enhance most single-family neighbourhoods. However, there is a recognition that the future housing needs of the community necessitate consideration of new housing types. In the Vision, the only new housing type that was approved (supported by more than 50 percent of residents in a general survey and also by 55 percent of random survey respondents) was Seniors’ Housing. However, the following types were rated as ‘uncertain’ which may be considered, subject to further area planning: Infill, Duplexes, Small Houses on Shared Lots, Cottages, Traditional Rowhouses, and Low-Rise Apartments.

3.2 Residential Neighbourhood Planning Principles

The basic concept for the residential neighbourhoods was to enable some flexibility for new housing types with the intent of providing more affordable housing options for local families while retaining the basic physical character of the neighbourhood. This concept was informed by the public input heard throughout the planning process and by the community directions, which include:
1. Ensure a diversity of housing types, including new, high-quality and sustainably designed family-oriented housing to fit within the character of the neighbourhood.

2. Maintain a strong single-family residential character in key areas of the neighbourhood, including retention of heritage houses.

3. Celebrate the unique historic and natural character of the area. New development should work to protect public views and mature trees.

Building on the directions, the following discussion outlines the principles that were developed to guide the formulation of the Housing Area planning policies. This discussion is provided as background to enable fuller understanding of the proposed policy.

1. **Focus on options that work with a single lot.** New housing types should not require lot assembly and provide a real choice for individual property owners. Single-lot options can be developed incrementally over time so that the change in the neighbourhood is organic.

2. **Fit in with the character of established single-family housing.** New housing types should not alter the visual character, harmony or rhythm of a residential street. Allowable building heights and sizes should be compatible with current zoning allowances.

3. **Create new ownership options.** More home ownership choices are needed in Vancouver, especially ones that are more affordable than a detached single-family house and can provide family-friendly options.

4. **Retain rental housing options.** Secondary suites provide valuable rental housing and are an important source of ‘mortgage helper’ revenue for homeowners. Lock-off secondary suites should be permitted within all new housing types.

5. **Use block characteristics to determine type.** New housing types are planned based on the types of blocks. On narrow and deep lots: stacked townhouses and duplexes; on wide and shallow lots: traditional rowhouses; and on wide and deep lots: duplex and infill housing.

6. **Retain current options in addition to new options.** New zoning regulations should not remove any option currently allowed on an individual property. If a property owner is allowed to build a single-family detached home with a basement suite and a laneway house today, they should still be able to in the future.

**Other Policy Considerations**

**House-Like Attributes**

For many, a single family home has attractive qualities, but is too expensive, or too large to care for. The following are some of the desirable attributes of single family homes reflected in the housing choices offered in this Plan:

- ground-oriented with own front door on the street
- front porches and expression of “home” on street or common outdoor space
- useable outdoor space: direct access to private and/or shared outdoor space and garden areas
- multiple exposures and cross ventilation
Neighbourliness and Area Character

This Plan and its implementation is intended to result in developments that fit with the neighbourhood. With rezoning, not all properties will redevelop: many will remain as single family houses. The housing types therefore should be “good neighbours” to existing houses, including:

- Small scale developments that can fit comfortably into a single family context
- Working within existing block structure: pedestrian access from the street and vehicular access from the lane
- Neighbourly massing and adjacencies
- Design guidelines to ensure quality and fit

Location Opportunities and Challenges

- **Areas Closest to the Kingsway and Skytrain Stations.** This Plan generally locates the slightly denser Stacked Townhouse typology in closer proximity to the shopping street and the station areas, enabling more people to be located within a very quick (5 min.) walk to shops, services and transit.

- **Busy Streets.** There are a few streets within the study area that experience higher vehicular traffic volumes such as Nanaimo north of 33rd, Earles north of Kingsway, and Clarendon south of Kingsway. On these streets, the challenge is to provide new Ground-Oriented Housing while ensuring an acceptable level of liveability. This Plan proposes noise mitigation regulations for all new units constructed on these streets, as well as design guidelines to provide all units with at least one major exposure to the quiet side of the development parcel.

- **Around Parks and Schools.** Parks and Schools are major existing amenities. This Plan proposes to place the relatively denser Stacked Townhouse and Traditional Rowhouse housing types around the centrally-located Norquay Elementary and Norquay Park. The areas around General Brock Park, Earles Park and Cunningham School are located on the periphery of the study area and will instead be rezoned for Small Houses, Duplexes and Infills. In an effort to create more surveillance on the park and for better park definition, Infill Housing oriented towards the playing fields will be encouraged for those parcels that back or side onto a service lane that is against a park or school.

- **Double-Fronting Lots.** One localized condition exists between Wenonah Street and Galt Street located just east of Gladstone where several parcels have Galt Street serving a rear lane function. This section of Galt Street will require upgrades with treed boulevards and street curbs since future and recent development on Galt Street envision this portion of the street to serve as a working street rather than a rear lane. Infill houses with their front doors oriented towards Galt Street will therefore be encouraged on these particular parcels.

Housing Variety and Accessibility

Creating new opportunities for single-level units will improve the housing choices suitable for less mobile seniors and disabled people, making the area a more complete community. Some of the new ground-oriented housing types could be developed with some single level at-grade units, most likely in the Stacked Townhouse typology.
Retaining Character Houses

With redevelopment of properties over time, many pre-1940 character houses have been lost. The Community Vision supported encouraging the retention of character houses. There are approximately 300 houses dating from before 1940 in the housing plan area. This Plan proposes introducing measures to the zoning that will encourage their retention by allowing infill houses to be developed on sites with existing pre-1940’s houses.

Greening

Landscape is an important aspect of quality and fit with the neighbourhood. Guidelines will be written to address relationships of private and public outdoor spaces, and to call for intense planting of gardens and yards. Guidelines will also address achieving quality landscapes, while addressing parking and servicing needs.

Improvements to the public realm should also be completed to enhance the pedestrian, cyclist, and visual experience of the neighbourhood. Planting of public boulevards will be encouraged.

Retention of Existing RS-1 development rights

Many property owners in the area reported a desire to retain the development rights currently allowed under existing RS-1 zoning. This would include a Principal Building with a Secondary Suite plus Laneway House, all with only a single parking space being required. All properties currently zoned RS-1 within the Ground-Oriented Housing Plan will have the option to develop under the RS-1 District Schedule instead of being solely subject to the new zoning introduced by this plan.

3.1 New Residential Zones

The following sections contain the policies and development parameters for the new housing types proposed by this Plan. This zones will be allowed as illustrated in Figure X: New Residential Zones.

3.3 Small House / Duplex Zone

The Small House / Duplex Zone allows for a choice of housing types to be built on individual properties, depending on the size and location of the site. The primary new housing type envisioned in this zone is the duplex which enables two strata-titled units each with the potential for a secondary suite. This zone also enables rear-yard infill units for sites whose rear or side frontage is adjacent to a park, with the intent to create front doors and windows on the park, and for sites with character houses.

1. One 33 foot x 120 foot lot (approximate)
   - One single-family house, with or without secondary suite (0.7 FSR), plus laneway house
(0.125 FSR), same as the current RS-1 zoning; or

- Duplex (two attached units, strata-titled, each with or without a Lock-off suite) (0.85 FSR); or
- Character house retention. Sites with an established pre-1940s character house may be permitted 0.9 FSR total, conversion to two or three units, and / or an infill (or ‘coach house’) unit over the garage at the lane. Infill will be feasible only where fire access requirements can be met; or
- Sites with a rear or side property line flanking a park or school may be permitted a duplex and infill, 0.9 FSR total.

2. Two 33 foot x 120 foot lots (approximate)

- Four small houses or duplex court (0.85 FSR). Existing character houses are to be retained as part of the development. Flexibility in siting and other regulations will be included to assist retention.

3. Three or more 33 foot x 120 foot lots (approximate)

- Seven or eight units in mini-houses and / or duplexes (0.85 FSR). Existing character houses are to be retained as part of the development. Flexibility in siting and other regulations will be included to assist retention.

Further refinement and testing of the zoning may result in some minor changes to what is described below.

Policies

1. Small House / Duplex District Schedule. Draft a new District Schedule and Guidelines for a Small House / Duplex Zone generally as described below. Ensure all new development (including one family and two family dwellings) within the zone meets high standards of quality, character, landscape, and neighbourhood fit. This zone is intended to be similar to the existing RT-10 zone but with increased densities to permit basement lock-off suites and design guidelines to mitigate the resultant densities.

2. Basic Development Parameters.

   1. Allowable building density: 0.825 FSR (depending on lot size), with at-grade parking.
   2. Allowable unit density: will vary depending on site size, assembly, and frontage, but will typically be in the range of 22-30 units per acre, not including lock-off suite potential.
   3. Maximum allowable building height (in storeys): One basement storey (up to 5 feet above grade) and 2 full storeys. The second storey will be contained within the roof form and have some sloped ceilings down to 4 foot ceiling height.
   5. Required front yard: Approximately 16-24 feet.
   6. Required rear yard: Requirements will be minimized to enable buildings to more fully utilize the depth of lots to advantage and enable garden space in the middle and/or edges of sites.

3. Site Coverage and Impermeable Material Area Limits. Limits should be used to ensure effective storm-water management, however, limits will likely be higher than typical for a residential neighbourhood to accommodate the increased footprint of medium-density ground-
oriented housing.

4. **Atypical Sites and Lots.** Variations in the above basic parameters should be included to deal with non-standard situations such as extra deep lots, shallow lots, sites without lanes, corner locations, topography, etc.

5. **Retention of RS-1 Development Option.** The development rights enabled by the current RS-1 District Schedule (including the ability to develop a one-family dwelling, with the option of a secondary suite and a laneway house) should be retained. Development of this option will be subject to the development parameters outlined in the RS-1 District Schedule.

6. **Character House Retention and Park and School Adjacency.** The Small House / Duplex zone will include incentives for the retention of pre-1940 character houses on single-lots, and will require their retention as part of any development that involves the assembly of two or more lots. Flexibility in siting and other regulations will be included to assist this (A character house is defined as one built before 1940 and still having a majority of its original features).

In the Small House / Duplex zone, single lot properties retaining character houses or which rear or flank a park or school should be offered the following incentives in the zoning:
- An increase in allowable FSR from 0.85 to 0.9
- An increase in the number of units allowed (from 2 to 3, on a typical 33 foot lot, possibly more on a larger lot)
- The potential to build a coach-house or infill unit, if fire access requirements can be met (typically a 3 foot clear side yard access on a mid-block lot; corner lots and lots which flank a lane will not need to have this width of side yard)
- Possible relaxation of minimum parking requirement by one space

3.4 **Traditional Rowhouse Zone**

The Traditional Rowhouse Zone will enable new housing to be built on shallow lots. Traditional Rowhouses produce dwelling units with shared side party walls, resulting in units with windows located only on the front and rear exposures. In order to minimize the amount of living space without natural light, unit depths should be limited to 40 feet (maximum) and are therefore most logically located on shallow lots. This zone is intended to allow:

1. **One 44 foot x 90 foot lot (approximate)**
   - One single-family house, with or without secondary suite (0.7 FSR), plus laneway house (0.125 FSR), same as the current RS-1 zoning; or
• Character house retention - multiple conversion dwelling (up to 3 strata-titled dwelling units) for a pre-1940s character house (0.9 FSR); or
• Duplex (two attached units oriented side-by-side, strata-titled, each with or without a Lock-off suite) (0.85 FSR).

2. Two 44 foot x 90 foot lot (approximate)
• Five Traditional Rowhouse units, each 16 feet in width (minimum), strata-titled, each with or without a lock-off suite (1.1-1.2 FSR);

3. Three or more 44 foot x 90 foot lots (approximate)
• A continuous streetwall of Traditional Rowhouse units, each 16 feet in width (minimum), strata-titled, each with or without a lock-off suite (1.1-1.2 FSR);

Further refinement and testing of the zoning may result in some minor changes to what is described below.

Policies

1. Traditional Rowhouse District Schedule. Draft a new District Schedule and Guidelines for a Traditional Rowhouse Zone generally as described below. Ensure all new development within the zone meets high standards of quality, character, landscape, and neighbourhood fit. This zone is intended to permit basement lock-off suites and guidelines mitigate the resultant massing.

2. Basic Development Parameters.
1. Allowable building density: 0.825 to 1.1 FSR (depending on lot size), with at-grade parking.
2. Allowable unit density: will vary depending on site size, assembly, and frontage, but will typically be in the range of 27 units per acre, not including lock-off suite potential.
3. Maximum allowable building height (in storeys): One basement storey (up to 5 feet above grade) and 2 full storeys. The second storey will be contained within the roof form and have some sloped ceilings down to 4 foot height.
5. Required front yard: Approximately 8 to 12 feet depending on neighbouring context.
6. Required rear yard: Requirements will be stipulated to allow a minimum yard depth of 16 feet between the garage and the rear exterior wall.

3. Building Design. Single-lot developments should be designed to appear as a large house to maintain the existing rhythm of the single-family neighbourhood. Two or multi-lot developments should appear as a small multi-family townhouse building while respecting neighbouring properties.

4. Private Outdoor Space. Private outdoor space should be required for each unit, in the form of a front or rear yard, a balcony, porch, or open roof deck.

5. Site Coverage and Impermeable Material Area Limits. Limits should be used to ensure effective storm-water management, however, limits will likely be higher than typical for a residential neighbourhood to accommodate the increased footprint of medium-density ground-oriented housing.
6. **Retention of RS-1 Development Option.** The development rights enabled by the current RS-1 District Schedule (including the ability to develop a one-family dwelling, with the option of a secondary suite and a laneway house) should be retained. Development of this option will be subject to the development parameters outlined in the RS-1 District Schedule.

7. **Character House Retention.** The Traditional Rowhouse zone will include incentives for the retention of pre-1940 character houses on single-lots. For all development sites, however, the retention of a character house is at the owner’s discretion. (A character house is defined as one built before 1940 and still having a majority of its original features).

### 3.5 Stacked Townhouse Zone

The Stacked Townhouse zone will enable up to 3 family-sized units on a typical 33 foot wide lot or 9 family-sized units on two 33 foot wide lots. The stacked townhouse is a very flexible housing type where the single-lot owner can sell the other units, rent one or two of the units, or share the townhouse with other family members. Also, the Stacked Townhouse provides a more affordable and energy-efficient housing option than single-family houses while sharing many of the attributes of single-family housing: front and rear yards, ground-orientation, private entrances, ability to have a secondary rental suite (bottom level unit only), and housing that fits into the character of single-family residential neighbourhoods. Livability of units is ensured by stressing the requirement for multiple exposures for every unit, thereby attaining cross-ventilation and natural light for every room.

1. **One 33 x 100-120 foot lot (approximate)**
   - New single family house, with or without secondary suite plus Laneway House (0.7 +0.125 FSR, same as current zoning); or
   - Character House Retention - Multiple Conversion Dwelling (up to 3 strata-titled dwelling units) for an existing pre-1940’s Character House, 0.9 FSR; or
   - Triplex (three attached 2- or 3-bedroom units oriented as flats one above another or as a duplex on top of a ground-floor flat, or any variation thereof), strata-titled, a lock-off suite permitted at the ratio of 1 per every 3 dwelling units, 0.9 FSR).

2. **Two 33 x 100-120 foot lots (approximate)**
   - 9 large dwelling units (oriented in 3 columns of 3 stacked flats or any variation thereof), strata-titled, a lock-off suite permitted at the ratio of 1 per every 3 dwelling units, 1.1 FSR.

Further refinement and testing of the zoning may result in some minor changes to what is described below.
Policies

1. **Stacked Townhouse District Schedule.** Draft a new district schedule and guidelines for a Stacked Townhouse Zone generally as described below. Ensure all new development within the zone meets high standards of quality, character, landscape, and neighbourhood fit.

2. **Basic Development Parameters.**
   1. Allowable building density: 0.9 FSR for single-lot development and 1.1 FSR for two or more lot development. (depending on lot size)
   2. Allowable unit density: 33 dwelling units per acre for single-lot development); 49 dwelling units per acre (two or more lot development).
   3. Maximum allowable building height (in storeys): 2 full storeys and a partial third. The third storey should be contained within a sloping roof to ensure visual cohesiveness with the existing neighbourhood character or, in the case of flat-roof design, substantially setback from the front of the building.
   5. Minimum front yard: Approximately 18 to 24 feet front yard setback depending on neighbouring context.
   6. Minimum rear yard: Approximately 16 feet depth between the parking area and the rear exterior wall.
   7. Rear yard requirements will be minimized to enable buildings to more fully utilize the depth of lots and in recognition of the potential for four storeys or more rear walls for development along Kingsway.
   8. Minimum building articulation: 2 or more major exposures per dwelling unit

3. **Building Design.** Single-lot developments should be designed to appear as a large house to maintain the existing rhythm of the single-family neighbourhood. Two or multi-lot developments should appear as a small multi-family townhouse building while respecting neighbouring properties.

4. **Private Outdoor Space.** Private outdoor space should be required for each unit, in the form of a front or rear yard, a balcony, porch, or open roof deck.

5. **Parking Requirements.** Parking requirements should permit equivalencies in the case that on-grade parking spaces cannot be provided at the rate of 1 space per dwelling unit.

6. **Site Coverage and Impermeable Material Area Limits.** Limits should be used to ensure effective storm-water management, however, limits will likely be higher than typical for a residential neighbourhood to accommodate the increased footprint of medium-density ground-oriented housing.

7. **Retention of RS-1 Development Option.** The development rights enabled by the current RS-1 District Schedule (including the ability to develop a one-family dwelling, with the option of a secondary suite and a laneway house) should be retained. Development of this option will be subject to the development parameters outlined in the RS-1 District Schedule.

8. **Noise Mitigation.** Noise mitigation standards should be required where separate dwelling units are located on top of another.

9. **Character House Retention.** The Stacked Townhouse zone should include incentives for the retention of pre-1940 character houses on single-lots. For all development sites, however, the
retention of a character house is at the owner’s discretion. (A character house is defined as one built before 1940 and still having a majority of its original features).

3.6 Apartment Transition Zone

This plan recognizes the need for a careful transition from residential neighbourhoods to the higher densities and intensities of the Kingsway. This transition should not only enable a more appropriate form of development adjacent to mid-rise buildings along Kingsway but also designed to be compatible with residential streets. In response, this plan includes a ‘transition’ zone that includes the remainder of the block across the lane from the Kingsway rezoning area. This zone allows for low-rise apartments, a 3 to 4-storey multi-family residential building that provides cost-effective, higher-density, housing options that are appropriate for families but without the traditional backyard that would be impacted by the shadows created by the higher-storey development along Kingsway.

Major concerns that this plan seeks to address within the low-rise apartment transition zone include accommodations for families, ensuring a high-degree of livability for all dwelling units, ability to facilitate cross-ventilation and natural light to increase energy efficiency, and the provision of private outdoor spaces.

Further refinement and testing of the zoning may result in some minor changes to what is described below.

Policies

1. **Low-Rise Apartment District Schedule.** Draft a new district schedule and guidelines for a Low-Rise Apartment transition zone generally as described below. Ensure all new development within the zone meets high standards of quality, character, landscape, and neighbourhood fit.

2. **Units for Families.** Any new low-rise apartment development within the transition zone should be required to provide 3-bedroom units for a minimum of 50 percent of the total unit count.

3. **Basic Development Parameters.**
   1. Allowable building density: 1.5 to 2 FSR (depending on lot size)
   2. Allowable unit density: 72 dwelling units
   3. Maximum allowable building height: 45 feet
   4. Minimum site sizes:
   5. Minimum setbacks:
   6. Rear yard requirements will be minimized to enable buildings to more fully utilize the depth of lots and in recognition of the potential for four storeys or more rear walls for development along Kingsway.
   7. Minimum building articulation: 2 or more major exposures per dwelling unit
4.0 Kingsway Rezoning Area

At the heart of the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre is Kingsway - the main shopping street for the neighbourhood, a major regional connection, and a street that currently functions more as a barrier then as a place for active street life and community interaction. Although historically Kingsway has functioned well and has attracted a diversity of shops and services, over time the street has lost some of its lustre. Today’s Kingsway does not meet the local shopping needs of neighbourhood residents nor does it provide the distinctive ‘sense of place’ desired to mark Norquay Village.

In response, this Plan proposes a comprehensive strategy for redevelopment in the Kingsway corridor with a specific emphasis on improving the pedestrian quality of the street. A mix of mid-rise development opportunities with strategic public realm investments will evolve the character of the street in line with a changing neighbourhood - filling in gaps and supporting a vital community life and providing the goods and services of daily life.

This section outlines the basic principles, development parameters and urban design guidelines that will guide rezoning applications along the Kingsway corridor. This includes detail on the basic building typology, framework for development of key sites, urban design guidelines, and public realm improvements.

4.1 Existing Conditions / Policy Context

Kingsway is currently the major retail, service, and movement corridor in the Neighbourhood Centre and is also the major east-west diagonal road connecting to downtown in the city. The diagonal orientation of the street and the intersection of multiple street grid patterns in Norquay Village creates many interesting angled intersections. These angled intersections in turn create interesting ‘flat-iron’ situations that call for creative design solutions. Another result of the diagonal orientation of the street is that it creates blocks that are longer than typical for Vancouver. Average block lengths along Kingsway in Norquay Village are approximately 1,200 feet, which creates situations where pedestrians must travel further than is typical to cross the street or connect to Kingsway from the surrounding neighbourhoods.

The long blocks along Kingsway, in combination with its role as a major regional road connection and generous right-of-way dedicated to automobile movement, contributes to the feel of the street as a thoroughfare and not a local, pedestrian-friendly, street. Sidewalks are complete and well-used but narrow in many places and occasionally encroached upon. There is a lack of distinctive street furniture or decoration that identifies this particular stretch of Kingsway as belonging to any specific neighbourhood and the presence of long expanses of surface parking detract from an interesting and enjoyable pedestrian experience.

Current development patterns along Kingsway consist primarily of low and mid-rise commercial and mixed-use (commercial and residential) buildings. Older buildings (greater than 20 years in age) are typically between 1 to 2 stories in height while newer buildings are typically 4 stories in height, reflecting the predominant zoning. Most buildings are located along the front property line (some exceptions exist with off-street surface parking creating a buffer between the sidewalk and the front door).
Properties along Kingsway are primarily zoned C-2, a mixed-use residential and commercial zone which generally requires ground-level retail and allows three storeys of residential above (with a typical maximum of 2.5 FSR). Although there has been some redevelopment consistent with the C-2 zoning, the majority of Kingsway has not seen much redevelopment to this form (in this portion of Kingsway, there are only four examples of redevelopment to this form).

This Plan envisions that Kingsway will continue its role as the primary local shopping street and location for higher-density development within the Neighbourhood Centre. This role is also reflected in the R-C Community Vision which identified Kingsway as a location within the Neighbourhood Centre for a greater variety of retail stores, mixed-use developments, additional community amenities and facilities, and strengthened in its role as a major neighbourhood shopping area and special community place.

4.2 Concept / Principles

The basic concept for the Kingsway was to ensure an appropriate amount of height and density considering the nature of the street to encourage new development and to improve the pedestrian environment. New developments on Kingsway will be serving multiple functions: providing continuous ground-floor retail space for the shopping street; introduce new housing for a critical mass of population that can support a greater variety of shops and services; provide a multitude of public spaces for sitting, socializing, community-building and to improve pedestrian connectivity with the rest of Norquay; they will provide a new visual identity to the neighbourhood. This concept was informed by the public input heard throughout the planning process and by the community directions, which include:

1. Strengthen Kingsway as a diverse, vibrant, and walkable neighbourhood ‘heart’ and ‘high street’ for Norquay Village.
2. Create an attractive pedestrian-friendly and safe streetscape along Kingsway.
3. Encourage new development along Kingsway that adds to the diversity and character of Norquay with human scaled buildings and streetscape improvements.
4. Shops and services should be locally-oriented, providing daily goods and services within a comfortable walking distance of residences.
5. Focus higher density development in locations with convenient access to shops, services, and transit
6. Seek new opportunities to create functional and distinctive local public spaces to serve as community gathering spaces for neighbourhood activities.

Building on the directions, the following discussion outlines the principles that were developed to guide the formulation of the Kingsway Rezoning Area policies. This discussion is provided as background to enable fuller understanding of the proposed policy.

1. Midrise Buildings and Densities. The vision for Kingsway is for a midrise ‘urban village’ with building heights (six to eight storeys with taller buildings at key sites that fit the width and character of the street, locate higher density development in the most convenient location (for transit and walking to shops and services), create new and more affordable housing opportunities, and support new and existing local businesses.

2. Investment in the Public Realm. Redevelopment in the Kingsway corridor should also act as a catalyst for public realm improvements with a specific emphasis on improving the quality of the pedestrian environment (wider sidewalks, new benches and lighting, more mid-block pedestrian
connections), enhancing the identity and distinctiveness of Norquay Village, and providing new spaces for community gathering and interaction.

3. **Maintain a Retail Focus along Kingsway.** Kingsway is the traditional shopping street within the Neighbourhood Centre and will remain so. Opportunities for new local retail should reinforce Kingsway as the neighbourhood high street and this plan does not envision creating additional or secondary shopping areas until Kingsway’s potential as a local shopping area is realized.

4. **Apply Urban Design Criteria.** New developments should be designed to contribute to the unique local character of Norquay Village and to the creation of an attractive and functional pedestrian-oriented public realm (sidewalks and public spaces). New development will also be required to be respectful of local context and to fit well into the Neighbourhood Centre with quality materials, an emphasis on smaller storefronts, and details.

5. **Place an emphasis on the ‘2400 triangle’.** The triangle formed by Kingsway, Nanaimo, Slocan, and East 33rd Avenue has been frequently identified as a ‘heart’ of the Neighbourhood Centre and, with the current redevelopment of the Eldorado Motel and the potential redevelopment of the 2400 Motel, there is the opportunity to concentrate major commercial and public amenities in this prominent triangle.

**Other Policy Considerations**

**A Robust Pedestrian Realm on the Kingsway Shopping Street**

In CityPlan, one of the primary directions for Neighbourhood Centres is to “provide public places for strolling, window shopping, conversation, and entertainment which link the centre with the rest of the neighbourhood.” While this direction is clearly desirable in the interests of community-building and sustainability, the current state of this section of Kingsway in Norquay Village presents an exceptional challenge. The pedestrian realm can be significantly improved through the provision of the following:

- **Wider Sidewalks on Kingsway.** The current experience of walking along Kingsway does not meet the ambitions of this Plan to create a pedestrian-centric local shopping street. Narrow sidewalks (for the character of the street) and the lack of buffers from nearby automobile traffic often leave the impression that the street is not intended for pedestrian activity. A primary goal of this Plan is to achieve wider sidewalks through required building setbacks: up to twice the width of existing sidewalks (from 12 feet to 25 feet) as a standard requirement and further setbacks on key sites such as the 2400 Motel redevelopment and around the intersection of Kingsway and Earles.

  These wide sidewalks will create an environment that provides psychological relief from the feeling of vulnerability due to the proximity of fast vehicular traffic. By achieving greater pedestrian comfort, pedestrian streetlife will increase as people feel more at ease to linger, sit, relax and engage in face-to-face interactions on the sidewalk. Furthermore, wide sidewalks allow more outdoor seating, a second row of trees, patios and the display of merchandise for the ground floor retail and services, which will further encourage human interaction.

- **Mid-Block Pedestrian Linkages, Shopping Courts and Lighted-Crosswalks.** To break up the long blocks along Kingsway, this Plan encourages mid-block pedestrian mews and shopping courts. These new pedestrian linkages will provide pedestrian pathways to the residential areas off Kingsway and also the opportunity for outdoor shopping courts which supplement the typical sidewalk experience, adding more activation with shop frontages, patio life and residential lobby entrances to the apartment housing located above the shops. A good example of a mid-block...
pedestrian linkage and shopping court can be found on the 2300 block of West 4th Avenue (known as the “Capers” development).

Another important element of this Plan is the intent to add mid-block pedestrian-actuated signalized crosswalks, subject to demand assessment. These will be placed in conjunction with the pedestrian linkages. The provision of these lighted crossings will most likely be linked to a requirement for public realm improvements for major development applications.

- **Public Plazas Marking the Norquay Neighbourhood.** There are two large potential development sites located at either extreme of the Norquay Shopping street on Kingsway (currently in use by Purdy’s Chocolates and Canadian Tire). Any redevelopment on these two sites will be required to provide a large (approximately 6,000-8,000 square feet) and fully landscaped public plaza which will be activated by retail uses on the edges. These plazas should be prioritized for primary pedestrian use and should not be accessible by vehicles. The detailed design of these plazas will occur during the Rezoning or Development Permit application phase.

### 4.3 Kingsway Rezoning Policies

The following sections contain the policies and development parameters intended to direct rezoning considerations in this Area.

**Building Typology**

The basic building type proposed for Kingsway is a 6 to 8 storey mixed-use building (retail-at-grade and residential or office above) with variations in the height of individual building elements encouraged to create an eclectic and varied streetscape.

**Policies**

1. **Base Building Height.** The basic building height permitted along Kingsway is 6 storeys (from sidewalk to datum line). This height can be accommodated within the existing C-2 zoning (with Director of Planning approval) in exchange for the expanded sidewalk setback area required below and without increase to the allowable floor space (2.5 net FSR).

   In the case of a rezoning, the 6 storey basic building height can accommodate an increase in floor space (up to 3.2 net FSR).

   In all cases, the minimum required amount of floor space for ground floor retail is 0.35 net FSR.

2. **Building Height for Larger Sites.** For sites with greater than 150 feet of street frontage, variation in height (i.e. a mix of 4 storeys and 8 storeys) is desired.

3. **Increased Building Height for Mid-Block Sites.** Certain select sites are permitted an increase in height beyond the 6 to 8 storey pattern in exchange for additional public open space and mid-block pedestrian connections. These sites are identified in Figure 3.

4. **Upper Storey Setbacks.** Building elements above the 6 storey datum line must be setback a minimum of 5 feet from the building frontage.

5. **Future Connections to Shared or Sustainable Energy.** Developments should be designed to be easily connectable to a district heating system or other alternative sustainable energy source. Building design for connectivity and the connection agreement must be to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
Figure 3: Mid-Block and Large Sites

- Mid-Block Pedestrian Space Sites (maximum height: 10 storeys)
- Larger Sites for Public Plazas (maximum height: 12 storeys)
Urban Design

A key theme of the urban design approach for Kingsway is a new development policy for all Kingsway properties that will require significant building setbacks and public Right-of-Ways to achieve twice the width of existing sidewalks (from 12 to 25 feet). On the 2400 Motel redevelopment and around the intersection of Kingsway and Earles, a significant increase to commercial and community activity is anticipated. In these cases, further setbacks will achieve sidewalk widths to 40 feet. These wide sidewalks will create an environment that provides psychological relief from the feeling of vulnerability due to the proximity of fast vehicular traffic. By achieving greater pedestrian comfort, pedestrian streetlife will increase as people feel more at ease to linger, sit, relax and engage in face-to-face interactions on the sidewalk. Furthermore, wide sidewalks allow more outdoor seating, a second row of trees, patios and the display of merchandise for the ground floor retail and services, which will further encourage human interaction. Successful Vancouver examples of wide sidewalks on busy arterials can be found on the new CrossRoads development on Broadway west of Cambie, and the treatment of the east side of Cambie on the first two blocks north of Broadway.

Policies

1. **Sidewalk Setback.** New development should be setback a sufficient distance from the front property line to create a 24 foot sidewalk area. Additional setbacks may be required at prominent locations for the creation of public plaza spaces.

2. **Public Plazas on Large Sites.** Projects larger than 1 acre in size (there are two sites in the Neighbourhood Centre: a site at Gladstone that is currently in use as a Canadian Tire and a site at Earles that is currently in use as a Purdy’s chocolate factory) are also expected to include a more expansive (approximately 6,000 to 8,000 sq. ft. in size) public plaza space, landscaped and activated on the edges by retail uses. These plazas should be prioritized for primary pedestrian use and should not be accessible by vehicles. The detailed design of these plazas will occur during the Rezoning or Development Permit application phase.

3. **Building Materials.** New development is required to use high-quality and durable building materials such as brick, metal, and concrete.

4. **Weather Protection.** Continuous weather protection for pedestrians in the form of awnings or canopies is required along all Kingsway frontages.

5. **Human scaled architectural detail.** Buildings should have detailed and well articulated street level façades with quality materials to help animate the street and create visual interesting building frontages from the pedestrian view.

6. **Pedestrian-Oriented Streetfronts.** New development will contribute to the creation of pedestrian-oriented streetfronts through the following:
   - Locating active uses at-grade along all major pedestrian frontages;
   - Aligning buildings to relate directly with the primary pedestrian frontage with lobbies and building entries oriented toward the sidewalks;
   - Modulating building faces in width, height and finishing materials to visually break up large building walls.
   - The inclusion of smaller commercial retail units (CRUs) into the building façades of large retail tenants is encouraged. Individual storefronts that are greater than 30 metres in width should provide multiple entrances at the street level, which may include incorporating separate individual retail units that have entrances oriented to the street.
Buildings are expected to have a high degree of transparent glazing (doors and windows).
• Blank walls or façades should be limited.

7. **Landscaping.** Landscape is an important aspect of quality and fit with the neighbourhood. Guidelines will be written to address relationships of private and public outdoor spaces, and to call for intense planting of gardens and yards. Guidelines will also address achieving quality landscapes, while addressing parking and servicing needs. Improvements to the public realm will be done in accordance with the Linkages and Greening Plan to enhance the pedestrian, cyclist, and visual experience of the neighbourhood. Planting of public boulevards will be encouraged.

8. **Views and Focal Points.** The street network and building configuration should be designed to maximize focal point opportunities. And where possible, views and vistas should be aligned with key buildings and should terminate with a landmark feature, a building or public space.

9. **Universal Access.** New buildings should be designed to ensure universal access for all citizens. Where feasible, buildings should be designed to eliminate the need for access ramps. Where this is not feasible, the ramps should be designed to have minimal impact on the sidewalk and should not intrude into the pedestrian throughway.

**2400 Motel Site**

A common theme throughout the Neighbourhood Centre planning process has been the opportunity to create a true centre or ‘heart’ of the community in the triangle formed by Kingsway, Slocan Street, East 33rd Avenue, and Nanaimo Street. Located at a topographical high point in the community and the city, this site is one of the area’s most notable redevelopment sites. This Plan recognizes the potential of this site not only as a catalyst for the revitalization of Kingsway but also as an opportunity to create a meaningful community gathering space and to provide the types of commercial shops and services sought by the neighbourhood.

Any redevelopment of this site will require a separate detailed rezoning process which will also address other issues, such as heritage and housing affordability. This section is intended to provide plan-level direction to inform, but not preclude, the rezoning process.

**Policies**

To ensure the success of any new development on the 2400 Motel site, the following criteria are specified for any development inquiry on this site:

1. **Maximum Building Height.** Two tower elements with the maximum height of 16 and 12 storeys.

2. **Overall Building Density.** 3.2 FSR (net).

3. **Sidewalk Setbacks.** The City will seek a significant setback (up to approximately 25 feet) from the Kingsway property line to achieve a wide sidewalk along Kingsway. This increased sidewalk area is expected to be activated by street-level retail uses.

4. **Grocery Store.** The City will seek a commitment for a large grocery store tenant on the ground floor with any vehicle access restricted from the Kingsway frontage.

5. **Community Gathering Space (indoor).** An Indoor Community Space of approximately 15,000 square feet, to be operated by a third party (Future neighbourhood house or flexible public facility for arts, seniors, youth).

6. **Community Gathering Space (outdoor).** A Major Outdoor Public Gathering Space that is south-facing and shielded from the Kingsway traffic noise. Some of this space should also be
set apart from the East 33rd Avenue traffic noise and therefore located at the southeast corner of the site against East 30th Ave. This space should also be activated by the ground floor uses of the Indoor Community Space and the large grocery store, and spatially well-defined by the surrounding buildings. The overall area of this space should be approximately 20,000 square feet in size, and should be proportioned to facilitate large gatherings of people.

7. Public Plaza. A smaller plaza for increased street and outdoor patio life off Kingsway in the middle of the site frontage, to take advantage of views to downtown and the Coast Mountains and to provide visual relief from the otherwise continuous built-form on the Kingsway frontage. Furthermore, this should be designed to allow sun penetration onto the Kingsway sidewalk.

8. Pedestrian Accessibility. A north-south pedestrian connection should be provided through the site, activated with retail or community frontages.

9. Taller Building Elements. Any building forms that are taller than 6 storeys should be against the Kingsway frontage while smaller forms should respond to the envisioned 4-storey building forms on the adjacent sites across 33rd and 30th Avenues.

10. Consolidation. If the site located directly west of the site (at the intersection of Kingsway and Slocan Street) is obtained and consolidated with this site, then a third tower of 10-12 storeys in height may be located at the “flatiron” corner condition at Kingsway and East 33rd Avenue. In this case, the allowable FSR may be increased to 3.5 FSR (Net).

11. Office Uses. An office component to the development serving local service needs (eg. Medical, Dental services) is highly encouraged.

12. Housing Affordability. Opportunities to provide increased housing affordability on the site, including the potential for market rental housing, should be considered through the rezoning process.
5.0 Movement and Circulation

The ability to move efficiently, safely, and comfortably throughout the Neighbourhood Centre was an important issue in the Neighbourhood Centre planning process - particularly for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users. In response, this Plan contains a number of new policies and initiatives to enhance pedestrian safety and ease of movement, to improve bicycle connections through the neighbourhood, and to improve the efficiency of the local road network to reduce impacts from through traffic and address issues identified by local residents in the planning process.

5.1 Existing Conditions / Policy Context

Norquay Village is well located in relationship to two major east-west transportation corridors: Kingsway and the SkyTrain (Expo Line) / BC Parkway corridor. Together, these corridors provide convenient links to downtown Vancouver and the broader regional transportation network not just for private automobiles but also for bicyclists and transit users. Between the corridors is a well connected series of street grids that provide local access and support a choice of travel routes and modes through the Neighbourhood Centre.

However, some issues remain, particularly with the relationship between Kingsway and the local road network. Kingsway connects diagonally through the neighbourhood, creating long blocks and less than ideal intersection geometries. Although Kingsway does not carry a disproportionately high amount of traffic for a major regional road, the long blocks and the character of the street enable fast auto movement and detract from the potential of the area as a pedestrian-friendly shopping street. Also the intersection of different street grids creates a few disjointed road connections that inhibit efficient movement. Further, while the neighbourhood benefits from strong east-west connections, north-south connections are difficult and auto traffic that seek to connect through the study area moving northeast to southwest are funneled through local streets (a concern identified by community members).

Existing Policies

CityPlan (1995) puts the priority of walking, cycling and transit ahead of cars, and promotes the development of pedestrian and bicycle friendly streets.

The Vancouver Transportation Plan (1997) states that air pollution must be addressed on a regional and neighbourhood basis by focusing on alternatives to the automobile for transportation. It does this by placing increased priority on transportation planning for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit over goods movement then finally the private vehicle.

The Bicycle Plan (1999) and Vancouver Greenways Plan (1995) support a network of walking and cycling routes throughout the City.

The Renfrew-Collingwood Vision (2002) identifies the need to improve conditions and safety on primary arterials including Kingsway, Nanaimo and 41st Avenue and secondary arterials including Earles and Slocan, including improving pedestrian crossings and sidewalks, reducing the speed of traffic, improving the safety of intersections, reducing the adverse impacts of trucks on neighbourhoods, and adding more planting, landscaping, and public art. The Vision also identifies 29th Avenue and Clarendon Street to be reclassified as collector streets.

The Renfrew-Collingwood Vision also supports the use of traffic calming programs, controlling on-street parking, bus priority measures, improving bus routes and frequency, implementing the greenway and bike route network, and general walking and biking improvements, more bike parking, and bike routes on Kingsway and Slocan.
In addition, many issues and ideas regarding movement in Norquay Village were identified through the planning process. Many of these issues and ideas are reflected in the following policies, however the general concept is well summarized by the Community Direction most relevant to movement:

- **Create a safe, pedestrian-friendly, and traffic-calmed transportation network.**

In summary, the concept for movement in Norquay Village is simple and straight-forward: to focus on the pedestrian and cyclist, and to target street network improvements to provide more rational and efficient connections for local traffic and enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety.

### 5.2 Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements

A major underlying purpose for developing and strengthening Neighbourhood Centres is to create pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly communities. Throughout the consultation process, community members have called for improvements to make Norquay Village safer and more comfortable to walk within. At the most basic level, there are many blocks lacking sidewalks on one or both sides, and several places where missing links impose longer routings. Persons with physical disabilities encounter obstacles to moving about. On a broader level, several Bike Routes or Greenways traverse Norquay Village, some along temporary routings awaiting improvements. The transportation measures to be given highest priority are those for pedestrians and cyclists.

For pedestrians, a systematic examination of the sidewalk and path network was undertaken, and priorities established for where improvements should be made. These are:

- Where redevelopment is occurring;
- Along routes to schools, parks, and transit;
- Where there is no sidewalk on either side of the street; and
- Where a “missing link” is identified.

Furthermore, quick responses are sought to address deficiencies in the network such as sidewalks in a poor state of repair or where curb ramps are either missing or defective.

#### Policies

1. **Seek wider sidewalks and boulevards through redevelopment.** Where redevelopment occurs new, wider sidewalks will be sought, and boulevards of adequate width provided to support street trees. Along Kingsway, boulevards will be developed in accordance with the approved Norquay Village Public Realm and Transportation Improvement Plan.

2. **Enhance pedestrian spaces and crossings.** Along arterials such as Kingsway, additional opportunities for pedestrians to cross safely are encouraged, which will serve not only pedestrians but cyclists, too. Creation of publicly accessible plazas and other small-scale public spaces, plus addition of street trees in Norquay Village will add to the comfort of pedestrians.

3. **Expand Bike Route Network and Bicycle Facilities.** Bike Route development will continue, most significantly with improvements along Duchess and Wales to allow relocation from busy Earles Street. In addition, lane widths are to be reallocated along Kingsway to increase the curb lane widths, where feasible, to match or surpass those provided in the Kingsway and Knight Neighbourhood Centre, to the west of Norquay Village. Bicycle parking provisions for new developments, in compliance with City standards, will further improve conditions for cyclists.

For a listing of specific improvements supported in principle, see Appendix A.
5.3 Pedestrian-Oriented Public Realm Improvements

To further support the vision of an attractive, safe, and comfortable pedestrian travel and activities in Norquay Village, this Plan proposes a broad program of targeted public realm improvements. These improvements include:

- On Kingsway, a landscaped median between Gladstone and Earles Streets
- Geometric changes to the intersection of 34th Avenue, Wales and Duchess Streets and Kingsway, creating an area for seating, an off-street cycling path, special planting, public art, a new pedestrian/cyclist-actuated signal, and shorter street crossing distances for pedestrians
- Installation of small landscaped corner bulges at Gladstone, Clarendon, Rhodes, Moss, and Dundee Streets, and Kingsway to provide shorter street crossing distances for pedestrians as well as improving sight lines for pedestrians and motorists
- New streetscape elements including improvements to landscaping and street trees, unique tree grates and sidewalk stamps, additional street furniture, character lighting and public art

These improvements, summarized here, are detailed in Appendix A: Norquay Village Public Realm and Transportation Improvements Plan (PRTIP). As detailed design and implementation proceed, refinements may occur prior to construction.

5.4 Transit and Other Transportation Modes

Norquay Village is relatively well-served by transit. Foremost is the SkyTrain Expo Line service, with the 29th Avenue Station and Nanaimo Station accessible within a short walk, cycle, or bus ride to all Norquay Village residents. Bus routes on Kingsway (#19), Slocan/Clarendon (#29 Elliott), and Kingsway/Nanaimo (#25 King Edward) were augmented by the initiation of the #33 service along 33rd Avenue and Slocan linking the 29th Avenue Station with UBC. The #33 service was a change identified in the Vancouver/UBC ATP and was implemented in 2008.

Existing City-wide policies should continue guiding actions in support of transit. For Norquay residents, workers, and visitors, this means:

- Increasing service through extending hours and frequency, particularly with the prospect of local population growth;
- Improving amenity at transit stops with shelters or other weather protection, benches, lighting, litter receptacles, and information;
- Promoting security by providing safe, convenient routes to stops and stations, improving the environment at stops and stations, and ensuring a responsive transit security force and an effective crime prevention program; and
- Improving the efficiency and operation of transit services with coordinated scheduling, route adjustments, and enhancement of stop locations.

City staff will continue advocating to TransLink for steady improvements to the transit system in Norquay Village and elsewhere through future area transit planning.

In Norquay Village the major arterials and designated Truck Routes are Kingsway, 41st Avenue, and Nanaimo Street north of Kingsway. The secondary arterials are Nanaimo from Kingsway to 33rd Avenue, Earles Street north of Kingsway, Slocan Street, 33rd Avenue, Clarendon Street south of
34th Avenue, and 29th Avenue. Clarendon Street and 29th Avenue were identified as candidates for reclassification in the 1997 City Transportation Plan, but the formal reviews have not been conducted to date.

Staff have received requests for reclassification of 29th Avenue and support proceeding with that process in advance of reviewing Clarendon’s classification. Of concern in the community are the volumes of traffic travelling on local streets, particularly 34th Avenue (4,000 to 6,000 vehicles/day), Nanaimo Street south of 33rd Avenue (10,000 vehicles/day to 34th, and 5,000 vehicles/day south of 34th Avenue), and Earles Street between Kingsway and 41st Avenue (3,500 to 4,000 vehicles/day). These problems derive from discontinuity of the street network, placing high volumes on local streets. A program of changes have been developed with the community to deal with current issues in this area and designed so as to not prejudice the outcome of a future reclassification review. This is discussed further in the next section.

A major focus for the Neighbourhood Centre will be mitigating the traffic impacts of future developments. The current redevelopment of the Eldorado site serves as a model, whereby the applicant has had to satisfy numerous requirements dealing with traffic and pedestrian circulation, calming of a threatened street, managing truck activity, and increasing public amenity. As the Centre develops more fully, greater shares of trips generated will be by walking or cycling since work, shopping, and recreational activities will be found closer to home in Norquay Village.

5.5 Clarendon Connector

The lack of connectivity in Norquay Village’s street network south of Kingsway has been a longstanding challenge in the community, increasing traffic volumes on local streets. This was acknowledged during the Expo Line consultations of the mid-1980’s. Concepts were drafted which would link Nanaimo Street with Clarendon and generally supported by participants in that process. A key proposal in the Nanaimo/29th Avenue Station Areas plan, approved by City Council May 20, 1987, was the construction of the “Clarendon/Nanaimo Connector”, subject to a review process “involving residents nearby the proposed improvement.”

As a result of Council’s approval, the City set about acquiring properties needed for the connection. From a general concept involving many properties, staff refined the proposal to a minimal design requiring four purchases, with Clarendon extending from its present T-intersection at 34th Avenue north to form a similar T-intersection at 33rd Avenue. By 2005, Real Estate Services had purchased the required lots.

The visioning program for Norquay Village was the appropriate opportunity to consult nearby residents. What evolved was a package of measures, mostly traffic calming and pedestrian enhancements, designed to complement the connection and leave the door open for reclassification of Clarendon should that be decided in future. Community comments were largely supportive of the final package, as it would:

- Relieve several local streets of inappropriate through traffic;
- Improve connectivity for all modes;
- Improve pedestrian and cyclist safety by bulging corners, restricting movements by motor vehicles, and signalizing the new intersection of Clarendon/33rd Avenue;
- Provide a more direct connection to the proposed community amenities on the 2400 Motel site;
• Improve the efficiency and appeal of the #29 Elliott bus by eliminating circuitous routings involving local streets and a portion of Kingsway; and

• Enhance the public realm with tree planting and other landscaping.

The high levels of support from the Norquay community encouraged staff to recommend as part of the Neighbourhood Centre Plan that the City proceed with the full package of improvements which evolved, in advance of a reclassification review which may be years away and which yet retains all options open to it.
6.0 Community Amenities and Facilities

Amenities - such as recreational facilities, parks and libraries are important elements of a vibrant and livable community. And as the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre grows and evolves over time, new amenities and facilities will be needed to ensure the continued livability and desirability of the area. This section outlines directions and priorities for future amenities within the Neighbourhood Centre, in response to needs and preferences identified by community members and forecasted demand. As well, this Plan recognizes that new development should also contribute by paying a fair share towards public benefits to meet the demands created by the new population.

As part of the implementation program for this Plan, a detailed Public Amenity and Infrastructure Financing Strategy will be developed that outlines proposed funding and delivery of new amenities in the Neighbourhood Centre. The detailed Strategy will consider the impact of increased population and the mechanisms needed to pay for the benefits (i.e. capital expenditures, Development Cost Levies, and Community Amenity Contributions). This section will inform develop of that Strategy as well as rezonings completed in accordance with this Plan. The section is divided into three main sub-areas: Parks and Open Spaces, Community Gathering Spaces and Other Amenities and Services.

6.1 Existing Conditions / Policy Context

Residents in Norquay Village are served by a variety of amenities in and around Norquay and detailed information on existing amenities is provided separately in Appendix C.

Policies

CityPlan (1995) identifies the need for accessible, community-based services such as health and recreation programs, social programs, and libraries that will draw on the ideas of the people who use them, making those services widely accessible and responsive to different needs. CityPlan also directs that services be located in Neighbourhood Centres where they are easy to get to and that residents, agencies, and all levels of government, including the City, work together to solve problems at the neighbourhood level by tailoring services to meet individual and community needs.

The Renfrew-Collingwood Vision (2002) provides Directions on community safety, recreational facilities and services (including services for youth and seniors), library facilities and services, and improving awareness and accessibility of services. Other Directions address improving parks, streets, lanes, and public places.

6.2 Parks and Open Spaces

Norquay Village has three neighbourhood parks (General Brock, Norquay, and Earles) within the boundaries of the Study Area and a fourth (Slocan) on the northern border. Initially considered part of the Neighbourhood Centre, planning for improvements to Norquay Park was accelerated to take advantage of funding opportunities and construction is scheduled to start near the time of writing. Additional park and open space improvements will be sought as opportunities arise with a focus on extending the Renfrew Ravine Park between Slocan Park and Kingsway and for extensions of General Brock and Slocan Park for better access and street connections.

Policies

1. **Expand Neighbourhood Green Space.** Seek opportunities to add and extend green space throughout the neighbourhood. Naturalize and green key corridors and community resources including the Eastside Crosscut Greenway along Duchess Street and the Renfrew Ravine Linear Park.
2. **Add New Park Spaces.** Pursue creative ways to add park space in Norquay, especially in areas without parks nearby, including working with Vancouver School Board to share school land for public use, purchasing corner parks, reusing streets for multiple purposes (e.g., slowing traffic and enhancing pedestrian use of the street), setting back buildings (to create small green spaces), and encouraging donations of green space.

3. **Improve Existing Parks.** Examine opportunities to improve Norquay’s parks to make them more useful, by:
   - adding enhanced lighted recreational space (e.g., for basketball)
   - increasing park accessibility for all users (i.e., ease of travel to and within parks)
   - adding additional play equipment, and enclosed and covered play space for children
   - incorporating exercise equipment for adults and seniors

4. **Arts and Culture.** Provide more space for arts and culture in parks.

5. **Public Washrooms.** Provide more public washrooms in Norquay’s parks.

6. **Community Involvement.** Encourage community involvement in the programming and maintenance of parks (increasing their use, making parks safer).

7. **Urban Food.** Expand urban food growing/education in Norquay by proactive use of underutilized space.

8. **Lanes.** Encourage the greening of lanes.

**Priorities**

1. Implement the Eastside Crosscut Greenway through Norquay Village

2. Pursue the creation of pocket parks and green pedestrian connections along the Renfrew Ravine (existing Metro sewer right-of-way) to eventually link Slocan Park and the 29th Avenue Skytrain Station with the Kingsway shopping area and Norquay Park. Any redevelopment adjacent to the future Ravine Way should orient primary entrances to the Ravine Way.

3. Seek opportunities to extend General Brock and Slocan Parks to provide an enhanced street presence and park entrance.

4. Along Duchess Street, provide additional greening and cyclist and pedestrian improvements to enhance this cyclist and pedestrian connection between Norquay and Slocan Parks.

**6.3 Community Gathering Spaces**

A common theme throughout the planning process was the lack of a place to gather in the heart of the Neighbourhood Centre. In response, this Plan identifies the opportunity to locate a new community gathering space within the Neighbourhood Centre boundary as a key priority. Many needs were identified for this type of space, including space for senior’s programming, children’s activities, meeting space, arts space, and community gatherings such as cultural celebrations. In response, the Plan has identified the opportunity to include a significant community gathering space in the 2400 Motel redevelopment, should a rezoning be approved for the site. This space should be flexible in nature, to address the diverse needs and priorities of the community. An example of the type of flexible space that would address key needs is a Neighbourhood House.
Should a rezoning support a Community Amenity Contribution of space for community gathering, the Plan has identified two priorities. First, an indoor public gathering space that provides programming to meet the needs of residents including artists, seniors, and youth. Second, an outdoor public gathering space that is programmable for community events and activities.

Policies
1. Seek opportunities to create local community gathering spaces for neighbourhood activities.
2. Seek opportunities to provide additional recreational space for residents (e.g. a community gym).

Priorities
1. Provide an indoor public gathering space on the 2400 Motel site that provides programming to meet the needs of residents including artists, seniors and youth.
2. Provide an outdoor public gathering space on the 2400 Motel site that is programmable for community events and activities.

6.4 Other Amenities, Facilities, and Services
As the neighbourhood continues to grow over time, opportunities to add, expand, or enhance community amenities, facilities, and services will be actively sought. Key priorities that have been identified through the planning process include:

- additional child care spaces
- non-market housing
- services that provide programming and support for vulnerable populations within the Neighbourhood Centre, including recent immigrants, seniors, and youth.

Policies
1. **Range of Services.** Ensure that Norquay is fairly provided with a range of services to meet its residents needs (e.g., provision of low cost or free services, services for new immigrants, opening hours, indoor and outdoor recreation, library services).

2. **Libraries.** Seek opportunities to enhance the provision of library services to Norquay residents.

3. **Children and Youth.** Continue to provide support for Norquay’s children and youth:
   - Seek opportunities to provide more childcare spaces within and around Norquay
   - more support for organizations (e.g., churches) willing to provide more childcare spaces
   - more children’s programs especially for parents/caregivers and younger children

4. **Intergenerational Services.** Provide intergenerational support, for example, linking seniors with young families, or seniors with youth; consider integrating seniors programs with other programs offered by Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood House or local schools.

5. **Immigrant Services.** Provide needed and on-going services to immigrants in Norquay, and provide directories of those services.

6. **Non-Market Housing.** Ensure that existing non-market housing is maintained. Seek opportunities for providing additional affordable housing within new developments in Norquay. Maintain and encourage rental housing options within new development.
Priorities

1. As sites redevelop pursue the provision of additional childcare spaces within the neighbourhood.

2. Ensure that provision of affordable housing is encouraged for redevelopment of large sites within Norquay. Ensure that rental housing options are maintained.

3. Support and seek to expand services in and around Norquay that provide programming and support for vulnerable populations within Norquay including recent immigrants, seniors and youth.
Appendix A: Supported Transportation Improvements

- New sidewalk on the north side of East 30th Avenue (Nanaimo Street to East 33rd Avenue)
- New sidewalk on the north side of East 38th Avenue (Rhodes Street to Earles Street)
- New sidewalk on the north side of East 33rd Avenue (East 30th Avenue to existing west of Kingsway)
- New sidewalk on the south side of Brock Street (2268 Wenonah Street to Nanaimo Street)
- New sidewalk on the north side of East 34th Avenue (Kingsway to existing)
- New sidewalk on the north and south side of East 40th Avenue (Earles Street to Killarney Street)
- Curb ramps on both sides of Slocan Street (lanes north of Kingsway)
- Curb ramps on the west side of Gladstone Street (lane north of East 33rd Avenue)
- Pedestrian/cyclist signal on Kingsway (at Duchess Street/East 34th Avenue)
- Additional pedestrian signals along Kingsway to break up long blocks
- Upgrades to BC Parkway determined in collaboration between the City of Vancouver and TransLink
- On-boulevard two-way bicycle path from East 34th Avenue to Wales Street
- Corner bulge on west side of Gladstone Street (north of Kingsway)
- Corner bulge on east side of Clarendon Street (north of Kingsway)
- Corner bulge on east side of Duchess Street (north of Kingsway)
- Corner bulge on west side of Rhodes Street (south of Kingsway)
- Corner bulge on west side of Moss Street (north of Kingsway)
- Corner bulge on west side of Dundee Street (south of Kingsway)
- Redesign East 30th Avenue at Nanaimo Street with narrowing to create large green space on the N.E. corner
- Traffic calming redesign of East 30th Avenue at East 33rd Avenue
- Corner bulges at Clarendon Street and East 38th Avenue (Bike Route)
- Corner bulges at Clarendon Street and East 39th Avenue (Bus Stop)
- Traffic calming on Nanaimo Street, south of East 33rd Avenue
- New block of Clarendon Street from East 33rd to East 34th Avenue
- Corner bulges at new 4-legged intersection at Clarendon Street and East 34th Avenue
- Traffic/pedestrian/cycle signal at new 3-legged intersection at Clarendon Street and East 33rd Avenue
- Boulevard tree planting on Clarendon Street, East 33rd Avenue to East 41st Avenue
- Corner bulge/choker on Slocan Street at East 33rd Avenue with closure to southbound traffic
- New pedestrian link from Earles Street to Dundee Street, extending East 38th Avenue
- New pedestrian link from Earles Street to Rhodes Street, approximately mid-block (East 38th Avenue to East 41st Avenue)
- New pedestrian link (series of ‘pocket parks’) along the GVRD trunk sewer running mid-block between Duchess Street and Earles Street, from Kingsway to Euclid Avenue
- Connection of dead-end lane west of Clarendon Street to East 37th Avenue
- Acknowledge that East 29th Avenue east of Nanaimo Street is the highest priority for reclassification
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1. Introduction and Background

The Neighbourhood Centre Program is designed to deliver improvements to neighbourhood shopping areas and to plan for small scale housing around them. The Norquay Village area was identified as a Neighbourhood Centre in the Renfrew-Collingwood Community Vision in 2004. The shopping area should be developed, usually from existing shopping streets, to serve as the ‘heart’ of a community; that is to say, a place where people can find shops, jobs, services, public places that are safe and inviting, and an increased variety of housing types to meet the needs of residents at various age and stages of their lives. The Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Shopping Area: Public Realm and Transportation Improvements Plan (PRTIP) is one of the main elements of the implementation program for this Centre. This Plan was produced through a consultation process with the community undertaken jointly by the Planning and Engineering Departments. A Working Group provided ongoing advice throughout the process.

City staff held Open Houses on June 12, June 14 and June 16, 2010 so that the community could view and comment on proposals for the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan. City staff presented proposals to revitalize Kingsway and increase flexibility for individual property owners and renters. Many attendees filled out comment sheets to provide feedback on the plan proposals which includes; a wider variety of housing options in the neighbourhood, revitalizes Kingsway into a diverse, pedestrian-friendly, mid-rise commercial street, and provides new community amenities and public spaces.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this Plan is to guide the redesign of Kingsway and intersecting streets from Gladstone to Killarney Streets over time, in a consistent manner, whether the work is undertaken by the City of Vancouver or as part of private development. Geometric changes, a landscaped median, sidewalk stamps, public art and other initiatives are to be brought together into a cohesive whole.

3. Vision

The changes are intended to achieve a number of design and community development objectives and to capitalize on opportunities to strengthen the shopping area by providing a wider range of retail goods and services for a diverse community. The Renfrew-Collingwood Community said that Norquay Village should be a more attractive and lively shopping area, and that there should be a mix of new housing around it for the community’s families, seniors, and young people. Other directions include:

- Create More Attractive Parks, Streets, Lanes, and Public Places
- Create a Cleaner Community,
- Focus on Environmental Initiatives
- Enhance Community Safety
- Make Streets Safer
- Improve Community Involvement in Decision-Making
• Maintain and Enhance Single Family Neighbourhoods
• Enhance Community Services
• Add New Housing Opportunities
• Improve Walking and Biking Routes
• Norquay Village should be enhanced to act as the heart of their adjacent neighbourhoods.
• New housing should be added to help support the shopping areas.

Directions specific to Norquay Village include:

• Make commercial streets more convenient, safe and comfortable:
• Shops and services should be continuous along the ground floor of buildings
• More street trees and sidewalk merchandise
• Improve pedestrian safety
• Create convenient parking
• Create more attractive store fronts
• Maintain cleaner streets and lanes

4. Plan Overview

The Plan is composed of a series of interrelated changes that together will help achieve the objectives (Figure 1). The improvements include:

A. On Kingsway, a landscaped median between Gladstone and Moss Streets
B. Geometric changes to the intersection of 34th Ave, Wales Street, Duchess Street and Kingsway, creating an area for seating, an off-street cycling path, special planting, public art, a new pedestrian/cyclist-actuated signal, and shorter street crossing distances for pedestrians
C. Installation of small landscaped corner bulges at Gladstone, Clarendon, Rhodes, Moss, and Dundee Streets, and Kingsway to provide shorter street crossing distances for pedestrians as well as improving sight lines for pedestrians and motorists
D. New streetscape elements including improvements to landscaping and street trees, unique tree grates and sidewalk stamps, additional street furniture, character lighting and public art.

This Plan, including preliminary plans for geometric changes, has been produced by the Transportation Division of Engineering Services and the Community Planning Division of the Community Services Group. As detailed design and implementation proceed, refinements may occur prior to construction.
5. The Landscaped Median

Throughout the public consultation landscaped medians have always been included as a means to achieve important urban design. Both the Collingwood and the Kingsway Knight Shopping Areas have planted centre medians. By also including landscaped medians in the Norquay Village Shopping Area, it creates a shopping area identifier for the entire Kingsway corridor. Landscaped centre medians break down the scale of the road width and add street beautification to the road, without having to reconstruct curbs. Specific to Norquay Village is the selection of 3 different centre median trees which adds unique identity to this shopping area when compared to Collingwood and Kingsway Knight. Figure 2 illustrates the proposed typical cross section of Kingsway between Gladstone and Wales Streets. This configuration creates a special visual character, incorporates more greening and provides for a future bicycle facility in the curb lane. Figure 3 illustrates an alternative configuration for Kingsway through future process which shows the treed centre median with full-time parking and painted bike lanes. Figure 4 illustrates another alternative configuration for Kingsway through future process which shows the treed centre median with full-time parking and a painted bike lane on the north side of the street and reallocation of a travel lane/ parking for an eastbound separated bike lane on the south side of the street.
Figure 2.

KINGSWAY Proposed
(Gladstone to Wales Streets)
TYPICAL CROSS SECTION

- Tread centre median
- Shared bike facility with parking both sides
- 3 travel lanes peak period

Figure 3.

KINGSWAY Future?
(Gladstone to Wales Streets)
TYPICAL CROSS SECTION

- Tread centre median
- Bike lanes and full-time parking both sides
- 2 travel lanes peak period

Figure 4.

KINGSWAY Future?
(Gladstone to Wales Streets)
TYPICAL CROSS SECTION

- Tread centre median
- Bike lane and full-time parking north side
- Separated bike facility south side
- 2 travel lanes peak period
6. Street Geometric Design

Figures 5 to 12 show preliminary geometric designs of key sub-areas of Kingsway and related intersections. As detailed design and implementation proceed, refinements may occur prior to construction.

Figure 5. Gladstone Street & Kingsway

Figure 6. Baldwin Street & Kingsway
Figure 7. Nanaimo Street & Kingsway

Figure 8. Clarendon, Slocan Streets & Kingsway
Figure 9. Duchess, Wales Streets and 34th Avenue & Kingsway

Figure 10. Rhodes Street & Kingsway
7. Landscaping and Special Places

Tree species

Four varieties of street trees (Figure 13) are specified for this character area, appropriate for different conditions:

- Street tree: Ginkgo biloba ‘Princeton Sentry’
- Flowering tree at public spaces: Parks Board will be determining a flowering species

Landscaping materials for corner bulges and boulevards on side streets are typically street trees and turf. These areas also provide opportunities for additional planting and ongoing maintenance by local residents, businesses and groups.

Figure 13: Images of Ginkgo, Sequoia, Beech and Honey Locust

Public Places

A variety of small public places will be created through implementation of the plan along the corridor. They vary from small corner bulges to larger places suitable for benches, flowering trees and public art as well. Figure 14 and 15 provide examples of possible designs for some of the public spaces. Planning will be undertaking further design exercises to achieve a high level of placemaking design for the Norquay Village public realm.
Figure 14. Corner Bulges along Kingsway

Figure 15. Kingsway/ 34th Avenue and Wales St.
8. Sidewalk Treatment

Figures 16 through 20 show the basic sidewalk paving material and treatment, composed of the following main elements:
- Broom-finished concrete
- 1.2m utility strip and 3.7m setback on Kingsway at new mixed-use developments are included in the unified sidewalk treatment.
- “NORQUAY” and the tree species stamp in surround
- Ginkgo Leaf sidewalk stamp at corners

Figure 16. Tree Surround

Figure 17. Sidewalk Stamp

Figure 18. Corner Treatment
9. Street Furniture

Street furniture will be provided as development occurs in Norquay Village. The Norquay Village street furniture plan includes:

- Bus shelter style: “Cityline”
- Bench: “Centennial” or “Goblet”
- Litter receptacle: “Cityline”
- Bicycle rack: Inverted U rack – custom
  (Colour: All furniture is to be provided in glossy black)

Figure 21 shows the recommended placement of the street furniture. Locations will be determined as detailed and implementation proceeds.
10. Utility Poles and Character Lighting

The style and colour of utility poles as well as light fixtures can make important contributions to the overall appearance of a street. There are no plans to change the style of poles on Kingsway as they are trolley poles: however, there are planned changes to the colour of the utility poles and the style of light fixture.

Utility Poles

The City of Vancouver is proposing glossy Jet Black (RAL 9005) with an anti-graffiti additive included in the paint as the colour for utility poles in the Neighbourhood Centre Shopping Area. Poles were painted in the Norquay area in 2002 and they generally get painted every 15 years. Completion of construction and installation of the character fixtures and the pole painting upgrades is anticipated to be performed sometime in 2013-2015. The timing of this work is in keeping with the City’s regular utility pole maintenance program.
Character Lighting

Character lights attached to existing light poles will add to the intended character and identity of the shopping area. They are to replace the existing highway style luminaries in place on Kingsway. The decorative luminaries will be installed with LED optics. They have the added advantages of not adding to the demand for electrical supply, they are more energy efficient, more cost effective, and meet the City's objective of reducing night sky pollution.

The style of character fixture chosen is: King Luminaries ‘Wilshire’ K809 with full cut-off lens and LED optics. The colour selected is Standard Black.
11. Public Art

A number of opportunities for different kinds of public art are available in the shopping area. The City of Vancouver Public Art Program seeks to incorporate contemporary art practices into city planning and development. Public Art staff will be seeking Council approval to commit significant public art funds to the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre. Other City art initiatives include the Art Underfoot manhole cover program and the Mural program.

Opportunities for future community public art may also arise in residential neighbourhoods surrounding the shopping area. These could be related to pedestrian and cycling routes connecting neighbourhoods to the shopping area, to community facilities and to each other. Private rezoning-related public art provides opportunities for major commissioned public art installations.

Figure 23 identifies a preferred range of opportunities and locations, and Figure 24 provides relevant examples. Additional consultation will be required to finalize choices for specific pieces, locations and artists.

Figure 23. Possible Locations for Public Art
Figure 24. Examples of Public Art

Murals
1161 Commercial Drive
(Artist: Nelson & Xochitl Garcia)

Medians
“Kingsway Luminaires”
(Artist: David MacWilliams)

Manhole Covers
Sanitary Sewer Design
(Artist: Jen Weih)

Sculptures
“Sculpture Poems”
(Artist: Sam Carter)

“Peacable Kingdom”
(Artist: Tom Dean)

Acknowledgements

The Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan was made possible by the contributions of many people. The Neighbourhood Centre staff team would like to extend their thanks to all community members who participated and provided input, as well as all City staff who contributed to creating the Plan.
Consideration Item A: Areas to be included in Transition Zone

Consideration Item B: Areas to be included in Transition Zone
Analysis of the Financial Viability of the Housing Forms in the Proposed Norquay Village Draft Plan

October 2010

Prepared for:
City of Vancouver

By:
Coriolis Consulting Corp.
# Table of Contents

1.0 **Introduction** ........................................................................................................... 1  
2.0 **Description of Proposed Building Forms** ................................................................. 2  
3.0 **Financial Feasibility of Redevelopment** ................................................................ 4  
   3.1 Land Value Under Existing Use and Existing Zoning .................................................. 4  
   3.2 Land Value Supported by Redevelopment ................................................................. 6  
      3.2.1 Kingsway Midrise Analysis .................................................................................. 7  
      3.2.2 4-Storey Lowrise Analysis ................................................................................ 8  
      3.2.3 Rowhouse Analysis ........................................................................................... 9  
      3.2.4 Stacked Townhouse Analysis ........................................................................... 9  
      3.2.5 Duplex Analysis ............................................................................................... 9  
      3.2.6 Cottages or Detached Strata Dwelling Unit Analysis ......................................... 10  
      3.2.7 Infill Analysis .................................................................................................. 10  
      3.2.8 Summary ....................................................................................................... 11  
4.0 **Conclusions and Implications** .................................................................................. 12  
   4.1 Kingsway Mixed-Use Midrise .................................................................................... 12  
   4.2 Housing Proposed for RS-1 Sites ............................................................................. 12  
   4.3 Implementation ..................................................................................................... 13  
5.0 **Appendix 1** ............................................................................................................ 14
1.0 Introduction

The draft plan for the Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre includes a variety of new forms and densities of housing proposed for the area, including:

- Midrise mixed-use residential and commercial buildings along Kingsway.
- Lowrise (4-storey) apartments to the north and south of the midrise buildings, which will act as a transition between higher density buildings and lower density multifamily residential areas.
- A variety of ground-oriented residential building forms (e.g. townhouse, rowhouse, duplex, infill) in the remainder of the neighbourhood.

Achieving the proposed vision of the draft plan will require rezoning and redevelopment of existing properties, so the City commissioned Coriolis Consulting Corp. to analyze the financial viability of the proposed types and forms of buildings.

This report documents the results of our analysis.
2.0 Description of Proposed Building Forms

We were asked to analyze the financial viability of seven different types of redevelopment projects in the planning area:

1. Midrise mixed-use residential and commercial buildings along Kingsway. Heights are proposed to range primarily between 6 and 8-storeys, but there would be opportunities for taller buildings on some mid-block and gateway sites. The density envisioned is 3.2 FSR (which would not change for different building heights). Most of the sites that are identified for this building type are currently zoned C-2. Most are improved with existing commercial buildings, but many of these buildings can be characterized as older, low density retail and service buildings.

Many sites fronting on Kingsway in the study area are relatively small. Some have frontages of only 33 feet and many have depths of about 100 feet. Narrow frontage means that larger, higher density development will require site assembly. This may be an obstacle to redevelopment as proposed because many of these small sites can currently be redeveloped to a relatively high density under the existing C-2 zoning without assembly or with minor assembly.

2. Lowrise apartment buildings (4-storeys), which would provide a transition between Kingsway and the surrounding lower density residential areas. Achievable density is expected to range between 1.5 and 2.0 FSR. The draft concept indicates that there could be a requirement for a minimum percentage of the units to be 1200 sq.ft. or larger and have 3 or more bedrooms. However, the percentage is not identified in the draft plan.

Sites that are identified for this use are currently zoned RS-1 and are improved with single family houses. Lots typically have 33 foot frontages so rezoning and redevelopment will likely require assembly.

3. Rowhouses, with densities in the range of 0.9 to 1.0 FSR. Sites that are identified for this use are currently zoned RS-1 and are improved with single family houses. These lots typically have 44 foot frontages, but depths are often less than 90 feet. The parking requirement would be a minimum of 1 space per strata unit (in garages off the lane).

4. Stacked townhouses, with densities in the range of 0.9 to 1.1 FSR. Sites that are identified for this use are currently zoned RS-1 and are improved with single family houses. These lots typically have 33 foot frontages. The parking requirement would be a minimum of 2 spaces per 3 strata units (in garages off the lane).

Although this form of development will be 4-storeys (like C-2 zoning allows), the achievable density in the absence of assembly is much lower than in the C-2 District because C-2 requires minimal setback from property lines.
5. Duplexes. Sites that are identified for duplex are currently zoned RS-1 and are improved with single family houses. These lots typically have frontages ranging from 33 feet to 50 feet. The maximum permitted density would be 0.85 FSR.

6. Cottages or small detached houses on shared lots. This would allow multiple detached strata units on a single lot (or an assembly of lots). Sites that are identified for these uses are currently zoned RS-1 and are improved with single family houses. These lots typically have frontages ranging from 33 feet to 50 feet. The maximum FSR would be about 0.8 FSR. The parking requirement would be a minimum of 1 space per strata unit (in garages off the lane).

7. Infill housing. This would allow a single family house (typically the existing house) with an additional infill unit at the rear. The maximum total density would be 0.75 FSR. The infill unit could be strata-titled.
3.0 Financial Feasibility of Redevelopment

As almost all sites in the study area are occupied by some use, any site can be thought of as having three potential values:

1. The property value supported by the existing use (i.e. the amount an investor or user would pay just to keep the site in its present use), as an income-producing investment property, a home, or premises for an owner-occupied business.

2. The land value supported by redevelopment under existing zoning, which is the maximum a developer can pay to acquire the property in order to demolish the existing improvements and develop a viable project under existing zoning.

3. The land value supported by redevelopment under proposed zoning, which is the maximum a developer can pay to acquire the property, rezone and develop a viable project under the proposed new zoning.

For rezoning and redevelopment to occur, the land value supported by rezoning and redevelopment must be high enough to out-compete both the property value supported by existing use (number 1 above) and the land value under existing zoning (number 2 above).

3.1 Land Value Under Existing Use and Existing Zoning

Many of the properties along Kingsway are occupied by older, relatively low density commercial buildings. These are probably the main candidates for redevelopment, so we have analyzed whether it is financially feasible for a developer to acquire these sites, rezone and redevelop to 3.2 FSR as envisioned in the draft plan.

To estimate the existing value of the C-2 zoned sites along Kingsway that could be considered redevelopment candidates, we examined a variety of indicators:

1. We examined evidence of the actual sale prices for C-2 sites along Kingsway over the past year or so (2009 and 2010). There have been few sales in Norquay Village and they ranged from about $168 per sq.ft. of site area to well over $200 per sq.ft. of site area.

2. We examined assessed values for C-2 zoned sites in Norquay Village. Most older, low density commercial properties have current assessed property values (land and improvements) in the range of about $150 to $160 per sq.ft. of site. The assessed values may slightly understate actual market value as property owners will appeal an assessment if they think it overstates market value, but they will not appeal the assessment if it understates market value. Therefore, on balance the assessments likely understate the actual market value. In addition, assessments are based on market values from mid-2009 so they do not reflect current market conditions.

3. We estimated the market value of older low density commercial buildings along Kingsway by capitalizing the estimated achievable net operating income. We assumed an older retail and
service building with these property characteristics: 10,000 sq.ft. site, a building with a footprint of 5,000 sq.ft. (i.e., 50% site coverage)\(^2\), and a grade level retail tenant paying rent of $18 per square foot net\(^3\). Total annual income from this property is about $90,000 at full occupancy. Deducting say 2\% for landlord expenses leaves net operating income of $88,000 per year. At a typical cap rate of 6.5\%, this property would command roughly $1.4 million in a sale to an investor wanting an income-producing investment (assuming the building is in reasonably good condition). This works out to $140 per sq.ft. of site. This likely represents the approximate value of the income stream from the lowest density, oldest buildings in the study area. The value of the income stream increases as the density of the existing building increases. For example, at 60\% site coverage the estimated value would be about $163 per sq.ft. of site area.

4. We completed a land residual analysis (or proforma analysis) for a hypothetical 4-storey woodframe apartment and retail project built under existing C-2 zoning (2.5 FSR) in Norquay Village\(^4\). This analysis is contained in Appendix 1. Our analysis indicates that the supportable land value is about $175 per sq.ft. of site (or $70 per sq.ft. buildable), making this the amount a developer would pay to buy the site and develop under existing C-2 zoning.

Our analysis indicates that (in many cases) the older, lower density existing C-2 properties in Norquay Village are more valuable as development sites than as income-producing investment properties. Therefore, the market value of these properties is based on their value as redevelopment sites (under C-2 zoning), which we estimate at $175 per sq.ft. of site area.

In order for midrise redevelopment along Kingsway to be financially viable, the midrise concept will need to support a land value of at least $175 per sq.ft. of land area because:

1. The C-2 zoning already supports a land value of about $175 per sq.ft. of site area. To off-set the costs and risks associated with rezoning, the draft midrise concept will need exceed this value.

2. Development under C-2 zoning will probably not require the same extent of assembly as relatively small sites can achieve the maximum permitted density in the C-2 District (or close to the maximum).

\(^2\) We do not have detailed information about existing FSR or site coverage at sites in the study area, but based on fieldwork it appears that most single storey buildings likely cover about 50\% to 80\% of the site. Therefore, our assumption of 50\% is likely representative of the lowest density existing buildings in the study area.

\(^3\) Based on our review of lease rates in the area, older low quality grade level commercial space along Kingsway leases for about $16 to $20 per sq.ft. net. We have used the mid-point of this range for this illustration. New(er), higher quality grade level space along Kingsway leases in the range of $25 to $30+ per sq.ft. net.

\(^4\) The revenue assumptions for our analysis are based on sales prices for new woodframe apartment units currently marketing in Norquay Village (and other nearby locations). The cost assumptions are based on information from BDC Development Consultants and discussions with multifamily developers that are active in Vancouver.
3. Developers are very familiar with the C-2 District and the form and density of development that is achievable.

4. The maximum density in the C-2 District can be achieved using woodframe construction. Woodframe construction involves lower costs than concrete and allows developers to target a lower price segment (possibly with less risk) than a concrete project.

To estimate the value of the properties currently zoned RS-1 that could be candidates for redevelopment, we examined evidence of sales prices for RS-1 lots in East Vancouver (and in Norquay Village) where the existing house has recently been demolished to create a new single family house. Values ranged from about $120 per sq.ft. of site to about $150 per sq.ft. of site, depending on lot size and location.

3.2 Land Value Supported by Redevelopment

To estimate the land value supported by redevelopment, we used two different approaches:

1. Because there have been relatively few development site sales in East Vancouver over the past year or so and because some of the proposed housing forms are not commonly permitted in Vancouver, we completed a land residual analysis (or proforma analysis) for each of the proposed housing forms. Our revenue assumptions for the land residuals are based on a detailed analysis of recent unit sales prices (last 12 months or so) at the newest projects in or near Norquay Village. Hard construction cost assumptions are based on information provided by quantity surveying companies (BDC, Altus, BTY Group) for mid-quality buildings in East Vancouver (in some cases adjusted for the lower parking requirements proposed by the City) and on discussions with developers that are active in the Vancouver multifamily market. The analysis also includes estimates for all other costs that would be incurred by a developer (including permits, soft costs, project management, sales/marketing, financing, landscaping, DCLs, financing, taxes, contingencies, and a minor servicing allowance). To estimate supportable land value (for a zoned site), we deduct all costs and a 15% developer’s profit margin on gross revenues from estimated revenues. The difference is the supportable land value. It is important to note that the analysis excludes any costs associated with rezoning (such as application fees, consultants or CACs) unless noted.

2. We examined sales evidence (which is limited) and listings information for actual development sites in East Vancouver over the past year or so to confirm that the results of our land residual analysis was consistent with development site sales.

All of the assumptions used on our land residual analysis are contained in the pro formas in Appendix 1. With any assumption (revenue or construction cost), there is typically a range of values that could be considered realistic. We have tended to use revenue assumptions near the upper end of the range in values. Therefore, our development site land value estimates could be considered slightly optimistic given that the current real estate market is relatively soft.
3.2.1 Kingsway Midrise Analysis

For the C-2 sites along Kingsway, a key consideration is the land value under existing zoning. If the proposed midrise buildings cannot support a higher value than the existing C-2 land value, then developers may not be interested in rezoning and may elect to redevelop under the existing C-2 zoning. As previously noted, this is not simply a land value issue because the C-2 zoning offers some additional benefits:

- Development under C-2 zoning will probably require less assembly than the proposed mid-rise zoning because relatively small sites can achieve the maximum permitted density in the C-2 District (or close to the maximum).
- Developers are very familiar with the C-2 District and the form and density of development that is achievable.
- The maximum density in the C-2 District can be achieved using woodframe construction. Woodframe construction involves lower costs than concrete and allows developers to target a lower price segment (possibly with less risk) than a concrete project.

Based our financial analysis:

- The value of sites under existing C-2 zoning is a minimum of about $175 per sq.ft. of site area, and likely higher if the existing commercial building is high quality (see Attachment 1).
- The land value supported by midrise mixed-use development at 3.2 FSR is about $130 to $140 per sq.ft. of site area (see Attachment 2). The estimated land value is lower than under the C-2 zoning (despite a higher permitted density) because the proposed 8-storey mixed-use form will require concrete construction (and C-2 buildings can be built using woodframe). Concrete construction costs per square foot are significantly higher than woodframe construction costs. Concrete units sell for a premium over woodframe units, but the sales price premium in this part of Vancouver is not currently high enough to off-set the increased construction costs. This results in a lower supportable land value. This may change over time, if concrete residential unit sales prices increase at a faster pace than concrete construction costs.
- Because C-2 supports a higher land value, most developers (at least for the foreseeable future) will likely elect to build under the existing C-2 zoning, rather than go through the time, cost and risk associated with rezoning to a new zoning district that allows midrise development at 3.2 FSR.
The City asked us to estimate the minimum density that would likely be required to make rezoning from C-2 financially attractive (i.e., the minimum density required to support a land value that is equal to or higher than the $175 per sq.ft. of site area supported by C-2 zoning, after allowing for rezoning costs\(^5\)). We were instructed to assume a maximum building height of 10-storeys.

We estimate that (if the maximum building height is limited to about 10-storeys), a minimum density of 3.8 FSR\(^6\) is required (Attachment 2a) to make rezoning and redevelopment financially attractive.

This applies to sites where the value of the existing improvements is low so that the value of the site is effectively the C-2 land value. It should be noted that many sites along Kingsway will not be redevelopment candidates at this density because the existing use is too valuable. For such properties, allowable densities will have to be even higher or redevelopment will have to wait either until residential land values rise further or the existing improvements become physically obsolete.

### 3.2.2 4-Storey Lowrise Analysis

Attachment 3 contains our financial analysis for a hypothetical 4-storey woodframe strata apartment building in Norquay Village\(^7\). Based our financial analysis:

- The lower value single family homes on sites identified for 4-storey lowrise apartment use range in value from about $120 to $150 per sq.ft. of site area.
- The land value supported by 4-storey apartment development is about $80 to $85 per sq.ft. buildable.
- At a permitted density in the range of 1.5 FSR to 2.0 FSR, the supportable land value is between $120 and $170 per sq.ft. of site area.
- 4-storey woodframe apartment development supports a high enough land value to make assembly and redevelopment of existing older single family houses financially viable (assuming rezoning costs are low).

---

\(^5\) For this analysis, we made an allowance for the rezoning application fee, a $3 per sq.ft. CAC (on additional permitted floorspace) which is the rate for a standard rezoning, and consultant fees (design, engineering, management) of $200,000 (which is modest and assumes the City and neighbourhood is generally supportive of rezoning).

We also assumed that the midrise developer would target a profit margin of 15% on project costs, which (in our experience) is at the lower end of the range of profit that a multifamily developer would target. If a higher profit margin is required, then the density would need to be higher.

\(^6\) This FSR does not include space that is typically excluded by the City of Vancouver when calculating density, such as balconies, residential storage space, and amenity areas. Therefore, the gross building size will be slightly larger.

\(^7\) The financial analysis assumes that the hypothetical project has an average gross unit size in the range of about 850 to 900 sq.ft. This would allow for a range of different unit types and sizes, including small units and larger 2 or 3 bedroom units.
Because there will likely be costs associated with assembly and rezoning, the density may need to be in the upper half of the envisioned range of 1.5 to 2.0 FSR to make redevelopment viable.

3.2.3 Rowhouse Analysis

Attachment 4 contains our financial analysis for a hypothetical rowhouse project in Norquay Village. Based our financial analysis:

- The lower value single family homes on sites identified for rowhouse use range in value from about $120 to $150 per sq.ft. of site area.
- The land value supported by rowhouse development is about $140 per sq.ft. buildable.
- At a permitted density in the range of 0.9 FSR to 1.0 FSR, the supportable land value is between $125 and $140 per sq.ft. of site area.
- Rowhouse development supports a high enough land value to make assembly and redevelopment of existing older single family houses financially viable, assuming rezoning costs are low.

3.2.4 Stacked Townhouse Analysis

Attachment 5 contains our financial analysis for a hypothetical stacked townhouse project in Norquay Village. Based our financial analysis:

- The lower value single family homes on sites identified for stacked townhouse use range in value from about $120 to $150 per sq.ft. of site area.
- The land value supported by stacked townhouse development is about $135 per sq.ft. buildable.
- At a permitted density in the range of 0.9 FSR to 1.1 FSR, the supportable land value is between $120 and $150 per sq.ft. of site area.
- Stacked townhouse development supports a high enough land value to make assembly and redevelopment of existing older single family houses financially viable, assuming rezoning costs are low.

3.2.5 Duplex Analysis

Attachment 6 contains our financial analysis for a hypothetical duplex project in Norquay Village. Based our financial analysis:

- The lower value single family homes on sites identified for duplex use range in value from about $120 to $150 per sq.ft. of site area.
3.2.6 Cottages or Detached Strata Dwelling Unit Analysis

Attachment 7 contains our financial analysis for a hypothetical duplex project in Norquay Village. Based our financial analysis:

- The lower value single family homes on sites identified for detached strata use range in value from about $120 to $150 per sq.ft. of site area.
- The land value supported by development of strata cottages or small detached houses is about $180 per sq.ft. buildable.
- At a permitted density of 0.80 FSR, the supportable land value is $145 per sq.ft. of site area.
- Development of detached strata units or cottages supports a high enough land value to make assembly and redevelopment of existing older single family houses financially viable, assuming rezoning costs are low.

3.2.7 Infill Analysis

We did not complete a detailed financial analysis of infill housing on an existing single family lot. If single family home owners are permitted to build an infill unit at the rear of their existing single family house, this will be financially attractive as it increases the development rights at the lot without requiring demolition of the existing structure.

The City indicated that it may allow that infill unit to be stratified. However, in our opinion, this is not needed to make infill financially attractive. Infill units will be viable if used for rental purposes. For example, our understanding is that it would likely cost about $200,000 to construct an 800 sq.ft. infill unit at the rear of a house (about $250 per sq.ft. all-in cost). Under current rental market conditions, this unit would likely rent for about $1600 per month, or so. Deducting a

---

8 Our duplex analysis assumes a lower developer’s project margin (10% on revenue rather than 15%) than used in our analysis for the other multifamily housing forms because the risks associated with a duplex project (marketing, construction, financing) are lower than for a larger multifamily project. Also, duplex units are often constructed by builders rather than developers. Part of the incentive for the builder to proceed with the project is the profit associated with being the general contractor (not just a developer’s margin) so a lower developer’s margin can be required.

9 Our detached strata analysis assumes a lower developer’s project margin (10% on revenue rather than 15%) than in our analysis for the other housing forms because the risks associated with a detached project (marketing, construction, financing) are lower than for a larger multifamily project.
maximum of 20% for operating costs would result in an annual net rental income stream of about $15,360, equivalent to a 7.7% annual return on total costs.

If the entire cost of the infill unit is financed through a mortgage with a 25 year amortization at a rate of 3.8% (current 5 year fixed rate), the annual mortgage costs would be about $12,365, or about $3,000 per year less than the net rental income. The revenue significantly exceeds the annual debt service costs (and after 25 years the loan is fully repaid). This illustrates that it would be financially attractive for a home owner to build a rental infill unit even if the costs were entirely borrowed.

Therefore, we recommend that the City consider restricting the infill units to rental use. If the infill units are stratified, it will make the future long term redevelopment of these sites to higher density multifamily forms more complicated and costly.

3.2.8 Summary

The results of our analysis are summarized in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1: Summary of Financial Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Concept</th>
<th>Land Value Supported by Proposed New Concept</th>
<th>Existing Value of Sites that are Redevelopment Candidates</th>
<th>Financially Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 to 8-Storey Mixed Use @ 3.2 FSR on Kingsway</td>
<td>$130 to $140 psf of site</td>
<td>$150 to $175 psf of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>10-Storey Mixed Use @ 3.8 FSR on Kingsway</td>
<td>$175 psf of site</td>
<td>$150 to $175 psf of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4-Storey Apartment @ 1.5 to 2.0 FSR</td>
<td>$125 to $165 psf of site</td>
<td>$120 to $150 psf of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rowhouse @ 0.9 to 1.0 FSR</td>
<td>$125 to $140 psf of site</td>
<td>$120 to $150 psf of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stacked Townhouse @ 0.9 to 1.1 FSR</td>
<td>$120 to $145 psf of site</td>
<td>$120 to $150 psf of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duplex @ 0.85 FSR</td>
<td>$150 psf of site</td>
<td>$120 to $150 psf of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cottages/Detached Houses @ 0.8 FSR</td>
<td>$145 psf of site</td>
<td>$120 to $150 psf of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Infill at Rear of Single Family House</td>
<td>not analyzed</td>
<td>not analyzed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Kingsway Mixed-Use Midrise

1. As proposed, the midrise (6-storeys to 8-storeys) mixed-use form envisioned along Kingsway is not financially attractive. The existing C-2 zoning along Kingsway supports a higher land value so most developers will likely elect to build under the existing C-2 zoning, rather than go through the time, cost and risk associated with rezoning to a new zoning district that allows midrise mixed-use development at 3.2 FSR. Compounding this land value constraint is the fact that the C-2 zoning offers some additional benefits:
   - Development under C-2 zoning will probably require less assembly because relatively small sites can achieve the maximum permitted density in the C-2 District (or close to the maximum).
   - Developers are very familiar with the C-2 District and the form and density of development that is achievable.
   - The maximum density in the C-2 District can be achieved using woodframe construction. Woodframe construction involves lower costs than concrete and allows developers to target a lower price segment (possibly with less risk) than a concrete project.

2. To make rezoning and redevelopment of the C-2 sites along Kingsway financially attractive, we estimate that a minimum density of 3.8 FSR (at 10-storeys) is required. Taller buildings would likely require a lower FSR because taller buildings will achieve higher average sales prices per sq.ft. due to increased view potential.

3. Because there is no land lift generated by rezoning to allow midrise development at 3.2 FSR, rezoning will not create an opportunity to negotiated community amenity contributions.

4. Our sensitivity analysis indicates that a 10-storey mixed-use building at 3.8 FSR can currently support the $3 flat rate community amenity contribution that the City charges for standard rezonings.

4.2 Housing Proposed for RS-1 Sites

1. The proposed forms of housing in the existing RS-1 neighbourhood will be financially viable. This includes:
   - 4-storey woodframe apartment buildings at densities in the range of 1.5 to 2.0 FSR.
   - Rowhouses, with densities in the range of 0.9 to 1.0 FSR.
   - Stacked townhouses, with densities in the range of 0.9 to 1.1 FSR.
   - Duplexes at 0.85 FSR.
   - Cottages or small detached strata houses on shared lots at densities of about 0.8 FSR.
   - Infill housing, at the rear of existing single family houses.
2. At the lower end of the proposed densities, these forms of housing are just financially viable. Any significant community amenity contribution will reduce the number of sites that are financially attractive development candidates. The ability for these projects to make a community amenity contribution will depend on whether or not the projects can achieve densities at (or near) the upper end of the proposed range.

4.3 Implementation

The housing forms and densities proposed in the draft plan are just at the threshold of being financially viable (or below in the case of the Kingsway midrise at 3.2 FSR).

Most projects will require assembly (which introduces some additional costs and risks). It is possible that if developers perceive that there is significant rezoning risk (in addition to assembly), they will not be interested in the proposed new forms of housing and will build under the existing zoning (particularly with the C-2 sites).

While all rezonings involve risk, it is possible that developers who are familiar with the history of the Norquay Village planning process will perceive that there will be opposition to some of the proposed new forms of housing and the proposed densities. If developers include a significant cost into their proforma to account for the time and risk associated with rezoning, it is possible that there will not be as much redevelopment to the new housing forms as the City would like to see.

As noted in our previous work for Norquay Village, we think that the City should consider pre-zoning the area as part of the implementation of the Plan. The City would still have control over the design of new projects through the development permit approval process.

In addition, it would not eliminate the ability of new projects to make contributions toward public facilities and amenities because new zoning districts could include a base outright density (that is just high enough to make development viable) plus bonus density that can be obtained in exchange for a prescribed amenity contribution.

---

10 The City could leave specific sites out of the prezonning strategy if there are sites that warrant a more individual approach, such as sites that are very large, have special amenity potential (e.g. heritage assets), or present unique development opportunities.
5.0 Appendix 1
## Attachment 1: Mixed-Use 4-Storey Project in C-2 District

### Major Assumptions (shading indicates figures that are inputs; unshaded cells are formulas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue and Value</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Residential Sales Price Per Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>$425 per sq.ft. of net saleable residential space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value of Commercial Space</td>
<td>$476 per sq.ft. Assuming net lease rate of vacancy/structural allowance of 3.0% capitalization rate of 6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site and Building Size</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site size</td>
<td>17,860 sq.ft. or 0.41 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage x Depth</td>
<td>149 frontage feet x 120 feet depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed density</td>
<td>2.5 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total floorspace</td>
<td>44,649 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Floorspace</td>
<td>6,251 sq.ft., assuming 0.35 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Residential Floorspace</td>
<td>38,398 sq.ft. or 85% of gross area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net saleable space</td>
<td>32,638 sq.ft. or 85% of gross area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Gross unit size</td>
<td>882 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>44 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Parking Stalls</td>
<td>5.16 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Stalls</td>
<td>48 stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Commercial Stalls</td>
<td>13 stalls, assuming 1 stall per 500 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stalls</td>
<td>61 stalls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>$12,502 or about $2 per sq.ft. of existing building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (3)</td>
<td>$68,063 or about $1,500 per lineal metre of frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Cost Used in Analysis (2)</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$0 per sq.ft. of site area on 0.0% of site (not covered by building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs (1)</td>
<td>11.0% of hard costs, servicing, landscaping (assumes commercial space adds premium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>5.0% of hard and soft costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD DCC sewer commercial</td>
<td>$0.443 per sq.ft. of commercial space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>$0.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC’s residential</td>
<td>$10,4200 per sq.ft. of residential building area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC’s commercial</td>
<td>$10,4200 per sq.ft. of retail building area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing on construction costs</td>
<td>6.0% of 50% of hard and soft costs, assuming a 1.5 year construction period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees</td>
<td>0.75% of hard and soft costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs and Allowances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Improvement Allowance on Commercial Space</td>
<td>$15 per sq.ft. for basic allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Marketing and Commissions</td>
<td>5.0% of gross revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Leasing Commissions</td>
<td>17.0% of estimated Year 1 leasing income upfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Sales Commission</td>
<td>2.0% of commercial value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer’s Profit</td>
<td>15.0% of gross revenue or 17.7% of total costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>1.864% of assessed value (assuming business classification as mixed use project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed current assessment (Year 1 of analysis)</td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed assessment after 1 year of construction (Year 2 of analysis)</td>
<td>$6,935,664 (50% of completed project value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross sales revenue</td>
<td>$13,871,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less marketing and commissions</td>
<td>$693,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net sales revenue</td>
<td>$13,177,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Commercial Space</td>
<td>$2,974,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Commissions on Sale</td>
<td>$59,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value of Commercial Space</td>
<td>$2,914,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Project Value</td>
<td>$16,092,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Rezoning Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (Upgrade of Adjacent Roads/Sidewalks/etc)</td>
<td>$68,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard construction costs</td>
<td>$7,367,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs</td>
<td>$817,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>$413,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uplift Leasing Commissions on Commercial</td>
<td>$31,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD DCC sewer residential</td>
<td>$24,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD DCC sewer commercial</td>
<td>$2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC’s residential</td>
<td>$400,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC’s commercial</td>
<td>$65,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing</td>
<td>$415,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees/costs</td>
<td>$69,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total construction costs</td>
<td>$9,782,251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Developer’s Profit

- Residual to Land and Land Carry: $3,783,430
- Less interim financing on land $2,526,835
- Residual Land Value $3,147,484
- Residual Value per sq.ft. of site $176.23
- Residual Value per square foot buildable $70.49
## Attachment 2: Mixed-Use 8-Storey Project at 3.2 FSR (Proposed)

### Major Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Revenue and Value</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Residential Sales Price Per Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>$490 per sq. ft. of net saleable residential space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value of Commercial Space</td>
<td>$476 per sq. ft. Assuming net lease rate of 3.0% vacancy/structural allowance of 0.0% capitalization rate of 6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site and Building Size

| **Site size** | 17,860 sq. ft. or 0.41 acre 149 frontage feet x 120 feet depth |
| **Assumed density** | 3.2 FSR |
| **Total floorspace** | 57,151 sq. ft. |
| **Commercial Floorspace** | 6,251 sq. ft., assuming 0.35 FSR |
| **Gross Residential Floorspace** | 50,900 sq. ft. or 86% of gross area |
| **Average Gross unit size** | 872 sq.ft. |
| **Average Net unit size** | 750 sq.ft. |
| **Number of units** | 58 units or 349 UPH |
| **Residential Stalls** | 64 stalls |
| **Required Parking Stalls** | 13 stalls, assuming 1 stall per 500 sq. ft. |
| **Total Stalls** | 77 stalls |

### Construction Costs

| **Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings** | $12,502 or about $2 per sq. ft. of existing building |
| **On-Site Servicing (3)** | $68,063 or about $1,500 per linear metre of frontage |
| **Other Predevelopment Costs** | $0 |
| **Hard Cost Used in Analysis (2)** | $220,000 |
| **Landscaping** | $0 per sq. ft. of site area or 0.0% of site (not covered by building) |
| **Soft costs (1)** | 11.0% of hard costs, servicing, landscaping (assumes commercial space adds premium) |
| **Contingency on hard and soft costs** | 5.0% of hard and soft costs |
| **GVRD DCC sewer residential** | $560.00 per unit |
| **GVRD DCC sewer commercial** | $9,443 per sq. ft. of commercial space |
| **SSAC** | $0.00 per unit |
| **DCC’s residential** | $10,420 per sq. ft. of residential building area or $ 9,587 per average unit |
| **DCC’s commercial** | $10,420 per sq. ft. of retail building area |
| **Interim financing on construction costs** | 6.0% on 50% of hard and soft costs, assuming 2.0 year construction period |
| **Financing fees** | 0.75% of hard and soft costs |

### Other Costs and Allowances

| **Rezoning Costs** | $0 |
| **Tenant Improvement Allowance on Commercial Space** | $19 per sq. ft. for basic allowance |
| **Residential Marketing and Commissions** | 5.0% of gross revenue |
| **Commercial Leasing Commissions** | 17.0% of estimated Year 1 leasing income upfront |
| **Commercial Sales Commission** | 2.0% of commercial value |
| **Property Taxes** | 1.864% of assessed value (assuming business classification as mixed use project) |
| **Assumed current assessment (Year 1 of analysis)** | $2,000,000 |
| **Assumed assessment after 1 year of construction (Year 2 of analysis)** | $10,724,601 (50% of completed project value) |

### Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Revenue</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross sales revenue</td>
<td>$21,449,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less marketing and commissions</td>
<td>$1,072,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net sales revenue</td>
<td>$20,376,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Commercial Space</td>
<td>$2,974,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Commissions on Sale</td>
<td>$59,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value of Commercial Space</td>
<td>$2,914,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Project Value</td>
<td>$23,291,496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Construction Costs</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Rezoning Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>$12,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (Upgrade of Adjacent Roads/Sidewalks/etc)</td>
<td>$68,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard construction costs</td>
<td>$12,573,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs</td>
<td>$1,390,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>$702,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI Allowance on Grade Level Commercial</td>
<td>$93,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upfront Leasing Commissions on Commercial</td>
<td>$31,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD DCC sewer residential</td>
<td>$32,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD DCC sewer commercial</td>
<td>$2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC’s residential</td>
<td>$530,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC’s commercial</td>
<td>$65,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing</td>
<td>$116,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees/costs</td>
<td>$77,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total construction costs</td>
<td>$16,545,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developer’s Profit</strong></td>
<td>$3,663,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Residual to Land and Land Carry** | $3,082,572 |
| **Less interim financing on land (approvals/presales/construction)** | $430,019 |
| **Less property purchase tax** | $51,051 |
| **Less property taxes** | $255,776 |
| **Residual Land Value** | $2,345,726 |

| **Residual Value per sq. ft. of site** | $191.34 |
| **Residual Value per square foot buildable** | $41.04 |
Attachment 2a: Mixed-Use 10-Storey Project at 3.8 FSR (Sensitivity Analysis)

**Major Assumptions** (shading indicates figures that are inputs; unshaded cells are formulas)

### Revenue and Value
- **Average Residential Sales Price Per Sq. Ft.** $495 per sq. ft. of net saleable residential space (premium due to increased view units)
- **Average Value of Commercial Space** $476 per sq. ft. Assuming net lease rate of $30, vacancy/structural allowance of 3.0% and capitalization rate of 6.5%

### Site and Building Size
- **Site size** 17,860 sq. ft. or 0.41 acre
- **Frontage** 149 feet x 120 feet depth
- **Assumed density** 3.8 FSR
- **Total floorspace** 67,866 sq. ft.
- **Commercial Floorspace** 6,251 sq. ft., assuming 0.35 FSR
- **Gross Residential Floorspace** 61,616 sq. ft., assumed 3.5 FSR
- **Net saleable space** 52,989 sq. ft. or 86.0% of gross area
- **Average Gross unit size** 872 sq. ft.
- **Average Net unit size** 750 sq. ft.
- **Number of units** 71 units or 428 UPH
- **Required Parking Stalls** 1.10 stalls per unit, 78 residential stalls, 13 commercial stalls
- **Total Stalls** 91 stalls

### Construction Costs
- **Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings** $12,502 or about $2 per sq. ft. of existing building
- **On-Site Servicing (Upgrade of Adjacent Roads/Sidewalks/etc)** $68,063 or about $1,500 per lineal metre of frontage
- **Other Predevelopment Costs** $5,502 or about $1,100 per unit
- **Hard construction costs** $14,930,626
- **Landscaping** $0
- **Soft costs** $1,649,956
- **Contingency on hard and soft costs** 15.0% of hard costs, servicing, landscaping (assumes commercial space adds premium)
- **GVRD DCC sewer residential** $642,035
- **GVRD DCC sewer commercial** $65,134
- **SSAC** $0
- **Interim financing** $1,117,080
- **Financing fees/costs** $140,123
- **Total construction costs** $19,940,331
- **Developer’s Profit** $3,808,203

### Analysis
- **Residual to Land and Land Carry** $4,064,502
- **Residual Land Value** $3,118,142
- **Residual Value per square foot buildable** $174.59
- **Residual Value per sq. ft. of site** $45.95

### Other Costs and Allowances
- **Resale Rezoning Costs** $229,100 for rezoning application fees, consultants
- **Residential Marketing and Commissions** 5.0% of gross revenue
- **Commercial Leasing Commissions** 17.0% of estimated Year 1 leasing income upfront
- **Commercial Sales Commission** 2.0% of commercial value
- **Developer’s Profit** 13.04% of gross revenue, or 15.0% of total costs
- **GVRD DCC sewer residential** $9,087 per average unit
- **GVRD DCC sewer commercial** $39,760 per unit
- **SSAC** $0
- **DCC’s commercial** $65,134
- **Interim financing** $1,117,080
- **Financing fees/costs** $140,123

### Financial Viability of Proposed Housing Forms in Norquay Village

**COROLIS CONSULTING CORP.**
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## Attachment 3: 4-Storey Woodframe Apartment (Proposed)

### Major Assumptions (shading indicates figures that are inputs; unshaded cells are formulas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Revenue and Value</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Sales Price Per Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>$425 per sq. ft. of net saleable residential space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site and Building Size</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site size</td>
<td>17,860 sq. ft. or 0.41 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 frontage feet x 120 feet depth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed density</td>
<td>1.75 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total floorspace</td>
<td>31,254 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net saleable space</td>
<td>26,566 sq. ft. or 85.0% of gross area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Gross unit size</td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Net unit size</td>
<td>759 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>35 units or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Parking Stalls</td>
<td>1.10 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Stalls</td>
<td>39 stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stalls</td>
<td>39 stalls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Construction Costs</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>$17,860 or about $2 per sq. ft. of existing building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (3)</td>
<td>$68,063 or about $1,500 per linear metre of frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Cost Used in Analysis (2)</td>
<td>$145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$5.00 per sq. ft. of site area on 50.0% of site (not covered by building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs (1)</td>
<td>10.0% of hard costs, servicing, landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>5.0% of hard and soft costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD Sewer Levy</td>
<td>$560.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>$0.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLs</td>
<td>$10.420 per sq. ft. of building area or 9,305 $ per average unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing on construction costs</td>
<td>6.0% on 50% of hard and soft costs, assuming a 1.5 year construction period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees</td>
<td>0.75% of hard and soft costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Other Costs and Allowances** |  |
| Rezoning Costs             | $0 |
| Marketing and Commissions  | 5.0% of gross revenue |
| Developer's Profit         | 15.0% of gross revenue, or 17.6% of total costs |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Analysis</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross sales revenue</td>
<td>$11,290,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less marketing and commissions</td>
<td>$564,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net sales revenue</td>
<td>$10,726,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Construction Costs</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Rezoning Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>$17,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (Upgrade of Adjacent Roads/Sidewalks/etc)</td>
<td>$68,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard construction costs</td>
<td>$4,531,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$44,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs</td>
<td>$464,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>$256,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD Sewer Levy</td>
<td>$19,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLs</td>
<td>$325,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing</td>
<td>$257,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees/costs</td>
<td>$42,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total construction costs</td>
<td>$6,029,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Developer's Profit** | $1,693,592 |

| **Residual to Land and Land Carry** | $3,003,227 |
| Less interim financing on land (approvals/presales/construction) | $355,160 |
| Less property purchase tax | $51,361 |
| Less property taxes | $24,535 |

| **Residual Land Value** | $2,592,171 |

| **Residual Value per sq. ft. of site** | $145.14 |
| **Residual Value per square foot buildable** | $82.94 |
### Major Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Revenue and Value</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Sales Price Per Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>$420 per sq. ft. of net saleable residential space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site and Building Size</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site size</td>
<td>8,800 sq. ft. or 0.20 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage feet x Depth</td>
<td>88 x 100 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed density</td>
<td>1.0 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total floor space</td>
<td>8,800 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net saleable space</td>
<td>8,800 sq. ft. or 100.0% of gross area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Gross unit size</td>
<td>1,257 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Net unit size</td>
<td>1,257 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>7 units or 1.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Parking Stalls</td>
<td>7 stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stalls</td>
<td>7 stalls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Construction Costs</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>$8,800 or about $2 per sq. ft. of existing building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (3)</td>
<td>$40,244 or about $1,500 per linear metre of frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Construction Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Cost Used in Analysis (2)</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$5.00 per sq. ft. of site area on 50.0% of site (not covered by building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs (1)</td>
<td>10.0% of hard costs, servicing, landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>5.0% of hard and soft costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD Sewer Levy</td>
<td>$626.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>$0.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLs</td>
<td>$2,430 per sq. ft. of building area or $3,055 per average unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing on construction costs</td>
<td>6.0% on 50% of hard and soft costs, assuming a 1.0 year construction period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees</td>
<td>0.75% of hard and soft costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other Costs and Allowances</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Commissions</td>
<td>5.0% of gross revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer's Profit</td>
<td>15.0% of gross revenue, or 17.6% of total costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>0.421% of assessed value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed current assessment (Year 1 of analysis)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed assessment after 1 year of construction (Year 2 of analysis)</td>
<td>$1,848,000 (50% of completed project value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Revenue</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross sales revenue</td>
<td>$3,696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less marketing and commissions</td>
<td>$164,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net sales revenue</td>
<td>$3,531,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Construction Costs</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Rezoning Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (Upgrade of Adjacent Roads/Sidewalks/etc)</td>
<td>$40,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard construction costs</td>
<td>$1,252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs</td>
<td>$129,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>$71,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD Sewer Levy</td>
<td>$5,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLs</td>
<td>$21,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing</td>
<td>$45,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees/costs</td>
<td>$11,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total construction costs</td>
<td>$1,588,680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Developer's Profit** | $554,400 |

| **Residual to Land and Land Carry** | $1,368,120 |
| Less interim financing on land (approvals/presales/construction) | $114,512 |
| Less property purchase tax | $23,072 |
| Less property taxes | $9,481 |
| **Residual Land Value** | $1,221,055 |

| **Residual Value per sq. ft. of site** | $138.76 |
| **Residual Value per square foot buildable** | $138.76 |
Attachment 5: Stacked Townhouse (Proposed)

**Major Assumptions** (shading indicates figures that are inputs; unshaded cells are formulas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue and Value</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Sales Price Per Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>$410 per sq.ft. of net saleable residential space (discount on row houses due to less parking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site and Building Size</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site size</td>
<td>11,680 sq.ft. or 0.27 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardage</td>
<td>99 frontage feet x 120 feet depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed density</td>
<td>1.1 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total floorspace</td>
<td>13,068 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net saleable space</td>
<td>13,068 sq.ft. or 100.0% of gross area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Gross unit size</td>
<td>1,089 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Net unit size</td>
<td>1,089 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>12 units or 8 stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Parking Stalls</td>
<td>0.67 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Stalls</td>
<td>8 stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stalls</td>
<td>8 stalls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>$11,880 or about $2 per sq.ft. of existing building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (3)</td>
<td>$45,274 or about $1,500 per linear metre of frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Cost Used in Analysis (2)</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$5.00 per sq.ft. of site area on 50.0% of site (not covered by building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>5.0% of hard and soft costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD Sewer Levy</td>
<td>$826.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>$0.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLs</td>
<td>$2,646 per average unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing on construction costs</td>
<td>6.0% on 50% of hard and soft costs, assuming a 1.0 year construction period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees</td>
<td>0.75% of hard and soft costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Costs and Allowances</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Commissions</td>
<td>5.0% of gross revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer's Profit</td>
<td>15.0% of gross revenue, or 17.6% of total costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>0.421% of assessed value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed current assessment (Year 1 of analysis)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed assessment after 1 year of construction (Year 2 of analysis)</td>
<td>$2,676,940 (50% of completed project value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross sales revenue</td>
<td>$5,357,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less marketing and commissions</td>
<td>$267,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net sales revenue</td>
<td>$5,089,986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Rezoning Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>$11,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (Upgrade of Adjacent Roads/Sidewalks/etc)</td>
<td>$45,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard construction costs</td>
<td>$1,829,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$29,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs</td>
<td>$190,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>$165,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD Sewer Levy</td>
<td>$9,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLs</td>
<td>$31,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing</td>
<td>$67,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total construction costs</td>
<td>$2,338,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees/costs</td>
<td>$16,904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Developer's Profit | $803,682 |

**Residual to Land and Land Carry**

|  |
|-----------------|---|
| $1,947,953 |
| Less interim financing on land (approvals/presales/construction) | $163,044 |
| Less property purchase tax | $33,698 |
| Less property taxes | $9,481 |
| Residual Land Value | $1,741,730 |

| Residual Value per sq.ft. of site | $146.61 |
| Residual Value per square foot buildable | $133.28 |
## Major Assumptions (shading indicates figures that are inputs; unshaded cells are formulas)

### Revenue and Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Sales Price Per Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>$475 per sq.ft. of net saleable residential space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site and Building Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site size</td>
<td>3,960 sq.ft. or 0.09 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage feet x depth</td>
<td>33 x 120 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed density</td>
<td>0.85 FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total floorspace</td>
<td>3,966 sq ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net saleable space</td>
<td>3,366 sq ft. or 100.0% of gross area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Gross unit size</td>
<td>1,683 sq ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Net unit size</td>
<td>1,683 sq ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>2 units or 1.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Stalls</td>
<td>2 stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stalls</td>
<td>2 stalls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Construction Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>$3,960 or about $2 per sq.ft. of existing building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (3)</td>
<td>$15,091 or about $1,500 per lineal metre of frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Cost Used in Analysis (2)</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$5.00 per sq.ft. of site area on 50.0% of site (not covered by building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs (1)</td>
<td>10.0% of hard costs, servicing, landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>5.0% of hard and soft costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD Sewer Levy</td>
<td>$0.00 per unit (not charged on 4 units or less)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>$0.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLs</td>
<td>$2,430 per sq.ft. of building area or $4,090 per average unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing on construction costs</td>
<td>6.0% on 50% of hard and soft costs, assuming a 1.0 year construction period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees</td>
<td>0.75% of hard and soft costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Costs and Allowances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rezoning Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Commissions</td>
<td>3.0% of gross revenue (MLS listing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer's Profit</td>
<td>10.0% of gross revenue, or 11.1% of total costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>0.421% of assessed value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed current assessment (Year 1 of analysis)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed assessment after 1 year of construction (Year 2 of analysis)</td>
<td>$799,425 (50% of completed project value)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross sales revenue</td>
<td>$1,598,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less marketing and commissions</td>
<td>$47,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net sales revenue</td>
<td>$1,550,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Rezoning Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</td>
<td>$3,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Servicing (Upgrade of Adjacent Roads/Sidewalks/etc)</td>
<td>$15,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Predevelopment Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard construction costs</td>
<td>$572,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft costs</td>
<td>$59,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency on hard and soft costs</td>
<td>$33,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVRD Sewer Levy</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLs</td>
<td>$8,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim financing</td>
<td>$21,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing fees/costs</td>
<td>$5,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total construction costs</td>
<td>$728,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer's Profit</td>
<td>$159,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual to Land and Land Carry</td>
<td>$662,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less interim financing on land (approvals/presales/construction)</td>
<td>$55,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less property purchase tax</td>
<td>$10,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less property taxes</td>
<td>$3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Land Value</td>
<td>$593,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Value per sq.ft. of site</td>
<td>$149.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Value per square foot buildable</td>
<td>$176.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 7: Detached Strata Houses (Proposed)

**Major Assumptions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue and Value</th>
<th>Site and Building Size</th>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th>Other Costs and Allowances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Sales Price Per Sq. Ft.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site size</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rezoning Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$480 per sq.ft. of net saleable residential space</td>
<td>7,920 sq.ft. or 0.18 acre</td>
<td>$7,920 or about $2 per sq.ft. of existing building</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumes premium over duplex, but discount to traditional SFD</td>
<td>66 frontage feet x 120 feet depth</td>
<td>$30,183 or about $1,500 per lineal metre of frontage</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site and Building Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site size</strong></th>
<th><strong>Assumed density</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total floorspace</strong></th>
<th><strong>Net saleable space</strong></th>
<th><strong>Average Gross unit size</strong></th>
<th><strong>Average Net unit size</strong></th>
<th><strong>Number of units</strong></th>
<th><strong>Required Parking Stalls</strong></th>
<th><strong>Residential Stalls</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total Stalls</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,920 sq.ft. or 0.18 acre</td>
<td>0.80 FSR</td>
<td>6,336 sq.ft.</td>
<td>6,336 sq.ft. or 100.0% of gross area</td>
<td>1,584 sq.ft.</td>
<td>1,584 sq.ft.</td>
<td>4 units</td>
<td>1.00 per unit</td>
<td>4 stalls</td>
<td>4 stalls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Allowance for Demolition of Existing Buildings</strong></th>
<th><strong>On-Site Servicing (3)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other Predevelopment Costs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Hard Cost Used in Analysis (2)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Landscaping</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,920 or about $2 per sq.ft. of existing building</td>
<td>$30,183 or about $1,500 per lineal metre of frontage</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td>$5.00 per sq.ft. of site area on 50.0% of site (not covered by building)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Costs and Allowances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Developer's Profit</strong></th>
<th><strong>Property Taxes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Assumed assessment after 1 year of construction (Year 2 of analysis)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Analysis</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.0% of gross revenue, or 11.1% of total costs</td>
<td>0.421% of assessed value</td>
<td>$1,520,640 (50% of completed project value)</td>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross sales revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Less marketing and commissions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Net sales revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Construction Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,041,280</td>
<td>$91,238</td>
<td>$2,950,042</td>
<td><strong>Allowance for Rezoning Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$7,920</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,183</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,077,120</strong></td>
<td><strong>Landscaping</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>Soft costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$30,183</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,710</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,710</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contingency on hard and soft costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,387</strong></td>
<td><strong>$62,387</strong></td>
<td><strong>GVRD Sewer Levy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>SSAC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,396</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,396</strong></td>
<td><strong>DCLs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$2,430</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,941</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,941</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interim financing on construction costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$0.75%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,160</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,160</strong></td>
<td><strong>Residual to Land and Land Carry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual Value per sq.ft. of site</strong></td>
<td><strong>Residual Value per square foot buildable</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,139,887</strong></td>
<td><strong>$304,128</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residual to Land and Land Carry**

- **Residual Value per sq.ft. of site** $143.93
- **Residual Value per square foot buildable** $179.91
Proposed Clarendon Connector Project

1. Reduce road width of Nanaimo Street south of 33rd Avenue

2. Connect Clarendon St. to 33rd Avenue

3. Signalize intersection, create a left-turn lane on 33rd Avenue (without widening), and install sidewalk links

4. Convert Slocan to 1-way North-bound at 33rd and improve for pedestrians and cyclists

5. Add trees to Clarendon between 34th and 41st Avenues

6. Reconfigure Kingsway/ 34th and Wales intersections to eliminate left turn movements and to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists

7. Add bulges on Clarendon at 38th and 39th Avenues

8. Add bulges on all corners of Clarendon and 34th Avenue, with stop signs on 34th