

# EcoDensity, Liveability & the Future of Vancouver's Public Realm

Report from the February 18, 2008 Community Workshop

---

Submitted to Mayor, Council and the City of Vancouver Planning Department  
Prepared by the Vancouver Public Space Network

## Contents:

Executive Summary  
Introduction & Methodology  
Part 1 - Defining Liveability  
Part 2 - Accounting for Issues and Assets  
Part 3 - Recommendations

Appendix A - Additional Participant Questions Regarding EcoDensity



**About the Vancouver Public Space Network**

The VPSN was founded in early 2006 to work on “*advocacy, education and outreach pertaining to Vancouver’s public spaces.*” Since that time our membership has grown to include over 500 individuals and organizations. VPSN activities are coordinated by a total of eleven working groups.

**For more information on the Network:**

Website: [www.vancouverpublicspace.ca](http://www.vancouverpublicspace.ca)

Email: [info@vancouverpublicspace.ca](mailto:info@vancouverpublicspace.ca)



# :: Executive Summary

On Monday, February 18, 2008, the Vancouver Public Space Network (VPSN) convened a community workshop on the City of Vancouver's EcoDensity initiative. The workshop, entitled EcoDensity, Liveability and the Future of Vancouver's Public Realm was designed to focus specifically on how the City's proposed initiative might impact on the city as a liveable place with a vibrant quality of life. The aim was to generate a record of community issues, concerns and ideas around liveability issues.

The evening featured a presentation by the Mr. Brent Toderian, Director of Planning at the City, and was followed up by a set of 10 facilitated small-group discussions. Approximately 120 participants were in attendance.

Community-generated definitions of liveability suggest that for EcoDensity to be successful, it will have to incorporate a broad range of liveability considerations in a clear and meaningful way. EcoDensity, in other words, needs to be a holistic initiative that is mindful of the social, environmental, economic and cultural ecology that underpin the city's sustainability.

Participants were also concerned about the nature of changes made between the May 2007 and November 2007 EcoDensity Charter and Actions. Commentary received at the VPSN workshop suggests that future iterations of the EcoDensity Charter and Actions need to address community concerns about liveability in a more precise and articulate fashion.

In general people expressed particular concern over four overarching themes: (1) mobility and transportation; (2) economic access to the city/questions of affordability; (3) considerations about neighbourhood scale, development and land-use; and, (4) the availability and accessibility of a range of community amenities, spaces and places. Underpinning all of these is a desire for a high degree of community inclusiveness, participation and engagement.

The final report contains a total of 10 "high-level" recommendations (with sub-recommendations) pertaining to EcoDensity and its relation to Vancouver's quality of life. These recommendations, along with the present supporting material, have been submitted to City Council and City Staff as part of the Public Meeting on EcoDensity on February 27, 2008.

## Ten Recommendations Emerging from the Workshop (*abbreviated*):

- 1) Affordable Housing.** Acknowledging that liveability is greatly enhanced by the availability of quality, affordable housing, ensure that EcoDensity results in the maximum range of housing types.
- 2) Mobility & Transportation.** Clearly articulate the City's commitment to integrating mobility and transportation considerations into all EcoDensity planning.
- 3) Proximity.** Ensure that the ecology of density in Vancouver allows people to be close to the important things in their lives, including community amenities, greenspaces, jobs, retail and cultural activities.
- 4) Neighbourhood Scale.** Promote a "Liveable Scale" for the City and its Local Areas, while strengthening neighbourhood identity and cohesion.
- 5) Community Amenities and Supports.** Ensure a sufficient capacity of appropriate, well-designed amenities and supports for the community to meet the needs of increased density.
- 6) Equity, Basic Needs, Safety.** Provide an explicit commitment to ensuring that the goals and attributes of a liveable city are accessible to all.
- 7) Economic Accessibility & Participation.** Champion the fact that the City can play a role in promoting affordability, assist in the maintenance of a vital local economy, and provide good value for money with its liveability-promoting 'assets.'
- 8) Public Spaces and the Public Realm.** Ensure that density does not inhibit the provision of a diversity of welcoming spaces and experiences (events, artistic installations, points of distinction) to meet the needs of different ages, ethnicities, and lifestyles – as well as to provide them with opportunities to encounter one another.
- 9) EcoDensity Coordination.** Ensure that the inter-departmental nature of the EcoDensity Project is enhanced, so that initiatives and expertise in all relevant City departments are appropriately resourced to strengthen the City's liveability.
- 10) EcoDensity Communication.** Ensure that EcoDensity communications materials are presented in a clear, focussed fashion – free from excess planning jargon, and reflecting the precise commitments of the City.

# :: Introduction

On Monday, February 18, 2008, the Vancouver Public Space Network (VPSN) convened a community workshop on the City of Vancouver's EcoDensity initiative. The workshop, entitled EcoDensity, Liveability and the Future of Vancouver's Public Realm was designed to focus specifically on how the City's proposed initiative might impact on Vancouver as a liveable place with a vibrant quality of life.

The rationale behind focusing on liveability was two fold. First, the intention of EcoDensity to support "a liveable city" has been one of the central goals (along with "sustainability" and "affordability") espoused by official EcoDensity literature since the initiative was first introduced. Many of the features commonly associated with liveability – parks, gathering places, vibrant streetscapes, etc. - are linked to the public realm. This made the EcoDensity initiative of particular interest to the VPSN because of the nature of our own mandate – which is to "engage in advocacy, education and outreach pertaining to Vancouver's public spaces."

Secondly, and perhaps more directly, the VPSN's ongoing analysis of the EcoDensity materials - suggests that the role of "liveability" has been progressively watered down from earlier versions. Part of our goal in conducting this work was to ensure that the message (more specifically, the social, political and material requirements) of liveability promoted by the EcoDensity initiative was not reduced to vague generalities or intangible goals. The capacity turn out for the event suggests that this is a view shared by many Vancouverites.



We were pleased to have the City's support for our work – in particular through the presence of Mr. Brent Toderian, Director of Planning, and Thor Khulman, EcoDensity Planner. Our workshop featured a presentation by Mr. Toderian, and was followed up by a set of 10 facilitated small-group dis-

cussions. The present report summarizes the key findings from these discussions, a brief analysis of their contents, and some general recommendations for the consideration of Council and City staff.



## Methodology

Approximately 120 people participated in the small group discussions. Each group was moderated by a VPSN facilitator with the ensuing conversations transcribed by a Note-Taker.

The three questions that groups worked on were:

1. What does Liveability mean to you?
2. Assets and Issues with Vancouver's Liveability – What's Working and What Needs Improvement?
3. What key strategies could the City of Vancouver undertake to maintain or enhance the city's liveability?

Notes from the workshop were transcribed and then assessed for points of commonality and difference.

A set of 10 recommendations were then produced that reflected the key points of concern raised by participants, as well as the VPSN's analysis of the EcoDensity initiative.

# :: PART ONE | Defining Liveability



Participants at the VPSN workshop responded by naming a diverse array of amenities and qualities that they associate with liveability. Of these, four overarching themes appeared throughout: (1) mobility and transportation; (2) economic access to the city/questions of affordability; (3) considerations about neighbourhood scale, development and land-use; and, (4) the availability of a broad range of community amenities, spaces and places. Underpinning all of these is a desire for a high degree of community inclusiveness, participation and engagement.

The following points provide an overview of the numerous ways that participants understand liveability. They are organized

One of the inherent challenges posed by the EcoDensity initiative is the problem of defining liveability. In the EcoDensity literature (e.g. EcoDensity Primer), such definition is accomplished with reference to various features or amenities, or via the notion of a positive quality of experience. But here and elsewhere in the planning materials, the actual essence of 'what liveability is' remains more elusive.

To that end, we felt that one of the critical pieces of work was to try to scope out what liveability means to people, and what they felt made a place liveable.

Participants were concerned about the nature of changes made between the May 2007 and November 2007 EcoDensity Charter and Actions. Commentary received at the VPSN workshop suggests that the future iterations of the EcoDensity Charter and Actions need to address these concerns about liveability in a more precise and articulate fashion.

Community-generated definitions of liveability suggest that for EcoDensity to be successful, it will have to incorporate a broad range of liveability considerations in a clear and meaningful way. EcoDensity, in other words, needs to be a holistic initiative that is mindful of the social, environmental, economic and cultural ecology that underpin the city's sustainability.

in a fashion that moves from the experience of liveability, through provision basic needs, opportunities for involvement and participation, to the availability of key amenities and services and the opportunity to move around.



## :: PART ONE | Defining Liveability

---

**General - the experience of liveability.** Participants recognized that the idea of liveability was subjective – and means different things to different people. The connotation of liveability was seen as positive, indexing place and people, past, present and future. One person suggested that: “Liveability is opportunity – opportunity to pursue the career they want, to study, to have a place in the city they like to be, to have housing opportunities – having the different elements they need to make their lives liveable on a day to day basis – having the elements there you need to reach your dreams – affordability is a piece of that – cultural diversity and people respecting one another – people saying thank you to the bus driver – for some people a sense of community matters and others it doesn’t...”

**Liveability begins with ensuring that basic personal & social needs are met.** This includes food, water, shelter, health, opportunities for communal behaviour and contact, welcoming spaces and more.

**Liveability includes food security and involves the entire the food system.** As an aspect of basic needs, participants felt that a liveable city was one in which the equitable availability of food (food security) is paramount. Local food production (including urban agriculture), farmers markets and community kitchens were also identified as key components of liveability. The importance of dealing with food waste through composting and recycling programs was also noted.

**A liveable city includes a range of well-designed, affordable housing and rental options, with appropriate supports for those who need them.** To this end, participants noted the importance of mixed-use housing and neighbourhoods, the importance of co-operative housing, and the need for equitable distribution of social, non-market and supported housing throughout the city. Design considerations were also considered important to many, and participants felt that merely ensuring adequate housing was not enough – that liveability meant a diversity of options, each of them well-crafted. Participants were deeply concerned about the role of housing in mitigating the effects of homelessness.

**A liveable city has a clean environment.** This means clean air, water and soil, good environmental stewardship, elaborate waste reduction and management strategies, less litter and pollution of all sorts (including noise), and the opportunity for people to access nature in a variety of ways.

**A liveable city is comprised of strong, diverse communities - with many opportunities and places for encounter.** The importance of heterogeneity to urban life was emphasized time and again by participants. They suggested that the liveable city was in which a “richness” or diversity of people, lifestyles, age groups, ethnicities and genders could come together in a safe and respectful fashion. Participants also suggested that neighbourhoods themselves reflect this sense of difference – (“diversity in neighbourhoods and among neighbourhoods - not everything needs to be the same!”). Importantly, one of the other features that participants emphasized was the need for more points and places where people can meet, assemble and interact with one another. People are concerned that density will inhibit interaction and neighbourliness.

**A liveable city should be built on foundations of equity and justice.** Participants questioned the notion of liveability, by asking “Liveability for whom?” and noted that in order for a city to be liveable, it also has to be equitable.

**A good quality of life includes opportunities for belonging and meaningful engagement.** A number of participants emphasized that the opportunity for engagement with their community (local or intentional), civic structures or next door neighbours was deeply important to them. The various networks that contribute to the building of social capital are an important feature of liveability. As one participant noted: “Liveability is more than simply a physical manifestation. It is also the ability to be involved in your community & neighbourhood. It is feeling comfortable and accepted for who you are. In addition to a high quality pedestrian environment, parks, etc (‘the usual’), it’s the quality of social relations.”

**Liveability requires economic accessibility, employment & economic participation.** The overarching theme of affordability did not, in participants’

minds, link solely to housing. The high cost of living in Vancouver is seen as a broad threat to quality of life. In contrast, a liveable city is seen as one where most (if not all) people “have the ability to take part in the life of the city, and to have shared access to the space and content of the city.” To do this, a liveable city requires a sufficient range of jobs that pay enough to allow reasonable participation in the economy - or, as another participant noted, “enough money to cover basics of life and go on a holiday.”

**Liveability includes opportunities for creativity.** Liveable cities are vibrant, eclectic and artistic. Participants noted liveability was enhanced by “creative people” engaged in creative acts. A liveable city is one that is able to provide space for artists and creators.

**Liveable cities contain beautiful, interesting features and places.** The aesthetics of the city help to contribute to its vitality. As one participant noted: “many of the new buildings have disappointing aesthetics. It isn’t critical to liveability, but is disappointing. But when I see a beautiful building with attention to detail, it makes me happy.”

**Liveability means having good public spaces - places to gather, recreate, celebrate, debate or just watch the world go by.** Participants noted the importance of having a sufficient number of enjoyable and accessible public spaces for all residents regardless of their age, ethnicity, abilities, where they live. In view of increased densification, this was also seen as an item of concern – given the potential for more people to be sharing an already limited pool of public realm resources. Finally, the importance of ensuring that public spaces remain fully public (i.e. not privatized or subject to corporate intrusion) was highlighted.

**Liveability includes semi-public places to gather - (Third Places).** A number of participants made mention of the features they found that enhanced other cities they had visited. Often these were things like small-scale neighbourhood cafes and bars – which, are seen as “classless and thus encourage conversation with neighbours and strangers.”

**Liveability allows for opportunities to encounter nature, green space and the outdoors.** Participants noted the importance of green spaces as part of the urban quality of life. In addition to parks (large and small), this was also reflected in references to community and rooftop gardens, open spaces, green streets and the urban forest.

**A liveable city is comprised of appropriate, well-designed and equitably distributed amenities & supports.** Here, amenities include community centres, neighbourhood houses, libraries, schools, places of worship, child development and daycare facilities, as well as seniors supports and centres, and services for those with physical and mental disabilities. Good design was substantively linked to a robust “green architecture” component.

**A liveable city is one in which residents are close to the important things in life.** The importance of proximity to enabling a good quality of life was a key feature in participants’ comments. People want to live near their jobs, near the amenities, greenspaces and services they use, the place where they get groceries or can enjoy a quick coffee or drink. Liveability, said one participant, “is related to all the activities you can do without needing a car.” Under this formula, the more activities that are close enough to enable alternatives, the more liveability increases.

**Liveability is enhanced by “compact localism” - a neighbourhood scale for community-building, a human scale for building.** A large number of participants made mention of the importance of neighbourhoods to their quality of life. This was seen as a positive outcome of Vancouver’s planning over the past decades, and something that participants wanted to see maintained and enhanced. They register as a focal point for a ‘local sense of place.’ In particular the compact nature of neighbourhoods are seen as a place of connection with fellow citizens, the development of community, as well as personal and family growth. In addition to the geography of neighbourhoods, participants also commented on the scale of built form and its relation to liveability. “Human-scale” buildings were seen as critical

## :: PART ONE | Defining Liveability

---

features of the liveable city – though as one participant suggested: “Human-scale doesn’t necessarily mean size of building but how do you feel in those buildings: public space is an important part of this.”

**A liveable city has a vital, animated, and varied street life.** Streets are often seen as arteries – places for moving along and through. Here, workshop participants noted that streets were also valuable spaces of activity and entertainment, vibrant commercial life and lively interaction.

**Liveability depends on a sense of safety and well-being - but not an excess of security.** Public safety is a concern for participants, many of whom identified that fear is a threat to quality of life. Liveable cities are ones that are accessible and safe, with low rates of crime and the type of social interaction amongst neighbours that allows people to ‘look out for one another’ – similar to the idea of “eyes on the street” as espoused by Jane Jacobs. Participants expressed concern about an excess of impersonal security measures impacting on liveability – suggesting that more security measures do not automatically equal a greater quality of life.

**Making a city liveable means enabling mobility.** Commentary on transportation, walkability, cycling and cars – in general, “the means to move around” – were among the most substantive (in quantitative terms) in our workshop. Several consistent sub-themes emerged in this area, each of which is interrelated.

- 1) Liveability means a reduction in automotive traffic - in particular Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) automotive traffic - as well as the parking infrastructure that supports this traffic. Where cars are needed, liveability means shifting to more environmentally-friendly automobiles - such as hybrid or electric vehicles;
- 2) A liveable city requires a robust transit system that is convenient and timely, safe, takes people to where they want to go, runs late, isn’t cost prohibitive, and has sufficient capacity to ensure that people aren’t left waiting;
- 3) Liveability is equated with a pedestrian-friendly city that is characterized by a high degree of walkability, as well as the infrastructure – wider sidewalks, appropriate signalling, etc. to support and encourage this; And,
- 4) In addition to pedestrian infrastructure and walkability, a liveable city is one that promotes cycling as a viable, year-round alternative – through an elaborate network of well-maintained bike routes and bike-lanes, good signage and wayfinding and safe, appropriate public locking and storage infrastructure.

# :: PART TWO | Issues and Assets

---

The following is a summary of the issues and assets identified during the workshop by Vancouver residents. Vancouverites are generally positive towards the various elements that comprise the city's liveability but they would like to see a greater quality and quantity of investment in these amenities and infrastructure. Many are concerned that adding more density will put additional pressure on already stressed public amenities such as community centres, parks and childcare facilities. There is an underlying concern that the densification of local areas will mean that neighbourhoods will become less familiar and people will not be connected with their community in the same way. Under scoring this anxiety is the desire to maintain a sense of neighbourliness and community that is rooted in local geography.

Vancouverites are looking for the city to be affordable, and for affordable housing choices that are located close to grocery stores, other shops and services, transit, schools, parks, community centres and other amenities. In order for a diverse city such as Vancouver to be liveable, residents need to be able to afford to live there. People are looking for a variety of housing types that respect the heritage of the neighbourhood and strengthen the identity of the different neighbourhoods that make up Vancouver.

Vancouverites are excited to get out of their cars and enjoy the existing bicycle network. They support traffic calming

initiatives such as the traffic circles and green streets program. However, to transition to a less auto-dependant lifestyle, they want a convenient and accessible alternative to the private car.

Vancouverites want to have the choice of being able to walk everywhere on a safe and extensive pedestrian oriented and human scale network of streets and greenways throughout the city.

Public transit was another hot topic at the well attended workshop and we heard many suggestions and comments on how transit must be substantively improved to meet the demands of the citizens of this city.

Vancouverites are concerned about the human scale of the urban built form that encourages interaction and allows one to know their neighbour. People want to live, work and play within walking distance. People are looking for community based events located in neighbourhood parks to celebrate their community.

People are looking for more places to meet other Vancouverites or to plan community celebrations and just to hang out. We have heard that if Vancouver is to be a liveable place, social equity is to be realized, critical social issues must be addressed, and support for community building must be paramount.

# :: PART THREE | Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on resident strategies documented at the VPSN workshop for including liveability within the EcoDensity Charter Statement and Set of Actions.

*Revise the November 2007 EcoDensity Charter Statement and Set of Actions to attend to the following recommendations...*

## A - Ensuring EcoDensity Maintains and Enhances Vancouver's Liveability

### 1. Housing

Acknowledging that liveability is greatly enhanced by the availability of quality, affordable housing, ensure that EcoDensity results in the maximum range of housing types. In so doing:

- (a) Continue to investigate alternative housing types for new developments; develop an expedited process to test and approve innovative new designs and tenure models;
- (b) Consider new tax and enforcement mechanisms to ensure maximal use of existing housing stock
  - 'Use it or lose it' taxation – where a higher rate of taxes is implemented for people that buy homes for investment purposes and leave them unoccupied,
  - Implement a No-flipping by-law that installs re-sale controlled agreements into housing sales;
- (c) Implement new models of housing finance and development – including City financed housing that is sold to consumers below market rates with a re-sale controlled agreement in place. Utilize best practises, such as the Verdant Re:think development on Burnaby mountain.

### 2. Mobility and Transportation

Clearly articulate the City's commitment to integrating mobility and transportation considerations into all EcoDensity planning. In particular, consider:

- (a) Facilitating and advocating for a greater number of quality public transportation options – including increased hours, service capacity, physical accessibility (universal design) and

routing options at a cost that is economically accessible to transit-users;

- (b) Ensuring that the principle of "walkability" (proximity planning) is demonstrably included in all neighbourhood and city-planning exercises;
- (c) Increased investment in quality cycling infrastructure, including bike routes, bike-lanes, bicycle way-finding, and locking and storage infrastructure;
- (d) Support for mechanisms that will lead to a reduction in automobiles and automobile usage, a switch to more environmentally-friendly cars, and support for car-share co-ops, rideshare programs, and reduced parking availability.

### 3. Proximity

Ensure that the ecology of density in Vancouver allows people to be close to the important things in their lives, including community amenities, greenspaces, jobs, retail and cultural activities. To assist with this:

- (a) Utilize zoning mechanisms and tax incentives to ensure the availability of neighbourhood scale shops, services, cafes and pubs;
- (b) Review zoning and licensing regulations to ensure the presence of vibrant commercial streetscapes in all neighbourhoods – particularly where a post-6pm lull occurs. Encourage extended opening hours for stores, restaurants and bars.

### 4. Neighbourhood Scale

Promote a "Liveable Scale" for the City and its Local Areas, while strengthening neighbourhood identity and cohesion. In doing so:

- (a) Recognize that Neighbourhoods might not be totally analogous to the City's Local Areas and will thus require a scale of response greater than the current "per-local-area" formula that is often used in planning activities;
- (b) To mitigate the effects of increasing numbers of people, promote mechanisms for interaction;
- (c) Strengthen neighbourhood identities through local celebrations, additional neighbourhood grants, public art and other "signature" design aspects;
- (d) Per November 2007 Actions – "pursue the achievement of neighbourhood plazas or community gathering places" – but ensure that

these are designed and built using a participatory planning process – so as to reflect the needs of Vancouver's diverse communities and heterogeneous neighbourhoods.

## 5. Community Amenities & Supports

Per the May 2007 suggested Ideas and Actions - Ensure a sufficient capacity of appropriate, well-designed amenities and supports for the community to meet the needs of increased density. In particular, consider:

- (a) New amenity space should be built with a consideration of flexible design; community centres and other shared spaces need to be re-worked to allow for diverse current and future uses;
- (b) Cluster new developments around existing or planned amenities – rather than arterials – make amenities the “hubs.”
- (b) Develop amenities that will promote sustainable, “green” living - such as community compost and recycling centres and other waste-reduction initiatives.

## 6. Equity, Basic Needs, Health, Safety

Provide an explicit commitment to ensuring that the goals and attributes of a liveable city are accessible to all.

- (a) Recognizing that liveability requires that basic needs (individual and communal) be met, create an integrated city-wide plan to ensure a high quality of life for all residents;
- (b) Enhance local food production and food-security initiatives – including a more robust investment in community gardens, community kitchens and emergency food services;
- (c) In collaboration with the VPD, ensure that Public Safety is strengthened through publicly accountable, community-based initiatives – such as Community Policing Offices, and beat-patrols.

## 7. Affordability: Economic Accessibility & Economic Participation

In order for a diverse city such as Vancouver to be liveable, residents need to be able to afford to live there. At the same time the City and its tax-paying residents should be prepared to pay for quality, recognizing taxes as an investment that will pay dividends.

Where market forces are often beyond Municipal control, the City should champion the fact that the City can play a role in promoting affordability, assist in the maintenance of a vital local economy, and provide good value for money with its liveability-promoting ‘assets.’

- (a) Create local economic incubators to support the creation of jobs, entrepreneurs and local economic development;
- (b) Ensure an equitable, non-stigmatizing means to mitigate user fees for community amenities and programs - so as to encourage the accessibility of these services;
- (c) Investigate the creation of additional “financing growth” mechanisms to fund community amenities (i.e. like Development Charge Levies, Bonusing, etc. but sustainable into the long-term);
- (d) Promote the benefit of taxes, and play a leadership role in allocating tax revenues (and tax increases) to fund the social, economic and environmental infrastructure needed to ensure liveability.

## 8. Public Spaces and the Public Realm

Public spaces are the “glue” that binds together a liveable city. To strengthen this bond, the City needs to ensure that density does not inhibit the provision of a diversity of welcoming spaces and experiences (events, artistic installations, points of distinction) to meet the needs of different ages, ethnicities, and lifestyles – as well as to provide them with opportunities to encounter one another. In particular:

- (a) To respond to the needs posed by increased density, (re)consider the idea of a “no net loss” formula for green space, public and community space (ha/person, m<sup>2</sup>/person, etc.) – to ensure that there is a measurable tool to ensure equity and transparency;
- (b) Recognize that streets are more than just arteries for moving through; work to provide more amenities such as benches, public washrooms, and stopping points;
- (c) Enable opportunities to encounter nature and green space – through an expansion (and re-sourcing) of community gardens, greenstreets, urban forestry and urban agriculture.
- (d) Better enforce traffic noise by-laws so as to deal with the preponderance of noisy vehicles and their effect on quality of life.

## B - EcoDensity - Organizational Components and Communications

### 9. EcoDensity Work at the City of Vancouver - Collaboration

As the three main components of the EcoDensity policy- affordability, sustainability and liveability are broad-reaching the EcoDensity should not only be a planning policy but should encompass all City departments to ensure that it is comprehensive and consistent with delivery and development of all city programs and services. Therefore:

Ensure that the inter-departmental nature of the EcoDensity Project is enhanced, so that initiatives and expertise in all relevant City departments are appropriately resourced to strengthen the City's liveability.

### 10. EcoDensity Communications & Participation

Ensure that EcoDensity communications materials are presented in a clear, focussed fashion – free from excess planning jargon, and reflecting the precise commitments of the City.

- (a) Clarify the difference between EcoDensity Charter Statements and Initial Actions – as the distinction between goals and actions is currently difficult to understand;
- (b) People want to feel that they are actively engaged with consultation and planning processes that listen to and involve them, and make use of their expertise. Therefore, ensure that there are on-going, neighbourhood-based opportunities for dialogue, city/resident collaboration, and community-driven participatory planning processes.



# Appendix A - List of Participant Questions for City of Vancouver

---

1. How can the city ensure that increased density will also improve affordability of housing?
2. What are the city's plans for pedestrian only streets?
3. Is the city considering rent controls to create more affordability?
4. How is density being increased in neighbourhoods such as Shaughnessy, Kerrisdale, West Point Grey and Dunbar? Will there be more amenities in these areas too?
5. How do the City of Vancouver's planning processes interact with adjacent municipalities?
6. How much space is set aside for public art inside and outside of new buildings?
7. How is Ecodensity going to address the ecological footprint of older buildings and practices?
8. How will ecodensity be carried forward if there are new politicians and different civic political parties changing over time?
9. How do we accommodate dogs in an Ecodense city?
10. How can we ensure that people can afford to live in the city and not move out to the suburbs and forced to drive back into the city?
11. How will you generally implement the ideas of residents?
12. How can the existing rental properties be protected to ensure that people can afford to rent and live in Vancouver?
13. How does the Gateway plan fit with the Ecodensity plan?
14. Why can we make affordable and supportive housing an imperative when negotiating with developers?
15. What are your views on Co-housing?
16. How can the city preserve and enhance existing artist studio spaces?
17. How will ecodensity avoid turning Vancouver into a Bangkok or Mexico City?
18. How do you change or shift the paradigm to a "new way of life" that supports the "single planet" concept?
19. How does ecodensity address the 2010 Olympics?
20. How can the planning department guarantee

- that the outcome of the ecodensity public consultation process will be adopted by council?
21. What cities is Vancouver looking to as models for implementing ecodensity ideas and why?
  22. How can we increase public spaces in areas like the DTES?
  23. It is possible to change the minimum apartment size (currently 398ft<sup>2</sup>)?
  24. Is the City of Vancouver advocating for electric car use?
  25. What are the limits to population growth and the carrying capacity of the Fraser River Delta?
  26. How can the items listed in the ecodensity charter and action items related to liveability be measured?
  27. How can Vancouver ensure that accessory dwelling unit zoning won't become a tool for real estate speculation?
  28. What are the city's plans for road tolls?
  29. What are the city's plans for pedestrian only streets?
  30. What is the city doing to allow retail in residential areas (i.e. corner stores)?
  31. How can ecodensity help the homelessness crisis in the city?
  32. How come your images used in your presentation don't include images from east of main or south of 12th?
  33. How is ecodensity going to have a real impact on housing affordability?
  34. Where do trees and green space and gardens fit into the ecodensity plan?
  35. Do you really think that housing affordability can be addresses solely through the market?
  36. What is the role of Ecodensity in helping foster a sense of community/ or is ecodensity more about physical form?
  37. Are there plans to fund and support community projects within neighbourhoods that are not initiated by the City?
  38. When new development proposals are submitted for approval weather they be commercial, industrial or residential will they all be evaluated in terms of their ecological footprint?
  39. How can we encourage more people to embrace living in a multi-family style dwelling?