

# False Creek South: Opportunities for the Future Engagement Summary Report

**City of Vancouver** February 1–28, 2021

**PREPARED BY** Kirk & Co. Consulting Ltd.

# Kirk&Co.

#### ABOUT KIRK & CO. CONSULTING LTD.

Kirk & Co. is a recognized industry leader in designing and implementing comprehensive public and stakeholder consultation and engagement programs. Utilizing best practices, consultation and engagement programs are designed to maximize opportunities for input, Kirk & Co. independently analyzes and reports on public and stakeholder input.

# Contents

| 1.0 Executive Summary     | 02 |
|---------------------------|----|
| 2.0 Background            | 05 |
| 3.0 What Was Consulted On | 06 |
| 4.0 Engagement Overview   | 08 |
| 5.0 Engagement Methods    | 10 |
| 6.0 What we heard         | 12 |

#### Appendix A

Survey results

**Appendix B** Notification materials

**Appendix C** Engagement materials

# **1.0** Executive Summary

#### **ABOUT THE PROJECT**

Over the month of February, the City of Vancouver engaged residents of Vancouver to gather input about how 80 acres of City-owned lands in False Creek South could be used to help address the housing crisis, and contribute to achieving other priorities such as accelerating action on climate change, increased focus on equity and critical social issues, and protecting and building the local economy.

From February 1-28, 2021, the City provided information about considerations for the public land, and sought feedback from Vancouver residents and stakeholders. During this time, there was a total of 4,349 public and stakeholder interactions, including completed surveys, submissions via email, and seven online community engagement sessions.

#### Participation by the Numbers:



**4,349** public and stakeholder interactions



277 online meeting attendees



### 3,944

completed surveys from Vancouver residents and False Creek South business owners. Over one-quarter (28%) of those who completed surveys reside in False Creek South.



### 3

written submissions via email



questions asked verbally during online meetings

#### How we collected survey responses

| City of Vancouver's                                   | Representative   |
|---|--|
| Talk Vancouver  | public opinion   |
| online portal   | survey   |
| Open to all Vancouver                                 | Online survey  |
| residents and False                                   | conducted of   |
| Creek South business                                  | Vancouver residents  |
| owners from February                                  | by Leger Research in                                       |
| 1-28, 2021  | January 2021   |
| 3,944 completed                                       | 800 completed  |
| surveys   | surveys  |
| About 28% of<br>respondents from False<br>Creek South | Data is weighted to reflect Vancouver's population by age, |
| Data is not weighted                                  | gender, geographic   |
| to reflect Vancouver's                                | sub-region, and visible                                    |
| population  | minority status  |

The same questions were used in each survey for comparison purposes

#### ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT FEBRUARY 1–28, 2021

Feedback will be used by the City to help inform longterm decisions about the City-owned lands in False Creek South. Public input from this engagement will also inform the City's broader Vancouver Plan.

A wide range of comments was received throughout the four-week engagement period. The following are key findings of what we heard:

#### 1. Overall support for the City to consider opportunities to increase housing that is affordable to a range of incomes, and address public priorities, in False Creek South.

Just over three-quarters (76%) of Talk Vancouver survey respondents agreed that the City should explore the potential opportunities to increase housing that is affordable to a range of incomes, and address other public priorities in False Creek South. A city-wide representative public opinion survey of 800 respondents found similar results with four-infive (80%) agreeing the City should explore potential opportunities in False Creek South.

#### 2. Majority of Vancouver residents see all housing types as very or fairly important, with family housing, accessible and adaptable housing, and purpose-built rental seen as most important overall.

When asked about increasing housing on Cityowned lands in False Creek South, family housing, accessible and adaptable housing, and purpose-built rental housing had the highest level of importance of nine types listed, with all types seen by a majority of respondents as very or fairly important.

#### 3. Majority of Vancouver residents view public priorities as important to address with environmental and social priorities ranked as most important.

In addition to potentially adding housing that is affordable to a range of incomes, the majority of Vancouver residents surveyed viewed other priorities as very important, such as planning for rising sea levels and shoreline stability, increasing sustainable transportation choices, enhancing park space, creating an equitable, diverse, and inclusive community, and helping reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Overall, representative public opinion survey respondents indicated a higher level of importance for public priorities compared to Talk Vancouver survey participants. In particular, public opinion survey respondents were more likely to view creating jobs and economic opportunities, advancing the City's reconciliation efforts, and using City-owned lands to provide new entertainment and cultural spaces as important.

## 4. Vancouver residents agree with potential housing development approaches.

Vancouver residents strongly agreed that: the neighbourhood should continue to have a mix of different housing types; Vancouver residents should have priority in accessing housing that is affordable to a range of incomes; any redevelopment should take place first on vacant land; and redevelopment should take place incrementally and be phasedin to minimize disruption. Over two-in-three residents agreed the City should use revenue from the development of market units in False Creek South to help pay for more non-market housing that is affordable to a range of incomes in the neighbourhood.

## 5. Current residents of False Creek South are seeking certainty regarding leases.

A very clear theme of feedback from residents of False Creek South is the desire to get clarity regarding lease ends and potential lease extensions, particularly among strata leaseholders and co-op members. This theme was reinforced through survey responses, responses to open-ended Talk Vancouver survey questions, emails, and in stakeholder meetings. Many False Creek South residents articulated how their community currently offers a mix of affordable housing choices, and expressed support for the neighbourhood plan developed by RePlan, a sub-committee of the False Creek South Neighbourhood Association (FCSNA) which was created to advance lease concerns with the City.

#### ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT FEBRUARY 1–28, 2021

A majority of city-wide respondents in the Talk Vancouver survey agreed that providing clarity for residents currently living on City-owned lands in False Creek South is a "very important" consideration, along with providing clarity for businesses operating in False Creek South. A majority of city-wide respondents in the public opinion surveys also agreed it was an important priority.

Some False Creek South residents questioned why Vancouver residents outside of False Creek South were being consulted, as well as the impact of consultation on timelines to resolve issues surrounding lease ends.

Overall, a majority of False Creek residents (63%) agreed that the City should explore the potential opportunity to increase housing that is affordable to a range of incomes and address other public priorities in False Creek South.

#### 6. While there is much consistency in results between False Creek South, city-wide, and representative public opinion survey respondents, there are differences in degree of importance and agreement.

Overall, results were fairly consistent across survey platforms and audiences, with differences noted below mainly a matter of degree.

False Creek South respondents in the Talk Vancouver survey are very familiar with the neighbourhood and feel very strongly about the need for clarity on leases, compared to public opinion survey respondents. They indicate lower levels of importance for the City exploring options to create additional housing that is affordable to a range of incomes in this location, and specifically, lower levels of importance for housing types such as purposebuilt rental, Indigenous housing, workforce housing, first-time homeowners housing, and social housing, compared to city-wide and public opinion survey respondents. City-wide respondents in the Talk Vancouver survey are more likely to view "ensuring decisions concerning the future of City-owned lands are financially responsible" and "considering how Cityowned lands in False Creek South could potentially help address public priorities..." with a higher level of importance, compared to False Creek South respondents.

Respondents in the representative public opinion survey also viewed "financially responsible" and "potentially help address public priorities" with higher level of importance. These respondents also viewed housing for first-time homeowners as a more important priority than Talk Vancouver participants, and also viewed creating jobs and economic opportunities, advancing the City's Reconciliation efforts, and providing new entertainment and cultural spaces with higher level of importance than Talk Vancouver participants.

Compared to False Creek South residents, city-wide respondents in the Talk Vancouver survey and in the representative public opinion survey had a higherlevel agreement with regard to using revenue from developing market units in False Creek South to help pay for more non-market and affordable housing units in False Creek South.

# **2.0** Background

The False Creek South neighbourhood is located between the Cambie and Burrard Street bridges on the south shore of False Creek, excluding Granville Island and Squamish Nation lands located near the south end of the Burrard Street Bridge. In the 1970s, the City transformed industrial land in this area into a unique community with a mix of housing, park lands, amenities and waterfront access. This visionary development created a legacy that became a model for progressive urban planning, nationally and around the world.



The City of Vancouver owns and manages 80 acres of this land on behalf of Vancouver citizens. Vancouver is situated on the unceded traditional territories of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh Nations.

When this neighbourhood was built in the 1970s and 1980s, much of the land was leased by the City to tenants via 60-year leases, with most of these leases expiring in the next 15 to 25 years. No new housing has been built in False Creek South since the 1980s. Today, False Creek South is a primarily residential neighbourhood, with approximately 1,800 units on leased City-owned lands. Many of the leases expire between 2036 and 2046, including two co-op leases that expire in the next six to 48 months. Considerations for the future of False Creek South include:

- How City-owned lands in False Creek South could potentially help address priorities in the best interests of all Vancouver residents.
- Clarifying potential future uses for False Creek South lands for residents and businesses located on these City-owned lands.
- Ensuring decisions concerning the future of Cityowned lands are financially responsible.

ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT FEBRUARY 1–28, 2021

# **3.0** What Was Consulted On

#### WHAT WERE THE GOALS OF THIS ENGAGEMENT?

- To invite Vancouver and False Creek South residents to provide input and feedback as Council develops a long-term vision for 80-acres of City-owned lands in False Creek South Lands.
- Specifically, with the expiry of most current leases taking place in 15 to 25 years, the City, in its role as landowner, sought public feedback on the potential opportunity to address how long-term use of these lands can help address public priorities, such as helping address the housing crisis, and environmental, social, and economic priorities.
- To provide opportunities for Vancouver and False Creek South residents to offer additional feedback through open-ended survey questions, feedback by email, and through public information sessions and stakeholder meetings
- Topics of engagement also included:
  - The importance of a range of considerations for the City to take into account as it considers the long-term use of these lands
  - The importance of adding different types of potential housing options
  - Agreement or disagreement on a range of statements about the way in which potential housing development could take place in False Creek South
  - The importance of addressing a range of other public priorities – environmental, social, and economic - on City-owned lands in False Creek South

#### The City as Landowner and Regulator

The City of Vancouver plays two important roles in False Creek South: Landowner and Regulator.

The City owns and manages hundreds of acres of land on behalf of Vancouver residents, including in False Creek South. The lands are essentially owned by the citizens of Vancouver and managed for the public's benefit, for example to provide housing, economic opportunities, park space and amenities. As landowner of 80 acres in False Creek South, the City is determining a vision for these lands, and results of this engagement will inform this vision.

The 2017/2018 False Creek South community planning process was conducted in the City's capacity as regulator, and is connected but separate from the City's work as landowner. While the community planning process is currently on hold, the work will be reinitiated once Council develops a long-term vision for the land. Before any potential future development on City-owned lands occurs, a planning process would take place as required for any proposed development, and it would account for community feedback, among other inputs.

#### HOW WAS FEEDBACK COLLECTED?

- 1. Representative Public Opinion Survey: Preceding the engagement period, a third-party representative public opinion survey was commissioned to understand the views of City residents as a whole, balanced by age, gender and geographic subregion. The intention of this survey was to collect responses from a group of 800 respondents who are statistically similar to Vancouver demographics. These results provide a representative comparison to public consultation feedback collected from participants in the Talk Vancouver survey, public meetings, and emails.
- 2. Talk Vancouver Survey: Using the same questionnaire as the public opinion survey, the Talk Vancouver survey ran throughout the month of February 2021. The survey was sent to the City's 15,000 Talk Vancouver members, and City residents could also visit the City website to take the survey. Paper copies of the survey were also provided. The results of the survey reflect those who opted to participate in the process.
- 3. Seven Online Meetings: Throughout February, two public information sessions were held, and five smaller stakeholder meetings: three meetings were held to hear from current residents and stakeholders of False Creek South, and two meetings included city-wide individuals and organizations related to housing and development. There was a total of 277 attendees at the seven online meetings. Attendees viewed a presentation and then had the opportunity to ask questions. Feedback was summarized for the purpose of this engagement summary report.
- 4. Written submissions: Written comments were also invited through email.

All of this feedback was considered in reporting what Vancouver residents think about the opportunities for the future of this City-owned land, including specific feedback from False Creek South residents. All feedback that was collected from the surveys, meetings and submissions was organized into the key themes that will be discussed in this report.

# **4.0** Engagement Overview

#### **ENGAGEMENT TIMING**

From Monday, February 1 to Sunday, February 28, 2021, the City of Vancouver conducted stakeholder and public engagement regarding the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South. Information about the neighbourhood, including history, its current status, and potential opportunities for the future were shared, and feedback was sought to determine on this information.

#### NOTIFICATION

Stakeholders and the public were notified about the public engagement opportunities using several notification methods:



#### Postcard drop

2,053 postcards were delivered to residents and businesses in False Creek South and Granville Island.

| ľ |            |
|---|------------|
|   | <b>U</b> - |
|   | <b>三</b>   |
| L |            |

#### Fact sheets

Two fact sheets were posted on the Shape Your City project page. One fact sheet was translated into simplified Chinese, traditional Chinese and Punjabi.



#### Stakeholder invitation email

Notification emails were sent to key stakeholder groups to provide information about the meetings and other opportunities to participate in the engagement.



#### Talk Vancouver email

Emails were sent to approximately 15,000 Talk Vancouver members to notify them of the survey.



#### Shape Your City project page

Information about the engagement period, including ways to participate and engagement materials, were posted on the City's digital engagement portal, Shape Your City Vancouver: **shapeyourcity.ca/fcslands**. Information about engagement opportunities were also posted on the City's web site.



#### Social Media

Posts were shared on the City's social channels to create awareness of the engagement and how to participate, including Twitter, Facebook, Instagram and Reddit.

|   | 7  |
|---|----|
| - | ノレ |

#### Video

A project video was posted on the Shape Your City project page, YouTube, and shared on social media.

| _ | Р |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | - |  |
|   |   |  |

#### **Information Bulletin**

An information bulletin about the engagement, including ways to participate, was published by the City and distributed to news outlets.

**ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY REPORT** FEBRUARY 1–28, 2021

#### PARTICIPATION

By the Numbers:



**4,349** public and stakeholder interactions



**written submissions via email** 



#### 277 online meeting attendees



**91** questions asked verbally during online meetings



### 3,944

completed surveys from Vancouver residents and False Creek South business owners. Over one-quarter (28%) of those who completed surveys reside in False Creek South.

Opportunities to provide input included verbal comments in meetings and information sessions, a survey and email submissions.



# **5.0** Engagement Methods

#### ONLINE INFORMATION SESSIONS & STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

Throughout February, two information sessions were held, and five smaller stakeholder meetings. Due to B.C. Public Health Orders restricting in-person gatherings and events, all engagement events were held online using the City's WebEx Events platform, with the option for people to join using a web-enabled device or call in via telephone.

There were originally two stakeholder meetings planned to engage with False Creek South residents and stakeholders, and two stakeholder meetings were intended to include city-wide stakeholders. Due to significant interest from residents and stakeholders in False Creek South, an additional meeting with that group was held to ensure all who were interested had a chance to participate.

At each of these online events, the Deputy City Manager delivered a presentation about the engagement, followed by a facilitated verbal question and answer session and discussion. Written questions and comments could be submitted and have been considered in the engagement record. In total, there were 277 participants at the seven online meetings.

#### SURVEY TOOLS AND APPROACH

Quantitative and qualitative feedback was collected from Vancouver residents through two survey tools using the same questionnaire.

- A representative public opinion survey received feedback from a randomly selected, representative sample of 800 Vancouver residents, reflecting Vancouver's demographic profile.
- A Talk Vancouver survey for Vancouver residents and False Creek South businesses. Results of this survey reflect those who participated.

**Representative Public Opinion Survey:** Between January 15 and January 27, 2021, an independent survey was conducted by Leger, a national public opinion research firm with an office in Vancouver. 800 people were invited to participate in the survey, without knowing the topic in advance, through Leger's online panel. Respondents included those aged 18+ in Vancouver who are representative of the demographics of the City's residents in terms of gender, age, and region of the city. Additionally, the number of respondents who are a visible minority represented Vancouver's current population overall.

The survey included nine questions to assess familiarity with the area, gauge respondents' thoughts on potential priorities for the area in the coming decades, and understand if residents thought that the City should explore potential public opportunities.

The answers to this public opinion survey provide a baseline with which to compare what was heard in other public engagement methods, and provides additional consistency and validity of public input across engagement methods.

The City shared the questions in advance with, and considered feedback from, representatives of RePlan, a sub-committee of the False Creek South Neighbourhood Association (FCSNA) which was created to advance lease concerns with the City.

#### TALK VANCOUVER SURVEY

Between February 1 and 28, 2021, the City conducted a Talk Vancouver survey on False Creek South, seeking input from Vancouver residents and False Creek South business owners/operators. With the addition of two demographic questions, the Talk Vancouver survey included the same consultation questions as the public opinion survey that was conducted in January, and rendered similar results.

Residents and businesses were invited to participate via the Talk Vancouver panel membership, and an public link to the survey was posted on the City's digital engagement hub, Shape Your City Vancouver which allowed any Vancouver resident or False Creek South business owners to participate. In addition, the survey link was emailed to stakeholders at the beginning of the engagement period, and attendees of the online information sessions and stakeholder meetings were also encouraged to complete the survey.

In total, there were 3,944 completed responses from Vancouver residents and/or False Creek South business owners who opted to complete the survey. Of these 3,944 respondents who completed the survey, about 28% responded that they are residents of False Creek South. Preceding the survey questions, respondents were provided background information on False Creek South including: a neighbourhood map; information on how the neighbourhood was transformed from industrial land into a unique community in the 1970s; information on current land ownership in the neighbourhood including that the City owns most of the land; and two paragraphs of background information regarding housing units and housing types on leased City-owned land in False Creek South.

Only responses from those that live in the City of Vancouver and/or own a business in False Creek South, were included in the data analysis.

Questionnaires and results from both surveys can be found in Appendix A.

RESULTS

# **6.0** What we heard

#### SURVEY RESULTS - PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY AND TALK VANCOUVER

#### Survey respondents very or somewhat familiar with False Creek South

Overall, there was high familiarity with the False Creek South neighbourhood reported in the Talk Vancouver survey. Outside of the neighbourhood, 97% of Vancouver respondents who responded through Talk Vancouver said they were very or somewhat familiar with the neighbourhood, as did over three-quarters (76%) of respondents in the representative public opinion survey.

|   | Talk Vancouver —<br>city-wide (excluding<br>False Creek South) <sup>1</sup> | Public opinion<br>survey |  |
|---|---|--------------------------|--|
| How familiar are you with               | 97%   |                          |  |
| the False Creek South<br>neighbourhood? | 76%   |                          |  |

\*Percentages are rounded. See reports in Appendix A for breakdown of importance scale per question.

1. Respondents include residents of Vancouver, excluding residents of False Creek South, and False Creek South business owners who reside in Vancouver but not False Creek South

#### Clarity for residents is most important consideration when it comes to the future of False Creek South; majority of Vancouverites see all considerations as important

Survey respondents were asked about the importance of a set of considerations concerning the future of False Creek South:

With the expiry of most current leases taking place in 15 to 25 years, the City, in its role as landowner, has an opportunity to consider potential long-term use of its lands to help address public priorities. At the same time, the current residents are seeking clarity from the City over the future of their land leases.

## Q. How important are the following considerations when it comes to the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South?

Providing clarity for residents currently living on City-owned lands in False Creek South about future plans for these lands

Providing clarity for businesses currently operating on City-owned lands in False Creek South about future plans for these lands

| Talk Vancouver<br>— all <sup>1</sup> | Talk Vancouver —<br>False Creek South<br>only <sup>2</sup> | Talk Vancouver —<br>city-wide (excluding<br>False Creek South) <sup>3</sup> | Public opinion<br>survey |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 92%                                  |  |   |                          |
| <b>96</b> %                          |  |   |                          |
| <b>90</b> %                          |  |   |                          |
| 88%                                  |  |   |                          |
| 87%                                  |  |   |                          |
| 89%                                  |  |   |                          |
| 86%                                  |  |   |                          |
| 87%                                  |  |   |                          |

**Ensuring decisions** concerning the future of City-owned lands are financially responsible



That the neighbourhood

of incomes in Vancouver

reflect Vancouver's diversity (today, over half of Vancouver's population identifies as a visible minority)

\* Results include "very important" and "fairly important" (combined)

\*\*Percentages are rounded. See reports in Appendix A for breakdown of importance scale per question.

- 1. Respondents include residents of Vancouver and/or business owners in False Creek South
- 2. *Respondents include residents of False Creek South only*
- 3. Respondents include residents of Vancouver, excluding residents of False Creek South, and False Creek South business owners who reside in Vancouver but not False Creek South

80% **72%** 83% 88%

RESULTS

A majority of Vancouver respondents indicated that the considerations listed in the survey were very or fairly important when it comes to the future of False Creek South. The degree of importance ranged from 65% to 92% among Talk Vancouver respondents, with "providing clarity for [False Creek South] residents" as the highest ranked consideration.

Respondents who believe that clarity for residents is "very important" ranged from 64% in the representative public opinion survey, to 72% among non-False Creek South respondents in the Talk Vancouver survey, and 86% of False Creek South respondents who completed the Talk Vancouver survey. The importance of providing clarity for False Creek South residents was a consistent theme in online public meetings and was also reinforced in emails and open-ended comments. *See pages 27–32, summarizing themes on public meetings.* 

- 59% of Vancouver respondents said that "providing clarity for business operating in False Creek South" is a "very important" consideration and about 9-in-10 (87%) said it is a "very" or "fairly important" consideration.
- 51% of Talk Vancouver respondents said that "ensuring decisions concerning the future of Cityowned lands are financially responsible" is a "very important" consideration and 8-in-10 (80%) said it is a "very" or "fairly important" consideration (including over 7-in-10 False Creek South respondents). Almost 9-in-10 (88%) city-wide respondents in the public opinion survey said it was a "very" or "fairly important" consideration.

- 56% of Vancouver respondents said that "considering City-owned lands in False Creek South could potentially help address public priorities in the best interests of all Vancouver residents, such as housing affordability, worker housing, climate change, job creation, equity, diversity, and reconciliation" is a "very important" consideration and about 8-in-10 (79%) said it is a "very" or "fairly important" consideration.
  - Over two-thirds of younger respondents (age 15-35 years) viewed this as a "very important" consideration and over 8-in-10 (84%) said it is a "very" or "fairly" important consideration.
  - Almost half (47%) of False Creek South respondents said it is a "very important" consideration and about 7-in-10 (74%) said it is a "very" or "fairly" important consideration.
- 65-77% of Vancouver respondents said that other considerations – that the neighbourhood should reflect Vancouver's diversity, have a mix of ages, a range of incomes – were seen as a "very" or "fairly important" consideration. Older respondents (55+) felt more strongly about a mix of ages, while younger respondents (15-35) felt more strongly about reflecting Vancouver's diversity and range of incomes.

#### RESULTS

### Majority of city-wide and neighbourhood respondents say it's important to explore options to create additional housing that is affordable to a range of incomes in False Creek South

 74% of respondents thought that the idea of exploring options to create additional housing that is affordable to a range of incomes in False Creek South was "very" or "fairly important," including two-thirds (66%) of False Creek South respondents. Almost 8-in-10 respondents in the city-wide public opinion survey said it was "very" or "fairly important."

# Q. In considering the future of its 80 acres of public land in False Creek South, how important is it for the City to explore options to create additional housing that is affordable to a range of incomes in this location?



\* Results include "very important" and "fairly important" (combined)

\*\*Percentages are rounded. See reports in Appendix A for breakdown of importance scale per question.

- 1. Respondents include residents of Vancouver and/or business owners in False Creek South
- 2. Respondents include residents of False Creek South only
- 3. Respondents include residents of Vancouver, excluding residents of False Creek South, and False Creek South business owners who reside in Vancouver but not False Creek South
- 51% of respondents thought that exploring options to create additional housing that is affordable to a range of incomes in False Creek South was "very important." Those most likely to say it's "very important" are women (55%), 15-35 age group (63%), renters (66%), co-op members (68%), and those living outside the False Creek South area (56%).

## Majority of Vancouver respondents see all housing types as very or fairly important, with family housing, accessible and adaptable housing, and purpose-built rental seen as most important overall

Overall, the top three ranked housing types, by importance, were consistent between Talk Vancouver and representative public opinion survey respondents – family housing, accessible and adaptable housing, and purpose-built rental. False Creek South respondents viewed seniors housing as the third most important housing type.

### Q. If there was new housing developed on City-owned lands in False Creek South, how important would it be to increase each of the following types of housing?



RESULTS

'Missing Middle' – diverse housing options, such as duplexes, townhomes, fourplexes, cottage courts, and multiplexes that fill the gap between single-family homes & multi-family apartment buildings

**Co-op** – non-profit, often subsidised housing controlled by resident co-op members who have a vote in decisions concerning the operation and maintenance of their building

Social Housing – rental buildings with rent amounts that are subsidized, making it more possible for people with lower incomes to find housing they can afford

attainable to first-time

homebuyers

 Indigenous Housing –
 53%

 housing available to
 49%

 Indigenous families and
 54%

 individuals
 58%

 First-Time Homeowners
 51%

 Housing – market housing
 49%

 on leased land at a price
 52%





| 63% |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 56% |  |  |
| 66% |  |  |
| 66% |  |  |



\* Results include "very important" and "fairly important" (combined)

\*\*Percentages are rounded. See reports in Appendix A for breakdown of importance scale per question.

- 1. Respondents include residents of Vancouver and/or business owners in False Creek South
- 2. Respondents include residents of False Creek South only
- 3. Respondents include residents of Vancouver, excluding residents of False Creek South, and False Creek South business owners who reside in Vancouver but not False Creek South

While there is much consistency in what was heard from False Creek South respondents and city-wide respondents in the Talk Vancouver survey, city-wide respondents were more likely to view various housing types as important such as purpose-built rental, workforce housing, social housing, and Indigenous housing. The city-wide results for nine of the 10 housing types were within 5 percentage points difference of the representative public opinion survey results, with the exception being first-time homeowners housing with the public opinion survey results ranking it as more important.

City-wide Talk Vancouver respondents viewed family housing (48%), accessible and adaptable housing (46%), and purpose-built rental (45%) as very important, consistent with the top three housing types ranked as very important in the public opinion survey. False Creek South respondents viewed family housing (51%), accessible and adaptable housing (45%), and co-op housing (45%) as very important.

City-wide, women viewed accessible and adaptable housing (54%), co-op housing (50%), and social housing (45%) as very important. Renters viewed purposebuilt rental (56%), seniors housing (55%), and family housing (52%) as very important. Older respondents were more likely to view seniors housing (47%) as very important. The 35-55 age group was more likely to view family housing (54%) as very important, while younger respondents (15-35) were more likely to view purpose-built rental (45%), Indigenous housing (37%), and housing for first-time homeowners (33%) as very important. Other types of housing did not have as much variance between age groups.

Respondents were asked if there are any other types of housing that they would like to see in False Creek South. In the public opinion survey, open-ended responses included "affordable housing", "townhouse/ condos/co-ops/co-housing", "housing for the homeless/ social housing", and "apartments". Other open-ended comments included "maintain integrity of the area" and "no high rise/towers/high density".

## Q. Are there any other types of housing you would like to see in False Creek South?

In the Talk Vancouver survey, there was a range of openended responses when asked about other types of housing, including general opposition to more housing options, along with support for consideration of affordable housing and co-op housing, and support for greater density and housing stock due to the growing need for housing in the City. Some respondents expressed support for housing for marginalized groups, and for market housing (both rental market housing and home ownership).

Please see the ten comments that were mentioned with the most frequency below. For full results, please refer to Appendix A.

| Comment  | Frequency (n) |
|--|---------------|
| Comments that expressed <b>opposition</b> to <b>redevelopment</b> , including that housing options are fine as they are now                        | 55            |
| Suggest considerations for <b>affordable housing</b>   | 52            |
| Suggested considerations for <b>co-op housing</b>  | 52            |
| Comments that included the need for <b>greater density</b> and <b>housing stock</b> including comments that there is a <b>growing housing need</b> | 47            |
| Comments for housing marginalized groups   | 44            |
| Suggested considerations for <b>market-housing</b> (both rental market housing and homeownership)  | 41            |
| Participants expressed <b>opposition</b> to <b>high rise buildings</b>   | 35            |
| Suggestions for incorporation of green spaces, trails, bike lanes  | 32            |
| Comments that suggest consideration of <b>multi-use housing</b>  | 31            |
| General comments that housing options should be <b>affordable</b> for <b>low and middle-income earners</b>   | 29            |

#### RESULTS

#### Selected Quotes (Talk Vancouver Survey)



Vancouver respondents agree with potential housing approaches: Continued mix of housing types, priority access for Vancouver residents, phased-in development, starting with vacant land, and using revenue from market-based housing to help fund non-market housing

Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with five statements that could guide how any potential development of housing options could take place. Agreement with the statements ranged from 68% to 90% among Talk Vancouver respondents, and ranged from 79% to 89% among city-wide respondents in the public opinion survey.

### Q. For the following statements about potential housing options in False Creek South, please indicate your level of agreement.



Vancouver residents, and people who work in Vancouver, should have priority in accessing affordable housing in False Creek South

Any redevelopment should take place incrementally, and phased-in over time, to minimize disruption

Any redevelopment should take place first on vacant land

The City should use revenue from developing market units (e.g., condos, townhouses) in False Creek South, to help pay for more non-market and affordable housing units in False Creek South



\* Results include "very important" and "fairly important" (combined)

\*\*Percentages are rounded. See reports in Appendix A for breakdown of importance scale per question.

- 1. Respondents include residents of Vancouver and/or business owners in False Creek South
- 2. Respondents include residents of False Creek South only
- 3. Respondents include residents of Vancouver, excluding residents of False Creek South, and False Creek South business owners who reside in Vancouver but not False Creek South

About 9-in-10 of respondents in the Talk Vancouver survey (90%) and public opinion survey (89%) agreed that the neighbourhood should continue to have a mix of different housing types, with the majority strongly agreeing (61% and 50% respectively). Over 9-in-10 of False Creek South respondents also agreed (92%). Older respondents (55+) were more likely to strongly agree (66%).

Agreement was consistent overall between the Talk Vancouver respondents and public opinion survey respondents on priority for Vancouver residents to access affordable housing, redevelopment being phased-in over time, to minimize disruption, and that redevelopment should take place first on vacant land. Older respondents (55+) were more likely to strongly agree on "phased-in over time" (60%) and "redevelopment taking place first on vacant land" (54%).

On using revenue from developing market units in False Creek South to help pay for more non-market and affordable housing units in False Creek South, over twothirds (68%) of Talk Vancouver respondents agreed, and 6-in-10 (60%) in False Creek South, compared to about 4-in-5 (79%) in the public opinion survey.

RESULTS

## Majority of Vancouver respondents view public priorities as important to address with environmental and social priorities ranked as most important

Of nine public priorities presented in the survey, the majority of respondents across the city and in False Creek South viewed them as "very" or "fairly important", ranging from 57% to 89% among city-wide Talk Vancouver participants, 53% to 85% among False Creek South respondents, and 66% to 86% among representative public opinion survey respondents.

# Q. In addition to potentially adding affordable housing, City-owned lands in False Creek South present a potential opportunity to help address other public priorities. How important are each of the following priorities when considering the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South?



Use City-owned lands in False Creek South to try innovative urban planning and sustainability practices that can be replicated in other neighbourhoods

opportunities

and cultural spaces

Advance the City's

Nations and urban

Indigenous partners

Reconciliation efforts,



\* Results include "very important" and "fairly important" (combined)

\*\*Percentages are rounded. See reports in Appendix A for breakdown of importance scale per question.

- 1. Respondents include residents of Vancouver and/or business owners in False Creek South
- 2. *Respondents include residents of False Creek South only*
- 3. Respondents include residents of Vancouver, excluding residents of False Creek South, and False Creek South business owners who reside in Vancouver but not False Creek South

REPORT RESULTS

The top two most important priorities – planning for rising sea levels and shoreline stability, and increased sustainable transportation choices - were consistent between Talk Vancouver respondents and public opinion survey respondents, including False Creek South residents.

The relative ranking of the priorities from 1 to 9 were the same between the city-wide Talk Vancouver respondents and False Creek South respondents.

Among Talk Vancouver respondents, there were some differences between men and women. Women rated rising sea levels and shoreline stability, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, advancing reconciliation, and creating an equitable, diverse, and inclusive community as more important compared to men. Men viewed creating jobs and economic opportunities and providing new entertainment and cultural spaces as more important priorities than did women.

Priorities were mostly consistent among age groups. Younger respondents viewed providing new entertainment and cultural spaces and advancing reconciliation as a higher priority than other age groups.

Public opinion survey respondents were much more likely to view creating jobs and economic opportunities as important (85%), including respondents selfidentifying as a visible minority (87%).

Overall, public opinion survey respondents viewed priorities as more important than Talk Vancouver survey participants, and the gap was wider among the priorities that ranked lowest– creating jobs and economic opportunities, advancing the City's reconciliation efforts, and using City-owned lands to provide new entertainment and cultural spaces. Q. Do you have any other suggestions about how City-owned land in False Creek South could potentially be used to help address public priorities, as noted in the above question, such as housing affordability, climate change, job creation, equity, diversity, and reconciliation over the coming decades?

Survey respondents were asked if they had any other suggestions about how City-owned land in False Creek South could potentially be used to help address public priorities, as noted in the prior question, such as housing affordability, climate change, job creation, equity, diversity, and reconciliation over the coming decades.

Respondents of the Talk Vancouver survey noted that they're interested in seeing a wide array of amenities be provided in the area, such as grocery stores, restaurants and retail spaces, and incorporation of green spaces, trails and bike lanes. Respondents also suggested consideration of affordable housing and that housing be built sustainably. Some respondents expressed opposition to redevelopment.

Please see the ten comments that were mentioned with the most frequency below. For full results, please refer to Appendix A.

Most public opinion survey respondents (83%) did not offer further ideas. Those that did respond suggested ideas including adding affordable/low-income housing, community spaces (e.g., parks, green space, walkways, recreation centre), maintaining the integrity of the neighbourhood, green building practices, and business space/amenities (e.g., retail, restaurants, health care).

| Comment  | Frequency (n) |
|--|---------------|
| Comments suggesting that a wide array of <b>amenities</b> be provided (eg. grocery store, restaurants, retail spaces, adequate parking spaces, artist studios, public restrooms, public transit, schools, hospitals, community centers, public pool, daycares) | 165           |
| Suggestions for incorporation of green spaces, trails, bike lanes  | 144           |
| Suggest considerations for affordable housing  | 82            |
| Comments that expressed <b>opposition</b> to <b>redevelopment</b> , including that housing options are fine as they are now  | 75            |
| Comments that housing be <b>built sustainably</b> (eg. green roof, electric vehicle fueling stations, parked for shared vehicles)  | 70            |

| Comment  | Frequency (n) |
|--|---------------|
| Comments that pertain to <b>preserving</b> the <b>unique environment</b> of False Creek, including FCS is a <b>model</b> for housing affordability | 64            |
| Comments that included the need for <b>greater density</b> and <b>housing stock</b> including comments that there is a <b>growing housing need</b> | 55            |
| Suggested considerations for <b>co-op housing</b>  | 47            |
| Participants expressed general support for housing options   | 42            |
| Comments about ensuring proper engagement with <b>Indigenous groups</b> and suggestions related to land use for Indigenous peoples                 | 42            |

#### Selected Quotes (Talk Vancouver Survey)

"We need more restaurants and coffee shops along the seawall like the Olympic Village has."

"Very important to retain the access to the shoreline and the quantity of park space."

"Create functional high density subsidized housing for working class couples who make under 100K a year. Use the City-owned land and tax revenue to build these. Do not leave it to non-profits or market housing developers."

> "I don't see how demolishing a bunch of property and co-ops is going to address affordability for anyone. You're more likely to displace an entire population who've been paying affordable rents for a few decades only to remarket new units that heavily favour development of condo towers and drive the price of rental units to 'market rates' valued well over what the average resident can afford."

"Introduce innovative sustainable communities as a pilot project!"

# Over three-quarters of Vancouver respondents agree that the City should explore the potential opportunity to increase affordable housing options, and address other public priorities, in False Creek South

There is broad agreement among survey respondents with city-wide respondents in the Talk Vancouver survey and public opinion survey at the same level (80%). Majority of city-wide Talk Vancouver participants strongly agreed (55%); over 2-in-5 public opinion survey respondents (43%) strongly agreed.

# Q. Overall, with the expiry of most land leases taking place in 15 to 25 years, do you agree or disagree that the City should explore the potential opportunity to increase affordable housing options, and address other public priorities, in False Creek South?



\* Results include "very important" and "fairly important" (combined)

\*\*Percentages are rounded. See reports in Appendix A for breakdown of importance scale per question.

- 1. Respondents include residents of Vancouver and/or business owners in False Creek South
- 2. Respondents include residents of False Creek South only
- 3. Respondents include residents of Vancouver, excluding residents of False Creek South, and False Creek South business owners who reside in Vancouver but not False Creek South

While a majority of False Creek South residents agreed the City should explore the opportunity (63%), it was a lower level of agreement than city-wide respondents.

Men and women were consistent in their agreement (77%); a majority of those who preferred not to reveal their gender and those who self-described as nonbinary or gender diverse agreed with the City exploring the opportunity (56% and 61% respectively). In the public opinion survey, men and women also had the same level of agreement (80%).

Younger people (15-35) were more likely to strongly agree (63%) and agree overall (84%). The majority of middle-aged people (36-55) strongly agreed (51%) and over three-quarters (76%) agreed overall. About three-quarters of older respondents (56+) agreed (73%), including over 4-in-10 (44%) that strongly agreed.

In the public opinion survey, agreement was consistent across age groups, ranging from 79% to 81%. Those who have lived in Vancouver less than 10 years showed a somewhat higher level of agreement (84%) than those who have lived in the city more than 10 years (79%).

Renters were more likely (86%) than homeowners (69%) to agree with exploring the opportunity. Co-op members expressed a similar level of agreement (84%) as renters. Almost two-thirds of renters (65%) and co-op members (64%) strongly agreed.

RESULTS

#### **ONLINE MEETINGS AND EMAIL SUBMISSIONS**

Two online information sessions and five stakeholder meetings were held. There were originally two stakeholder meetings planned to engage with residents and stakeholders of False Creek South, and two stakeholder meetings were intended to include city-wide stakeholders. Due to significant interest from residents and stakeholders in False Creek South, an additional meeting with that group was held to ensure all who were interested had a chance to participate. Many of the speakers at the public meetings were residents of False Creek South and/or members of RePlan, and some residents spoke in multiple meetings.

We also heard from members of Abundant Housing Vancouver, the Urban Development Institute, the Vancouver City Planning Commission, Broadway Lodge, and residents from the Residences for Independent Living Society, among others.

At each of these online events, the Deputy City Manager delivered a presentation about the engagement, followed by a facilitated verbal question and answer session and discussion. Written questions and comments could be submitted and are considered in the engagement record. In total, there were 277 participants at the seven meetings People were also invited to provide comments via email.

#### **Key Themes:**

Below are the key themes that were identified in the online meetings and email submissions. Themes were determined based on frequency of comment.

#### Lease Expiry Key Themes

At each of the meetings, in particular the meetings with residents and stakeholders of False Creek South, the theme of leases expiring was the most prevalent, with many strata leaseholders and residents of co-op housing sharing their stories about how this issue is affecting them. Discussion also included:

- Concerns about when residents will have clarity regarding their leases.
- Concerns about the impact of the lease uncertainty on residents, financially and emotionally.
- Concern about how co-op leases will be addressed.
- Concern about what will happen to False Creek South residents if leases are not extended.

## Selected Quotes (Public Consultation Meetings and Emails)

"I'm a senior and I'm worried about what's going to happen to me in the next 10-15 years. I don't know where I'm going to be or where I'm going to go, I'm feeling really vulnerable, and I want the City to be concerned about that."

"It's frustrating to me as we now have less than 25 years left on most leases, which has put people in a tremendous position of uncertainty regarding something that is very central to life, which is certainty around housing."

"I've always had confidence that the City would renew leases, but I see in the language and the rhetoric that your engagement team is putting out there just concerns me more and more that I'm going to be kicked out of my home when my kids are teenagers. And we'll have to find a place in 16 years from now, which isn't affordable housing for us."

"Why do co-ops have a different lease renewal framework in comparison to the stratas or the leaseholds?"

"To speak frankly, if the City's staff and political leadership decide to put the interests of private land developers above those of lower to middle income families living in the False Creek South by requiring the co-op lease renewals to be based on unaffordable housing options such as market rent, this would be disastrous for my family and the many other young families living in False Creek South."

#### **Housing Key Themes**

False Creek South respondents expressed that they value the current mix of housing that is in place today, while other respondents discussed the potential for new housing types in the area. Key themes related to housing included:

- Comments about the mix of housing types in the area and whether there are plans to maintain original ratios of one-third housing co-ops, one-third non-market rental units, and one-third leasehold strata units.
- Expressions of support for higher-density housing options.
- Comments suggesting that co-op housing in the neighbourhood is often internally subsidized, rather than publicly subsidized.
- Interest in seeing certain housing types considered, such as higher density options, and infill housing on vacant land.
- Concern about what will happen to existing housing if there is future redevelopment of the area.
- Comments that False Creek South currently represents the "missing middle" of housing options.

#### Selected Housing Quotes (Public Consultation Meetings and Emails)

"I'm hoping no one's actually considering putting duplexes in False Creek South. What about higher density forms? Should we not be considering 12-storey mass timber as legal now, and much higher forms in some places given the limited land?"

"It's important for the City understand that more often than not, and especially here in False Creek, co-ops are subsidizing internally. Co-ops are subsidizing internally, meaning that the membership are subsidizing other members. We are not taking money away from the public purse elsewhere."

"I strongly encourage the City of Vancouver to develop and present people with options for False Creek South that maximize the amount of affordable housing as well as financial, health, environmental and other benefits to the people of Vancouver and the region."

> "I have lived here [Residences for Independent Living Society] for 36 years and [I love] False Creek residence so much. The people of False Creek residence have been here and have taken care of us so good that this place would not be the same without them. I love the beautiful area of False Creek like people, the children running around, people biking around or walking their dog being surrounded by water. The False Creek Community is an extension of our family."

"Is the City considering options for immediate infill such as towers in spaces between existing buildings, to allow for faster action to address the housing crisis? Is there a plan to allow for this neighborhood to become less exclusive and more accessible to other residents of the city?"

> "Our co-op not only provides dignified living space, but a welcoming community and care for our most vulnerable within the community and keeping them in the community. I am asking the City not to break what is working so well and proven over the years as a model to aspire to."

"It [False Creek South] really is an amazing location for urban living. I mean, it's adjacent to downtown, it's adjacent to the Broadway corridor. These are the two biggest job concentrations in all of BC. Then of course, it has this lovely waterfront location, which you all enjoy. It's adjacent to the Canada Line, it will be close to the Broadway Subway. So, my question is: is the City considering just how urban the location is when it's considering how much housing to allow on these lands?"



#### **Engagement Process Key Themes**

Some participants expressed concern and asked questions about the engagement process, including materials, process and how it fit into previous engagements and planning processes. Key themes included:

- Concerns about the representation of False Creek South in the survey and engagement materials, particularly the use of demographic data that they felt did not represent the community accurately.
- Comments about the purpose of this engagement and how it relates to previous consultation that has been conducted in the neighbourhood.
- Comments about the relationship between the City's distinctly different roles of landowner and regulator.
- Comments wondering why the survey polled residents from across Vancouver.
- Comments about how this consultation process works alongside other planning processes in Vancouver.
- Comments about how non-profit organizations in the area will be engaged.

#### Selected Engagement Process Quotes (Public Consultation Meetings and Emails)

"What thoughts are being had as to how you will partner with non-profits in this process?"

"My question is, why didn't the survey questions and the whole approach to this community give more acknowledgement, and ask people an opportunity to say what they value about the community and to acknowledge what's already here?"

"Is this long-term high-level engagement process worth letting a vibrant and model community crumble in the meantime? You misrepresent the community in the survey and there is no acknowledgment."

"I'm curious to find out how this planning and consultation effort meshes with the extensive consultation that was already done on this area about two years ago. How is the City taking [that] into account?"

#### **Community Planning Key Themes**

There was a range of comments about the planning process. Key themes included:

- Comments about the timing of the next steps as the City puts together their vision for the area.
- Comments about how RePlan's vision for the future of False Creek South could be incorporated in the City's vision for the area.
- Expression of support for developing adjacent vacant land first.
- Comments about how and when the planning process will take place.
- Comments that the City should make sure that they consider what already exists in False Creek South before they plan for future development.
- Comments about how this False Creek South engagement takes into account the context of other developments in the surrounding area.
- Comments related to plans for additional schools in the area.
- Comments about how a rising sea level will affect False Creek South and what is being done to prepare.

#### Selected Planning Quotes (Public Consultation Meetings and Emails)

"When will the rising sea levels threaten the seawall, and will the City then be taking steps to prevent False Creek South from flooding?"

"How are you taking into consideration the densification of adjacent lands?"

"RePlan's developed a strong vision for the future of False Creek South with our community. Our vision incorporates the work done with the planning department in 2018, and addresses all relevant City of Vancouver policies with respect to new development, including the range of options talked about on the slides. Will our vision be incorporated into the survey results that are presented to Council?"

> "Going back to that ratio discussion earlier, part of the reason why we have those ratios is so you do have market housing which helps fund the social housing and a lot of the amenities. Is that still something the City is looking for in terms of a self-funding model. Is there a recognition that you may need market housing to help fund those other things?

"It [False Creek South] has always kind of struck me as kind of like a bit of like an exclave. Kind of hidden by itself and kind of quiet. Whatever vision there is, there has to be better connections with the surrounding neighborhoods. It's also not the best in in terms of transit connections."

#### Other

- Comments about park space within False Creek South and if it is protected as park land
- Comments about whether the City is engaging with Indigenous peoples in regards to the future of False Creek South



# Appendix A

Survey results

Talk Vancouver survey results
# False Creek South: Opportunities for the Future – Talk Vancouver Survey Topline Results

### Introduction

Between February 1 and 28, 2021, the City conducted a Talk Vancouver survey on False Creek South, seeking input from Vancouver residents and False Creek South business owners/operators. With the addition of two demographic questions, the Talk Vancouver survey included the same consultation questions as the public opinion survey that was conducted in January, and rendered similar results.

Residents and businesses were invited to participate via the Talk Vancouver panel membership, and a public link to the survey was posted on the City's digital engagement hub, Shape Your City Vancouver which allowed any Vancouver resident or False Creek South business owners to participate. In addition, the survey link was emailed to stakeholders at the beginning of the engagement period, and attendees of the online information sessions and stakeholder meetings were also encouraged to complete the survey.

In total, there were 3,944 completed responses from Vancouver residents or False Creek South business owners who opted to complete the survey. Of these 3,994 respondents who completed the survey, about 28% responded that they are residents of False Creek South.

#### Survey

This survey is about potential uses of City-owned lands in Vancouver and how they could help address public priorities.

Specifically, the City of Vancouver owns 80-acres of land in the False Creek South neighbourhood, located between the Burrard Street bridge and Cambie Street bridge, on the south shore of False Creek. In the 1970s, the City transformed industrial land in this area into a unique community with a mix of housing, park lands, amenities and waterfront access.



In the False Creek South neighbourhood, the City of Vancouver owns most of the land. The rest of the land is privately-owned or owned by other levels of government. False Creek South borders Squamish Nation lands, which are on the neighbourhood's western boundary. Click here to see a map of ownership in the area.



Share your thoughts on future opportunities in the False Creek Lands. Your feedback will be used to help inform long-term decisions about the future of False Creek South. Public input from this engagement will also inform the City's broader Vancouver Plan.

Preceding the survey questions, respondents were provided background information on False Creek South. Only responses from those that live in the City of Vancouver and/or own a business in False Creek South were included in the data analysis.

#### 1. How familiar are you with the False Creek South neighbourhood?

| Very familiar       | 2638 | 66.89% |
|---------------------|------|--------|
| Somewhat familiar   | 1214 | 30.78% |
| Not very familiar   | 80   | 2.03%  |
| Not familiar at all | 12   | 0.30%  |

Today, there are approximately 1,800 housing units on leased City-owned land in False Creek South. Most of the leases expire between 2036 and 2046. While there has been much new housing built and proposed around False Creek in the past two to three decades, no new housing has been built in the False Creek South neighbourhood since the 1980s. The City leases its land for about an equal mix of market and non-market housing. Housing types include:

- Leasehold strata (townhouses and condos)
- Co-op housing
- Non-market rental (including seniors housing)
- Social housing
- Long-term care homes

With the expiry of most current leases taking place in 15 to 25 years, the City, in its role as landowner, has an opportunity to consider potential long-term use of its lands to help address

public priorities. At the same time, the current residents are seeking clarity from the City over the future of their land leases.

## **2.** How important are the following considerations when it comes to the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South?

Providing clarity for residents currently living on City-owned lands in False Creek South about future plans for these lands

| Very important       | 2975 | 75.43% |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Fairly important     | 638  | 16.18% |
| Slightly important   | 238  | 6.03%  |
| Not important at all | 81   | 2.05%  |
| Don't Know           | 12   | 0.30%  |

Providing clarity for businesses currently operating on City-owned lands in False Creek South about future plans for these lands

| Very important       | 2339 | 59.31% |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Fairly important     | 1087 | 27.56% |
| Slightly important   | 399  | 10.12% |
| Not important at all | 96   | 2.43%  |
| Don't Know           | 23   | 0.58%  |

Considering how City-owned lands in False Creek South could potentially help address public priorities in the best interests of all Vancouver residents, such as housing affordability, worker housing, climate change, job creation, equity, diversity, and reconciliation.

| Very important       | 2207 | 55.96% |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Fairly important     | 919  | 23.30% |
| Slightly important   | 502  | 12.73% |
| Not important at all | 258  | 6.54%  |
| Don't Know           | 58   | 1.47%  |

Ensuring decisions concerning the future of City-owned lands are financially responsible

| Very important       | 2007 | 50.89% |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Fairly important     | 1133 | 28.73% |
| Slightly important   | 608  | 15.42% |
| Not important at all | 145  | 3.68%  |
| Don't Know           | 51   | 1.29%  |

That the neighbourhood should reflect the range of incomes in Vancouver

| Very important       | 1961 | 49.72% |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Fairly important     | 972  | 24.65% |
| Slightly important   | 601  | 15.24% |
| Not important at all | 372  | 9.43%  |
| Don't Know           | 38   | 0.96%  |

That the neighbourhood should have a mix of ages reflective of

| Vancouver            |      |        |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Very important       | 1894 | 48.02% |
| Fairly important     | 1131 | 28.68% |
| Slightly important   | 556  | 14.10% |
| Not important at all | 341  | 8.65%  |
| Don't Know           | 22   | 0.56%  |

That the neighbourhood reflect Vancouver's diversity (today, over half of Vancouver's population identifies as a visible minority)

| Very important       | 1447 | 36.69% |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Fairly important     | 1131 | 28.68% |
| Slightly important   | 711  | 18.03% |
| Not important at all | 603  | 15.29% |
| Don't Know           | 52   | 1.32%  |

# 3. In considering the future of its 80 acres of public land in False Creek South, how important is it for the City to explore options to create additional housing that is affordable to a range of incomes in this location?

| Very important       | 2030 | 51.47% |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Fairly important     | 905  | 22.95% |
| Slightly important   | 593  | 15.04% |
| Not important at all | 384  | 9.74%  |
| Don't Know           | 32   | 0.81%  |

## 4. If there was new housing developed on City-owned lands in False Creek South, how important would it be to increase each of the following types of housing?

Purpose-built rental - buildings built and designed expressly for long-

| term rental accommodation |      |        |
|---------------------------|------|--------|
| Very important            | 1640 | 41.58% |
| Fairly important          | 1186 | 30.07% |
| Slightly important        | 715  | 18.13% |
| Not important at all      | 343  | 8.70%  |
| Don't Know                | 60   | 1.52%  |
|                           |      |        |

| Family housing – units with two or more bedrooms                                     |                   |        |
|--|-------------------|--------|
| Very important   | 1937              | 49.11% |
| Fairly important   | 1292              | 32.76% |
| Slightly important   | 496               | 12.58% |
| Not important at all   | 171               | 4.34%  |
| Don't Know   | 48                | 1.22%  |
| Seniors housing – units for seniors over 55 or those close t                         | o 55 with a       |        |
| disability   |                   |        |
| Very important   | 1409              | 35.73% |
| Fairly important   | 1306              | 33.11% |
| Slightly important   | 842               | 21.35% |
| Not important at all   | 326               | 8.27%  |
| Don't Know   | 61                | 1.55%  |
| Workforce housing – units for working people making low proximity to their workplace | to moderate incom | ies in |
| Very important   | 1504              | 38.13% |
| Fairly important   | 1228              | 31.14% |
| Slightly important   | 789               | 20.01% |
| Not important at all   | 374               | 9.48%  |
| Don't Know   | 49                | 1.24%  |

'Missing middle' – diverse housing options, such as duplexes, townhomes, fourplexes, cottage courts, and multiplexes that fill the gap between single-family homes and multi-family apartment buildings

| Very important       | 1542 | 39.10% |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Fairly important     | 1164 | 29.51% |
| Slightly important   | 710  | 18.00% |
| Not important at all | 457  | 11.59% |
| Don't Know           | 71   | 1.80%  |

Co-op –non-profit, often subsidised housing controlled by resident co-op members who have a vote in decisions concerning the operation and maintenance of their building

| Very important       | 1622 | 41.13% |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Fairly important     | 943  | 23.91% |
| Slightly important   | 717  | 18.18% |
| Not important at all | 587  | 14.88% |
| Don't Know           | 75   | 1.90%  |

| Social housing – rental buildings with rent amounts that ar possible for people with lower incomes to find housing the |                   | it more |
|--|-------------------|---------|
| Very important   | 1506              | 38.18%  |
| Fairly important   | 978               | 24.80%  |
| Slightly important   | 801               | 20.31%  |
| Not important at all   | 608               | 15.42%  |
| Don't Know   | 51                | 1.29%   |
| Accessible and adaptable housing – housing that is accessil of all ages and abilities                                  | ple to people     |         |
| Very important   | 1808              | 45.84%  |
| Fairly important   | 1242              | 31.49%  |
| Slightly important   | 614               | 15.57%  |
| Not important at all   | 226               | 5.73%   |
| Don't Know   | 54                | 1.37%   |
| Indigenous housing – housing available to Indigenous familindividuals  | lies and          |         |
| Very important   | 1133              | 28.73%  |
| Fairly important   | 956               | 24.24%  |
| Slightly important   | 876               | 22.21%  |
| Not important at all   | 825               | 20.92%  |
| Don't Know   | 154               | 3.90%   |
| First-time homeowners housing – market housing on lease attainable to first-time homebuyers                            | d land at a price |         |
| Very important   | 962               | 24.39%  |
| Fairly important   | 1062              | 26.93%  |
| Slightly important   | 1000              | 25.35%  |
| Not important at all   | 837               | 21.22%  |
| Don't Know   | 83                | 2.10%   |

## 5. Are there any other types of housing you would like to see in False Creek South?

| Comment  | Frequency<br>(n) |
|--|------------------|
| Comments that expressed <b>opposition</b> to <b>redevelopment</b> , including that housing options are fine as they are currently                  | 55               |
| Suggest considerations for affordable housing  | 52               |
| Suggested considerations for co-op housing   | 52               |
| Comments that included the need for <b>greater density</b> and <b>housing stock</b> including comments that there is a <b>growing housing need</b> | 47               |
| Comments for housing disadvantaged groups  | 44               |
| Suggested considerations for <b>market-housing</b> (both rental market housing and homeownership)  | 41               |

| Participants expressed opposition to high rise buildings  | 35 |
|---|----|
| Suggestions for incorporation of green spaces, trails, bike lanes   | 32 |
| Comments that suggest for <b>multi-use housing</b>  | 31 |
| General comments that housing options should be <b>affordable</b> for <b>low and middle-</b>  | 29 |
| income earners  | _  |
| Comments suggesting that a wide array of <b>amenities</b> be provided (eg. grocery store,   | 26 |
| restaurants, retail spaces, adequate parking spaces, artist studios, public restrooms,  |    |
| public transit, schools, hospitals, community centers, public pool, daycares)   |    |
| Suggested consideration for apartment buildings, including comments that living   | 24 |
| quarters should have an adequate amount of space  |    |
| Participants expressed general support for housing options  | 19 |
| Suggested considerations for low-rise buildings   | 19 |
| Suggestions for the project to be <b>aesthetically designed</b> including incorporating mountain views and innovative architecture  | 18 |
| Comments that housing should be built that is <b>economical of space</b> to accommodate higher densities and is <b>cost-effective</b> (eg. high rise buildings, tiny homes) | 16 |
| Housing disadvantaged groups focusing on the homeless   | 14 |
| Comments that expressed <b>concern</b> regarding <b>lease details</b> , specifically the terms of   | 14 |
| expiration, renewal, market value   | 14 |
| Affordable housing focusing on families   | 13 |
| Participants expressed general opposition to more housing options   | 13 |
| Participants expressed opposition to social housing   | 12 |
| Comments that pertain to <b>preserving</b> the <b>unique environment</b> of False Creek, including  | 12 |
| FCS is a <b>model</b> for housing affordability   | 12 |
| Suggested considerations for co-housing arrangements  | 11 |
| Comments that housing should be built with the character of the neighbourhood in  | 11 |
| mind, including comments about ensuring safety of residents   |    |
| Comments for townhouses to be built   | 10 |
| Affordable housing focusing on seniors  | 9  |
| Suggested considerations for assisted living  | 9  |
| Housing disadvantaged groups focusing on individuals with addictions and mental health issues   | 9  |
| Suggested considerations of high-end housing  | 9  |
| Suggested consideration for high-rises  | 7  |
| Comments for multi-generational housing   | 7  |
| Comments that housing redevelopment be pet friendly   | 7  |
| Suggested consideration of including the <b>implications</b> of the project to improve  | 7  |
| transparency (eg. homeowners being bought out, social housing, cost to taxpayers,   | '  |
| current leaseholders)   |    |
| Suggested considerations that <b>diversity</b> and <b>inclusiveness</b> of residents should be prioritized  | 7  |
| Assisted living focusing on the elderly   | 6  |
| Participants expressed opposition to condominiums   | 6  |

| current residents6Comments that housing be built sustainably (eg. green roof, electric vehicle fueling<br>stations, parked for shared vehicles)6Affordable housing focusing on youth5Comments that praised the public consultation process including map provided clarity,<br>open-ended questions, incorporating broad range of issues, clear questions.5Comments about ensuring proper engagement with Indigenous groups and suggestions5related to land use for Indigenous peoples4Participants expressed opposition to co-op housing, including comments against strata<br>and that co-op housing is exclusionary4Comments that included survey questions were vague and misleading<br>suggested considerations for marina housing and/or floating homes4Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral<br>position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis2Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1Comments and/or concerns over False Creek South being city-owned land1 | Comments that the survey did not represent the needs nor demographics of the            | 6 |
|--|---|---|
| stations, parked for shared vehicles)Affordable housing focusing on youth5Comments that praised the public consultation process including map provided clarity,<br>open-ended questions, incorporating broad range of issues, clear questions.5Comments about ensuring proper engagement with Indigenous groups and suggestions<br>related to land use for Indigenous peoples5Participants expressed opposition to co-op housing, including comments against strata<br>and that co-op housing is exclusionary4Comments that included survey questions were vague and misleading4Suggested considerations for marina housing and/or floating homes4Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral<br>position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis2Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1  | current residents   |   |
| Affordable housing focusing on youth5Comments that praised the public consultation process including map provided clarity,<br>open-ended questions, incorporating broad range of issues, clear questions.5Comments about ensuring proper engagement with Indigenous groups and suggestions5related to land use for Indigenous peoples5Participants expressed opposition to co-op housing, including comments against strata<br>and that co-op housing is exclusionary4Comments that included survey questions were vague and misleading4Suggested considerations for marina housing and/or floating homes4Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral<br>position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis2Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1  | Comments that housing be built sustainably (eg. green roof, electric vehicle fueling    | 6 |
| Comments that praised the public consultation process including map provided clarity,<br>open-ended questions, incorporating broad range of issues, clear questions.5Comments about ensuring proper engagement with Indigenous groups and suggestions<br>related to land use for Indigenous peoples5Participants expressed opposition to co-op housing, including comments against strata<br>and that co-op housing is exclusionary4Comments that included survey questions were vague and misleading<br>Suggested considerations for marina housing and/or floating homes4Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral<br>position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis2Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1   | stations, parked for shared vehicles)   |   |
| open-ended questions, incorporating broad range of issues, clear questions.SComments about ensuring proper engagement with Indigenous groups and suggestions5related to land use for Indigenous peoples5Participants expressed opposition to co-op housing, including comments against strata<br>and that co-op housing is exclusionary4Comments that included survey questions were vague and misleading4Suggested considerations for marina housing and/or floating homes4Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral<br>position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis2Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1  | Affordable housing focusing on youth  | 5 |
| Comments about ensuring proper engagement with Indigenous groups and suggestions5related to land use for Indigenous peoples5Participants expressed opposition to co-op housing, including comments against strata<br>and that co-op housing is exclusionary4Comments that included survey questions were vague and misleading4Suggested considerations for marina housing and/or floating homes4Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral<br>position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis2Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1  |   | 5 |
| related to land use for Indigenous peoples1Participants expressed opposition to co-op housing, including comments against strata<br>and that co-op housing is exclusionary4Comments that included survey questions were vague and misleading4Suggested considerations for marina housing and/or floating homes4Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral<br>position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis2Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1   |   | _ |
| and that co-op housing is exclusionary4Comments that included survey questions were vague and misleading4Suggested considerations for marina housing and/or floating homes4Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral<br>position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis3Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Assisted living focusing on disabled individuals2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1  |   | 5 |
| Suggested considerations for marina housing and/or floating homes4Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral<br>position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis3Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Assisted living focusing on disabled individuals2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1   |   | 4 |
| Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral<br>position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis3Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Assisted living focusing on disabled individuals2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1   | Comments that included survey questions were vague and misleading                       | 4 |
| position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for<br>ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis3Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Assisted living focusing on disabled individuals2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1  | Suggested considerations for marina housing and/or floating homes                       | 4 |
| ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)3Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis3Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Assisted living focusing on disabled individuals2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments expressing concern over decreasing square footage of homes2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1   | Comments including providing more options for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral   | 3 |
| Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the<br>mental health crisis3Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Assisted living focusing on disabled individuals2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments expressing concern over decreasing square footage of homes2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1  | position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for |   |
| mental health crisis2Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Assisted living focusing on disabled individuals2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments expressing concern over decreasing square footage of homes2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1  | ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back)                                    |   |
| Affordable housing focusing on individuals with disabilities2Assisted living focusing on disabled individuals2Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments expressing concern over decreasing square footage of homes2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1   |   | 3 |
| Suggested considerations for short-term rental housing (eg. hotels, motels, hostels,<br>dormitories)2Comments expressing concern over decreasing square footage of homes2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1Consultation process neglected the aspect of the project being city-owned land1  |   | 2 |
| dormitories)2Comments expressing concern over decreasing square footage of homes2Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1Consultation process neglected the aspect of the project being city-owned land1  | Assisted living focusing on disabled individuals  | 2 |
| Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)1Consultation process neglected the aspect of the project being city-owned land1   |   | 2 |
| survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous<br>status)Image: status status statusConsultation process neglected the aspect of the project being city-owned land1   | Comments expressing concern over decreasing square footage of homes                     | 2 |
| status)Consultation process neglected the aspect of the project being city-owned land1   | Comments that the survey was too long and fewer options should be provided for the      | 1 |
| Consultation process neglected the aspect of the project being city-owned land 1   | survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, indigenous |   |
|  | status)   |   |
| Comments and/or concerns over False Creek South being city-owned land 1  | Consultation process neglected the aspect of the project being city-owned land          | 1 |
|  | Comments and/or concerns over False Creek South being city-owned land                   | 1 |

## 6. For the following statements about potential housing options in False Creek South, please indicate your level of agreement.

The neighbourhood should continue to have a mix of different housing types

| Strongly agree    | 2386 | 60.50% |
|-------------------|------|--------|
| Somewhat agree    | 1161 | 29.44% |
| Somewhat disagree | 254  | 6.44%  |
| Strongly disagree | 103  | 2.61%  |
| Don't Know        | 40   | 1.01%  |

Vancouver residents, and people who work in Vancouver, should have priority in accessing affordable housing in False Creek South

| Strongly agree    | 2276 | 57.71% |
|-------------------|------|--------|
| Somewhat agree    | 1021 | 25.89% |
| Somewhat disagree | 329  | 8.34%  |
| Strongly disagree | 224  | 5.68%  |
| Don't Know        | 94   | 2.38%  |

The City should use revenue from developing market units (e.g., condos, townhouses) in False Creek South, to help pay for more non-market and affordable housing units in False Creek South

| Strongly agree    | 1350 | 34.23% |
|-------------------|------|--------|
| Somewhat agree    | 1329 | 33.70% |
| Somewhat disagree | 508  | 12.88% |
| Strongly disagree | 543  | 13.77% |
| Don't Know        | 214  | 5.43%  |

Any redevelopment should take place incrementally, and phased-in over

| time, to | mini | imize | disru | ption |
|----------|------|-------|-------|-------|
|----------|------|-------|-------|-------|

| -,                |      |        |
|-------------------|------|--------|
| Strongly agree    | 1880 | 47.67% |
| Somewhat agree    | 1142 | 28.96% |
| Somewhat disagree | 473  | 11.99% |
| Strongly disagree | 339  | 8.60%  |
| Don't Know        | 110  | 2.79%  |
|                   |      |        |

Any redevelopment should take place first on vacant land

| Strongly agree    | 1885 | 47.79% |
|-------------------|------|--------|
| Somewhat agree    | 1095 | 27.76% |
| Somewhat disagree | 482  | 12.22% |
| Strongly disagree | 252  | 6.39%  |
| Don't Know        | 230  | 5.83%  |

7. In addition to potentially adding affordable housing, City-owned lands in False Creek South present a potential opportunity to help address other public priorities. How important are each of the following priorities when considering the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South?

Plan for rising sea levels and shoreline stability

| Very important       | 2567 | 65.09% |
|----------------------|------|--------|
| Fairly important     | 896  | 22.72% |
| Slightly important   | 324  | 8.22%  |
| Not important at all | 126  | 3.19%  |
| Don't Know           | 31   | 0.79%  |
|                      |      |        |

| Enhance park space   |                          |              |
|--|--------------------------|--------------|
| Very important   | 1922                     | 48.73%       |
| Fairly important   | 1212                     | 30.73%       |
| Slightly important   | 593                      | 15.04%       |
| Not important at all                                       | 192                      | 4.87%        |
| Don't Know   | 25                       | 0.63%        |
| Use City-owned lands in False Creek South to try innova    | ative urban planning a   | nd           |
| sustainability practices that can be replicated in other r | neighbourhoods           |              |
| Very important   | 1598                     | 40.52%       |
| Fairly important   | 1244                     | 31.54%       |
| Slightly important   | 678                      | 17.19%       |
| Not important at all                                       | 347                      | 8.80%        |
| Don't Know   | 77                       | 1.95%        |
| Use City-owned lands to provide new entertainment ar       | nd cultural spaces       |              |
| Very important   | 1020                     | 25.86%       |
| Fairly important   | 1252                     | 31.74%       |
| Slightly important   | 1089                     | 27.61%       |
| Not important at all                                       | 546                      | 13.84%       |
| Don't Know   | 37                       | 0.94%        |
| Increase sustainable transportation choices, such as wa    | lking, cycling, electric | vehicles and |
| mobility devices, and transit                              |                          |              |
| Very important   | 2409                     | 61.08%       |
| Fairly important   | 883                      | 22.39%       |
| Slightly important   | 426                      | 10.80%       |
| Not important at all                                       | 207                      | 5.25%        |
| Don't Know   | 19                       | 0.48%        |
| Help reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs)                |                          |              |
| Very important   | 1954                     | 49.54%       |
| Fairly important   | 1027                     | 26.04%       |
| Slightly important   | 611                      | 15.49%       |
| Not important at all                                       | 310                      | 7.86%        |
| Don't Know   | 42                       | 1.06%        |
| Advance the City's Reconciliation efforts, working with    | Musqueam, Squamish       | and Tsleil-  |
| Waututh Nations and urban Indigenous partners              |                          |              |
| Very important   | 1286                     | 32.61%       |
| Fairly important   | 914                      | 23.17%       |
| Slightly important   | 872                      | 22.11%       |
| Not important at all                                       | 769                      | 19.50%       |

Don't Know

2.61%

103

| Create an equitable, diverse, and inclusive community |      |        |
|---|------|--------|
| Very important  | 1864 | 47.26% |
| Fairly important                                      | 1151 | 29.18% |
| Slightly important                                    | 579  | 14.68% |
| Not important at all                                  | 302  | 7.66%  |
| Don't Know  | 48   | 1.22%  |
| Create jobs and economic opportunities                |      |        |
| Very important  | 1110 | 28.14% |
| Fairly important                                      | 1395 | 35.37% |
| Slightly important                                    | 1005 | 25.48% |
| Not important at all                                  | 380  | 9.63%  |
| Don't Know  | 54   | 1.37%  |

8. Do you have any other suggestions about how City-owned land in False Creek South could potentially be used to help address public priorities, as noted in the above question, such as housing affordability, climate change, job creation, equity, diversity, and reconciliation over the coming decades?

| Comment  | Frequency<br>(n) |
|--|------------------|
| Comments suggesting that a wide array of <b>amenities</b> be provided (eg. grocery store, restaurants, retail spaces, adequate parking spaces, artist studios, public restrooms, public transit, schools, hospitals, community centers, public pool, daycares) | 165              |
| Suggestions for incorporation of green spaces, trails, bike lanes  | 144              |
| Suggest considerations for affordable housing  | 82               |
| Comments that expressed <b>opposition</b> to <b>redevelopment</b> , including that housing options are fine as they are now (reword)   | 75               |
| Comments that housing be <b>built sustainably</b> (eg. green roof, electric vehicle fueling stations, parked for shared vehicles)  | 70               |
| Comments that pertain to <b>preserving</b> the <b>unique environment</b> of False Creek, including FCS is a <b>model</b> for housing affordability   | 64               |
| Comments that included the need for <b>greater density</b> and <b>housing stock</b> including comments that there is a <b>growing housing need</b>   | 55               |
| Suggested considerations for co-op housing   | 47               |
| Participants expressed general support for housing options   | 42               |
| Comments about ensuring proper engagement with <b>Indigenous groups</b> and suggestions related to land use for Indigenous peoples   | 42               |
| General comments that housing options should be <b>affordable</b> for <b>low and middle-</b><br><b>income earners</b>  | 40               |
| Comments that the survey <b>did not represent</b> the <b>needs nor demographics</b> of the <b>current residents</b>  | 37               |
| Comments that the <b>profits</b> from the <b>waterfront property</b> may be used for social/low-<br>income housing development in other parts of the city  | 32               |
| Participants expressed opposition to high rise buildings   | 29               |

| Comments that included survey questions were vague and misleading   | 29  |
|---|---|
| Comments that expressed <b>concern</b> regarding <b>lease details</b> , specifically the terms of   | 28  |
| expiration, renewal, market value   |   |
| No further comments provided  | 27  |
| Participants expressed opposition to social housing   | 26  |
| Comments that housing should be built that is <b>economical of space</b> to accommodate higher densities and is <b>cost-effective</b> (eg. high rise buildings, tiny homes)   | 26  |
| Suggestions for the project to be <b>aesthetically designed</b> including incorporating mountain views and innovative architecture  | 25  |
| Comments that suggest for multi-use housing   | 24  |
| Comments that housing should be built with the <b>character of the neighbourhood</b> in mind, including comments about ensuring safety of residents   | 23  |
| Suggested considerations for <b>market-housing</b> (both rental market housing and homeownership)   | 22  |
| Comments for housing <b>disadvantaged groups</b>  | 22  |
| Suggested consideration for habitat conservation and restoration that preserves biodiversity and water quality, including rising sea level mitigation   | 19  |
| Suggested considerations that <b>diversity</b> and <b>inclusiveness</b> of residents should be prioritized  | 18  |
| Comments and/or concerns over False Creek South being city owned land   | 18  |
| Comments and/or concerns that pertain to job creation   | 18  |
| Participants expressed general opposition to more housing options   | 17  |
| Suggested considerations for low-rise buildings   | 16  |
| Suggested consideration of including the <b>implications</b> of the project to improve  | 13  |
| <b>transparency</b> (eg. homeowners being bought out, social housing, cost to taxpayers, current leaseholders)  |   |
| Suggested considerations for assisted living  | 12  |
| Assisted living focusing on the olderly   | 11  |
| Assisted living focusing on the elderly   | 1 11  |
| Suggested consideration for apartment buildings, including comments that living   | 10  |
|   |   |
| Suggested consideration for <b>apartment buildings</b> , including comments that living<br>quarters should have an adequate amount of space<br>Comments that the survey was <b>too long</b> and <b>fewer options</b> should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, Indigenous  | 10  |
| Suggested consideration for <b>apartment buildings,</b> including comments that living<br>quarters should have an adequate amount of space<br>Comments that the survey was <b>too long</b> and <b>fewer options</b> should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, Indigenous<br>status)<br>Housing disadvantaged groups focusing on the homeless<br>Comments that suggest a <b>background context</b> should have been provided (eg. specific<br>definitions, current housing types already built, housing demands, proposed housing   | 10<br>9   |
| Suggested consideration for <b>apartment buildings</b> , including comments that living<br>quarters should have an adequate amount of space<br>Comments that the survey was <b>too long</b> and <b>fewer options</b> should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, Indigenous<br>status)<br>Housing disadvantaged groups focusing on the homeless<br>Comments that suggest a <b>background context</b> should have been provided (eg. specific   | 10<br>9<br>8                                    |
| Suggested consideration for <b>apartment buildings</b> , including comments that living<br>quarters should have an adequate amount of space<br>Comments that the survey was <b>too long</b> and <b>fewer options</b> should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, Indigenous<br>status)<br>Housing disadvantaged groups focusing on the homeless<br>Comments that suggest a <b>background context</b> should have been provided (eg. specific<br>definitions, current housing types already built, housing demands, proposed housing<br>density and building heights, parking availability, maps and landmarks)   | 10<br>9<br>8<br>7                               |
| Suggested consideration for <b>apartment buildings</b> , including comments that living<br>quarters should have an adequate amount of space<br>Comments that the survey was <b>too long</b> and <b>fewer options</b> should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, Indigenous<br>status)<br>Housing disadvantaged groups focusing on the homeless<br>Comments that suggest a <b>background context</b> should have been provided (eg. specific<br>definitions, current housing types already built, housing demands, proposed housing<br>density and building heights, parking availability, maps and landmarks)<br>Suggested considerations for <b>marina housing</b> and/or floating homes   | 10<br>9<br>8<br>7<br>7<br>7                     |
| Suggested consideration for <b>apartment buildings</b> , including comments that living<br>quarters should have an adequate amount of space<br>Comments that the survey was <b>too long</b> and <b>fewer options</b> should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, Indigenous<br>status)<br>Housing disadvantaged groups focusing on the homeless<br>Comments that suggest a <b>background context</b> should have been provided (eg. specific<br>definitions, current housing types already built, housing demands, proposed housing<br>density and building heights, parking availability, maps and landmarks)<br>Suggested considerations for <b>marina housing</b> and/or floating homes   | 10<br>9<br>8<br>7<br>7<br>6                     |
| Suggested consideration for <b>apartment buildings,</b> including comments that living<br>quarters should have an adequate amount of space<br>Comments that the survey was <b>too long</b> and <b>fewer options</b> should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, Indigenous<br>status)<br>Housing disadvantaged groups focusing on the homeless<br>Comments that suggest a <b>background context</b> should have been provided (eg. specific<br>definitions, current housing types already built, housing demands, proposed housing<br>density and building heights, parking availability, maps and landmarks)<br>Suggested considerations for <b>marina housing</b> and/or floating homes<br>Suggested consideration for <b>high-rises</b><br>Affordable housing focusing on families<br>Comments that <b>housing</b> redevelopment be <b>pet friendly</b> | 10<br>9<br>8<br>7<br>7<br>7<br>6<br>6<br>6      |
| Suggested consideration for <b>apartment buildings</b> , including comments that living<br>quarters should have an adequate amount of space<br>Comments that the survey was <b>too long</b> and <b>fewer options</b> should be provided for the<br>survey (eg. opposition to providing - postal code, date of birth, ethnicity, Indigenous<br>status)<br>Housing disadvantaged groups focusing on the homeless<br>Comments that suggest a <b>background context</b> should have been provided (eg. specific<br>definitions, current housing types already built, housing demands, proposed housing<br>density and building heights, parking availability, maps and landmarks)<br>Suggested considerations for <b>marina housing</b> and/or floating homes<br>Affordable housing focusing on families  | 10<br>9<br>8<br>7<br>7<br>6<br>6<br>6<br>6<br>6 |

| Comments including providing <b>more options</b> for the survey (eg. priority scale, neutral position, expressing disagreement/opposition, personal relationship to FCS, choices for ethnicity, response to feedback, options to go back) | 5 |
|---|---|
| Comments that the consultation process was a waste of time and taxpayer's money   | 5 |
| Comments for multi-generational housing   | 4 |
| Participants expressed opposition to condominiums   | 4 |
| Comments that <b>opposed</b> the <b>housing focus</b> including that other uses should have also been considered (eg. transportation, amenities, space, social housing, public access, health)  | 4 |
| Participants expressed <b>opposition</b> to <b>co-op housing</b> , including comments against strata and that co-op housing is exclusionary   | 3 |
| Comments that pertain to respondents being "NIMBY" and not doing their part in the mental health crisis   | 3 |
| Suggested considerations of high-end housing  | 2 |
| Suggested considerations for co-housing arrangements  | 2 |
| Suggested solutions by incorporating <b>more open-ended questions</b> to clearly convey opinions and ideas  | 2 |
| Affordable housing focusing on seniors  | 1 |
| Assisted living focusing on disabled individuals  | 1 |
| Housing disadvantaged groups focusing on individuals with addictions and mental health issues   | 1 |

# 9. Overall, with the expiry of most land leases taking place in 15 to 25 years, do you agree or disagree that the City should explore the potential opportunity to increase affordable housing options, and address other public priorities, in False Creek South?

| Strongly agree                                     | 1958 | 49.65% |
|--|------|--------|
| Somewhat agree                                     | 1025 | 25.99% |
| Somewhat disagree                                  | 413  | 10.47% |
| Strongly disagree                                  | 434  | 11.00% |
| Don't Know   | 114  | 2.89%  |
| How would you describe your gender identity?       |      |        |
| Man  | 1783 | 45.21% |
| Woman  | 1852 | 46.96% |
| Non-binary/gender diverse                          | 59   | 1.50%  |
| Prefer not to answer                               | 222  | 5.63%  |
| None of the above. I Identify as (please specify): | 28   | 0.71%  |

| Age Roll up               | n   | %      |
|---------------------------|-----|--------|
| 15-17                     | 1   | 0.03%  |
| 18-19                     | 5   | 0.13%  |
| 20-25                     | 53  | 1.37%  |
| 26-29                     | 153 | 3.95%  |
| 30-35                     | 467 | 12.06% |
| 36-39                     | 368 | 9.50%  |
| 40-45                     | 438 | 11.31% |
| 46-49                     | 265 | 6.84%  |
| 50-55                     | 425 | 10.98% |
| 56-59                     | 270 | 6.97%  |
| 60-65                     | 423 | 10.92% |
| 66-69                     | 290 | 7.49%  |
| 70-75                     | 437 | 11.29% |
| 76-79                     | 136 | 3.51%  |
| 80 and over               | 140 | 3.62%  |
| Preferred not to disclose | 73  | 1.85%  |

| Do you have children under the age of 18 living with you at home?      |      |        |
|--|------|--------|
| Yes  | 805  | 22.74% |
| No   | 2531 | 71.50% |
| No – only have children OVER the age of 18 living at home              | 176  | 4.97%  |
| Other (please specify):  | 28   | 0.79%  |
| Do you live in the False Creek South Area?                             |      |        |
| Yes  | 1087 | 27.56% |
| No   | 2835 | 71.88% |
| Don't know   | 22   | 0.56%  |
| If you currently live in Vancouver, how long have you lived in Vancouv | er?  |        |
| Less than 1 year   | 26   | 0.66%  |
| 1-5 years  | 295  | 7.48%  |
| 5-10 years   | 489  | 12.40% |
| 10+ years  | 3111 | 78.88% |
| I do not live in Vancouver   | 9    | 0.23%  |
| Prefer not to say  | 14   | 0.35%  |

| What is your current housing situation?             |      |        |
|---|------|--------|
| l own my own home                                   | 2208 | 57.65% |
| I rent my home and live in a private market         |      |        |
| rental unit (non-subsidized)                        | 1122 | 29.30% |
| I rent my home and live in a subsidized rental unit | 60   | 1.57%  |
| I am a co-op member                                 | 348  | 9.09%  |
| I am experiencing homelessness or am living in a    |      |        |
| shelter or tent                                     | 0    | 0.00%  |
| Other (please specify):                             | 92   | 2.40%  |
|   |      |        |
| Postal code roll up                                 |      |        |
| NW  | 1815 | 46.02% |
| SW  | 430  | 10.90% |
| NE  | 563  | 14.27% |
| SE  | 330  | 8.37%  |
| DWE   | 797  | 20.21% |
| Other Postal Code                                   | 9    | 0.23%  |
| What is your household's annual income?             |      |        |
| Under \$10,000                                      | 21   | 0.53%  |
| \$10,000 to \$19,999                                | 63   | 1.60%  |
| \$20,000 to \$39,999                                | 246  | 6.24%  |
| \$40,000 to \$59,999                                | 374  | 9.48%  |
| \$60,000 to \$79,999                                | 491  | 12.45% |
| \$80,000 to \$99,999                                | 448  | 11.36% |
| \$100,000 to \$124,999                              | 486  | 12.32% |
| \$125,000 to \$149,999                              | 312  | 7.91%  |
| \$150,000 and over                                  | 770  | 19.52% |
| Prefer not to say                                   | 733  | 18.59% |
|   |      |        |

| City of Vancouver residents and visitors come from many different backgrounds. This     |
|---|
| question helps us understand if we're hearing from the diversity of people that make up |
| Vancouver. How would you describe your ethnocultural identity?                          |

| Indigenous (e.g. First Nations, Inuit or Metis peoples) | 111  | 2.81%  |
|---|------|--------|
| White   | 2863 | 72.59% |
| Chinese   | 216  | 5.48%  |
| Filipino  | 36   | 0.91%  |
| Latin American  | 90   | 2.28%  |
| West Asian (e.g. Iranian, Afghan)                       | 28   | 0.71%  |
| Japanese  | 48   | 1.22%  |
| South Asian (e.g. East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan)   | 67   | 1.70%  |
| Black   | 39   | 0.99%  |
| Arab  | 15   | 0.38%  |
| Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian, Thai)  | 29   | 0.74%  |
| Korean  | 19   | 0.48%  |
| Other (please specify):                                 | 230  | 5.83%  |
|   |      |        |

Public opinion survey results

## Report

City-wide Survey Regarding False Creek South



## We know Canadians

**DATE** 2021-03-25 **PROJECT NUMBER** 45687-001

# CONTEXT, OBJECTIVES & METHODOLOGY





## Methodology

#### **Study Population**

• General adult (18+ years of age) Vancouver Population (City wide)

#### **Data Collection**

- Interviews were conducted from January 15 to January 27, 2021.
- A total of n=800 surveys were performed.
- The survey averaged 10 minutes in length.
  - Quotas were set for age and gender, and sub-regions were set to ensure proper representation of the City. Additionally, a quota was set to ensure residents of Chinese descent were properly represented.

#### **Statistical Analysis**

- As a <u>non-probability</u> internet survey, a margin of error is technically not to be reported.
- If the data were collected through random sample, the margin of error would be general population (n=800) ±3.5%, 19 times out of 20.
- Using data from the 2016 Census, results were weighted according to age, gender, and region in order to ensure a representative sample of the population.
- The numbers presented have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

If you have questions about the data presented in this report, please contact Andrew Enns, Executive Vice-President, at the following e-mail address: <u>aenns@leger360.com</u>



# Key Findings

## **Key Findings**



## **COVID-19 and Commercial Activity**

- □ After being provided information about the neighborhoods, three-quarters of residents said they are familiar with False Creek South.
- □ Providing clarity for residents currently living on City-owned lands in False Creek South about future plans for these lands had the most individuals who rated it as **very** important. Total importance was fairly high for all considerations provided, ranging between 71%-88%.
- Eight-in-ten residents felt it is important that the City explore options to create additional affordable housing in the area.
- □ Three-quarters of residents found most types of housing to be important, with the top two being *Purpose-built rental* and *Family housing*. The least-ranked in importance were *Indigenous housing*, *Co-ops*, and *Social housing*.
- □ Three-quarters of residents did not provide another type of housing they would like to see in False Creek South; for those that did, the top mention was *Affordable housing* (7%). Additionally, for the few residents with additional suggestions, the top mention was *Add affordable/low income housing* (3%).
- □ There were high levels of agreement for all statements provided, as 8 to 9 out of 10 residents agreed with each. The highest level of agreement was for *The neighbourhood should continue to have a mix of different housing types*.
- □ Approximately 8 in 10 residents found most of the priorities to be important.
- □ The top priorities were *Plan for rising sea levels and shoreline stability* and *Increase sustainable transportation choices, such as walking, cycling, electric vehicles and mobility devices, and transit.*
- **□** Eight-in-ten residents agree that the City should explore potential public opportunities in False Creek South.



# **Detailed Results**

## **Information Pages – Overview**

This survey is about potential uses of City-owned lands in Vancouver and how they could help address public priorities. Specifically, the City of Vancouver owns 80-acres of land in the False Creek South neighbourhood, located between the Burrard Street bridge and Cambie Street bridge, on the south shore of False Creek.



#### Neighbourhood map – False Creek South



## **Information Pages – 1970s Transformation**

In the 1970s, the City transformed industrial land in this area into a unique community with a mix of housing, park lands, amenities and waterfront access.

#### Before 1970s – All Industrial Land



After 1970s and as of today – False Creek South neighbourhood (in white outline)





## **Information Pages – Land Ownership**

In the False Creek South neighbourhood, the City of Vancouver owns most of the land. The rest of the land is privatelyowned or owned by other levels of government. False Creek South borders Squamish Nation lands, which are on the neighbourhood's western boundary.

Land Ownership Map of False Creek South





# Three-quarters of residents said they are familiar with the False Creek South Neighbourhood.





# Leger

## Information Provided Prior to Questioning Importance Of Following Considerations

Today, there are close to 2,000 housing units on leased City-owned land in False Creek South. Most of the leases expire between 2036 and 2046. While there has been much new housing built and proposed around False Creek in the past two to three decades, no new housing has been built in the False Creek South neighbourhood since the 1980s. The City leases its land for about an equal mix of market and non-market housing. Housing types include:

- Leasehold strata (townhouses and condos)
- Co-op housing
- Non-market rental (including seniors housing)
- Social housing
- Long-term care homes

With the expiry of most current leases taking place in 15 to 25 years, the City, in its role as landowner, has an opportunity to consider potential long-term use of its lands to help address public priorities. At the same time, the current residents are seeking clarity from the City over the future of their land leases.

How important are the following considerations when it comes to the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South?

## (NOTE: RESULTS ARE ON FOLLOWING SLIDE)

### Considerations:

## Over seven-in-ten residents found considerations very or fairly important *Providing clarity for residents* is top consideration



| <u>List of Considerations</u><br>Base: All respondents (n=800)  | <u>TOTAL</u><br><u>IMP.</u><br><u>(%)</u> | Very<br>important<br>(%) | Fairly<br>important<br>(%) | <u>TOTAL</u><br><u>NOT IMP.</u><br><u>(%)</u> | Slightly<br>important<br>(%) | Not<br>important<br>at all<br>(%) | <u>Don't</u><br><u>know</u><br>( <u>%</u> ) |
|---|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Providing clarity for residents currently living on City-<br>owned lands in False Creek South about future plans<br>for these lands   | 88  | 64                       | 24                         | 9   | 8                            | 1                                 | 3   |
| Ensuring decisions concerning the future of City-owned<br>lands are financially responsible   | 88  | 57                       | 31                         | 8   | 7                            | 1                                 | 4   |
| Providing clarity for businesses currently operating on<br>City-owned lands in False Creek South about future<br>plans for these lands  | 87  | 55                       | 32                         | 10  | 9                            | 1                                 | 3   |
| Considering how City-owned lands in False Creek South<br>could potentially help address public priorities in the<br>best interests of all Vancouver residents, such as<br>housing affordability, worker housing, climate change,<br>job creation, equity, diversity, and reconciliation | 84  | 51                       | 33                         | 12  | 10                           | 2                                 | 3   |
| That the neighbourhood should reflect the range of<br>incomes in Vancouver  | 74  | 41                       | 33                         | 22  | 16                           | 6                                 | 4   |
| That the neighbourhood should have a mix of ages reflective of Vancouver  | 73  | 39                       | 34                         | 23  | 18                           | 5                                 | 3   |
| That the neighbourhood reflect Vancouver's diversity<br>(today, over half of Vancouver's population identifies<br>as a visible minority)  | 71  | 35                       | 36                         | 25  | 17                           | 8                                 | 4   |

Q2: How important are the following considerations when it comes to the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South? Base: All respondents (n=800)

Eight-in-ten residents felt it is important that the City explore options to create additional affordable housing in the area.





#### Very important

Fairly important

Slightly important

■ Not important at all

Don't Know

## Total IMPORTANT, 79%

Total NOT IMPORTANT, 18%

Q3: In considering the future of its 80 acres of public land in False Creek South, how important is it for the City to explore options to create additional housing that is affordable to a range of incomes in this location? Base: All respondents (n=800)

# Seven-in-ten found most types of housing to be important, with the top three being *Purpose-built rentals, Family housing*, and *Accessible and Adaptable housing*.



TOTAL IMPORTANCE PURPOSE-BUILT RENTAL – buildings built and designed expressly for long-term rental 79% 4% 37% 42% accommodation 79% FAMILY HOUSING - units with two or more bedrooms 37% 42% ACCESSIBLE AND ADAPTABLE HOUSING - housing that is accessible to people of all ages 4% 78% 32% 46% and abilities 73% SENIORS HOUSING - units for seniors over 55 or those close to 55 with a disability 5% 34% 39% WORKFORCE HOUSING – units for working people making low to moderate incomes in 5% 73% 33% 40% proximity to their workplace 'MISSING MIDDLE' – diverse housing options, such as duplexes, townhomes, fourplexes, 73% cottage courts, and multiplexes that fill the gap between single-family homes & multi-5% 37% 36% family apartment buildings FIRST-TIME HOMEOWNERS HOUSING - market housing on leased land at a price 72% 8% 37% 35% attainable to first-time homebuyers SOCIAL HOUSING - rental buildings with rent amounts that are subsidized, making it 66% 11% 27% 39% more possible for people with lower incomes to find housing they can afford CO-OP –non-profit, often subsidised housing controlled by resident co-op members who **62%** 10% 32% 30% have a vote in decisions concerning the operation and maintenance of their building **58%** INDIGENOUS HOUSING – housing available to Indigenous families and individuals 30% 28% 16%

Fairly important

Very important

Q4: If there was new housing developed on City-owned lands in False Creek South, how important would it be to increase each of the following types of housing? Base: All respondents (n=800) Note: Calculations include respondents who replied 'Don't know', which was 3%-6% for each type.

Slightly important

■ Not important at all

## TOTAL IMPORTANCE – INCREASE TYPES OF HOUSING – DETAILED RESULTS

| TOTAL IMPORTANCE – INCREASE TYPES OF HOUSING – DETAILED RESULTS  |       |      |        |       |       |     |                   |      |       |        |                   |         |                  |     |       |
|--|-------|------|--------|-------|-------|-----|-------------------|------|-------|--------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-----|-------|
|  |       | Ge   | Gender |       | Age   |     | Housing Situation |      |       | Income |                   |         | Visible Minority |     | 20301 |
|  | TOTAL | Male | Female | 18-34 | 35-54 | 55+ | Own               | Rent | Other | <\$40K | \$40K-<br><\$100K | \$100K+ | Yes              | No  |       |
| Weighted n =   | 800   | 380  | 413    | 266   | 275   | 259 | 159               | 350  | 217   | 380    | 281               | 113     | 370              | 416 |       |
| Unweighted n =   | 800   | 374  | 419    | 230   | 283   | 287 | 155               | 348  | 221   | 400    | 267               | 108     | 383              | 404 |       |
| PURPOSE-BUILT RENTAL – buildings built and designed<br>expressly for long-term rental accommodation  | 79    | 82%  | 76%    | 77%   | 74%   | 86% | 85%               | 79%  | 76%   | 75%    | 82%               | 88%     | 71%              | 87% |       |
| FAMILY HOUSING – units with two or more bedrooms   | 79    | 76%  | 82%    | 76%   | 77%   | 84% | 78%               | 80%  | 78%   | 79%    | 77%               | 86%     | 77%              | 81% |       |
| ACCESSIBLE AND ADAPTABLE HOUSING – housing that<br>is accessible to people of all ages and abilities   | 78    | 76%  | 80%    | 76%   | 74%   | 84% | 81%               | 81%  | 73%   | 76%    | 79%               | 86%     | 72%              | 84% |       |
| $\ensuremath{\textbf{SENIORS}}$ $\ensuremath{\textbf{HOUSING}}$ – units for seniors over 55 or those close to 55 with a disability   | 73    | 71%  | 75%    | 60%   | 72%   | 88% | 77%               | 71%  | 72%   | 76%    | 68%               | 80%     | 68%              | 79% |       |
| <b>WORKFORCE HOUSING</b> – units for working people<br>making low to moderate incomes in proximity to their<br>workplace   | 73    | 71%  | 74%    | 70%   | 71%   | 77% | 82%               | 73%  | 68%   | 65%    | 79%               | 86%     | 68%              | 77% |       |
| <b>'MISSING MIDDLE'</b> – diverse housing options, such as duplexes, townhomes, fourplexes, cottage courts, and multiplexes that fill the gap between single-family homes & multi-family apartment buildings | 73    | 74%  | 73%    | 71%   | 71%   | 77% | 71%               | 76%  | 73%   | 72%    | 72%               | 82%     | 69%              | 77% |       |
| FIRST-TIME HOMEOWNERS HOUSING – market<br>housing on leased land at a price attainable to first-<br>time homebuyers  | 72    | 70%  | 73%    | 76%   | 67%   | 71% | 69%               | 73%  | 73%   | 72%    | 70%               | 75%     | 73%              | 70% |       |
| <b>SOCIAL HOUSING</b> – rental buildings with rent amounts that are subsidized, making it more possible for people with lower incomes to find housing they can afford  | 66    | 65%  | 67%    | 69%   | 59%   | 71% | 79%               | 69%  | 56%   | 58%    | 71%               | 85%     | 58%              | 75% |       |
| <b>CO-OP</b> –non-profit, often subsidised housing<br>controlled by resident co-op members who have a<br>vote in decisions concerning the operation and<br>maintenance of their building                     | 62    | 59%  | 63%    | 63%   | 52%   | 70% | 71%               | 63%  | 55%   | 56%    | 63%               | 78%     | 59%              | 65% |       |
| INDIGENOUS HOUSING – housing available to<br>Indigenous families and individuals   | 58    | 55%  | 60%    | 66%   | 51%   | 58% | 66%               | 63%  | 47%   | 48%    | 66%               | 74%     | 53%              | 62% | 15    |

Q4: If there was new housing developed on City-owned lands in False Creek South, how important would it be to increase each of the following types of housing?

Three-quarters of residents did not provide another type of housing they would like to see in False Creek South; for those that did, the top mention was *Affordable housing* (7%).



Q5: Are there any other types of housing you would like to see in False Creek South? (RECORD OPEN END) Base: All respondents (n=800) 66%

Leger

There were high levels of agreement for all statements, as 8 to 9 out of 10 residents agreed with each. The highest level of agreement was for *The neighbourhood should continue to have a mix of different housing types*.



| <u>Agreement</u><br>Base: All respondents (n=800)  | <u>TOTAL</u><br><u>Agree</u><br><u>(%)</u> | Strongly<br>agree<br>(%) | Somewhat<br>agree<br>(%) | <u>TOTAL</u><br>DISAGREE<br><u>(%)</u> | Somewhat<br>disagree<br>(%) | Strongly<br>Disagree<br>(%) | <u>Don't</u><br><u>know</u><br><u>(%)</u> |
|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| The neighbourhood should continue to have a mix<br>of different housing types  | 89   | 50                       | 39                       | 8                                      | 5                           | 3                           | 3   |
| Vancouver residents, and people who work in<br>Vancouver, should have priority in accessing<br>affordable housing in False Creek South   | 83   | 49                       | 34                       | 13                                     | 8                           | 5                           | 3   |
| Any redevelopment should take place<br>incrementally, and phased-in over time, to<br>minimize disruption   | 82   | 39                       | 43                       | 13                                     | 10                          | 3                           | 5   |
| Any redevelopment should take place first on vacant land   | 80   | 46                       | 34                       | 10                                     | 8                           | 2                           | 9   |
| The City should use revenue from developing<br>market units (e.g., condos, townhouses) in False<br>Creek South, to help pay for more non-market and<br>affordable housing units in False Creek South | 79   | 37                       | 42                       | 13                                     | 8                           | 5                           | 8   |

*Q6: For the following statements about potential housing options in False Creek South, please indicate your level of agreement. Base: All respondents (n=800)* 



Not important at all Slightly important Fairly important Very important Q7: In addition to potentially adding affordable housing, City-owned lands in False Creek South present a potential opportunity to help address other public priorities. How important are each of the following priorities when considering the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South? Base: All respondents (n=800) Note: Calculations include respondents who replied 'Don't know', which was 3%-6% for each type.

18

Leger

2 in 3 found all priorities to be important. The top priorities were *Plan for rising sea levels and shoreline stability* and *Increase sustainable transportation choices, such as walking, cycling, electric vehicles and mobility devices, and transit.* 

## **TOTAL IMPORTANCE - PRIORITIES FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS**

## – DETAILED RESULTS



|   |       | Gender |        | Age   |       |     | Housing Situation |      |       | Income |                   |         | Visible Minority |     |
|---|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-----|-------------------|------|-------|--------|-------------------|---------|------------------|-----|
|   | TOTAL | Male   | Female | 18-34 | 35-54 | 55+ | Own               | Rent | Other | <\$40K | \$40K-<br><\$100K | \$100K+ | Yes              | No  |
| Weighted n =  | 800   | 380    | 413    | 266   | 275   | 259 | 159               | 350  | 217   | 380    | 281               | 113     | 370              | 416 |
| Unweighted n =  | 800   | 374    | 419    | 230   | 283   | 287 | 155               | 348  | 221   | 400    | 267               | 108     | 383              | 404 |
| Plan for rising sea levels and shoreline stability  | 86%   | 85%    | 88%    | 88%   | 85%   | 86% | 83%               | 87%  | 87%   | 86%    | 87%               | 89%     | 84%              | 89% |
| Increase sustainable transportation choices, such<br>as walking, cycling, electric vehicles and mobility<br>devices, and transit                                | 86%   | 87%    | 86%    | 87%   | 84%   | 88% | 89%               | 85%  | 86%   | 85%    | 88%               | 91%     | 84%              | 89% |
| Create jobs and economic opportunities  | 85%   | 87%    | 85%    | 89%   | 83%   | 85% | 86%               | 86%  | 85%   | 85%    | 86%               | 85%     | 87%              | 84% |
| Create an equitable, diverse, and inclusive community   | 83%   | 80%    | 85%    | 81%   | 84%   | 83% | 85%               | 82%  | 81%   | 83%    | 83%               | 86%     | 82%              | 84% |
| Enhance park space  | 82%   | 81%    | 81%    | 82%   | 79%   | 83% | 79%               | 80%  | 84%   | 83%    | 80%               | 82%     | 80%              | 83% |
| Help reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs)   | 81%   | 78%    | 82%    | 83%   | 79%   | 79% | 81%               | 79%  | 81%   | 80%    | 79%               | 88%     | 80%              | 81% |
| Use City-owned lands in False Creek South to try<br>innovative urban planning and sustainability<br>practices that can be replicated in other<br>neighbourhoods | 79%   | 81%    | 77%    | 84%   | 74%   | 78% | 78%               | 79%  | 78%   | 79%    | 79%               | 80%     | 79%              | 78% |
| Use City-owned lands to provide new entertainment and cultural spaces   | 70%   | 69%    | 70%    | 74%   | 69%   | 65% | 70%               | 68%  | 68%   | 68%    | 71%               | 71%     | 70%              | 68% |
| Advance the City's Reconciliation efforts, working<br>with Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh<br>Nations and urban Indigenous partners                       | 66%   | 64%    | 66%    | 71%   | 60%   | 66% | 75%               | 68%  | 57%   | 62%    | 69%               | 78%     | 64%              | 68% |

Q7: In addition to potentially adding affordable housing, City-owned lands in False Creek South present a potential opportunity to help address other public priorities. How important are each of the following priorities when considering the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South?


70%

20

# Eight-in-ten residents did not provide any further suggestions; for those that did, the top mention was *Affordable/low income housing*.



Q8: Do you have any other suggestions about how City-owned land in False Creek South could potentially be used to help address public priorities, as noted in the prior question, such as housing affordability, climate change, job creation, equity, diversity, and reconciliation over the coming decades? (RECORD OPEN END) Base: All respondents (n=800) Eight-in-ten residents agree that the City should explore potential public opportunities in False Creek South.





#### Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

■ Strongly disagree

Don't Know

### Total AGREE, 80%

#### Total DISAGREE,15%

*Q9:* Overall, with the expiry of most land leases taking place in 15 to 25 years, do you agree or disagree that the City should explore the potential opportunity to increase affordable housing options, and address other public priorities, in False Creek South? Base: All respondents (n=800)



# **RESPONDENTS PROFILE**



## **RESPONDENT PROFILE**

|                           | Weighted |
|---------------------------|----------|
| n=                        | 800      |
| Gender                    | (%)      |
| Male                      | 52       |
| Female                    | 47       |
| Non-binary/gender diverse | 1        |
| Age                       | (%)      |
| 18 to 34                  | 33       |
| 35 to 54                  | 34       |
| 55 years of age or older  | 32       |
| Income*                   | (%)      |
| Less than \$40K           | 22       |
| \$40K to less than \$100K | 48       |
| \$100K and over           | 30       |

|                               | Weighted |
|-------------------------------|----------|
| n=                            | 800      |
| Region                        | (%)      |
| Northeast                     | 26       |
| Southeast                     | 24       |
| Northwest                     | 20       |
| Downtown-West End             | 18       |
| Southwest                     | 12       |
| Length of Vancouver Residency | (%)      |
| Less than 1 year              | 1        |
| 1-5 years                     | 11       |
| 5-10 years                    | 11       |
| 10+ years                     | 76       |

\*Calculations exclude respondents who answered 'Prefer not to answer'.



## **RESPONDENT PROFILE**

|   | Weighted |
|---|----------|
| n=  | 800      |
| Housing Situation*  | (%)      |
| Own my own home   | 49       |
| Rent home, live in private market rent unit (un-subsidized) | 36       |
| Rent home, live in subsidized rental unit                   | 7        |
| Co-op member  | 3        |
| Live with a relative/friend                                 | 3        |
| Renting (general)   | 1        |

\*Calculations exclude respondents who answered 'Prefer not to answer'.

|   | Weighted |
|---|----------|
| n=  | 800      |
| Ethnicity*  | (%)      |
| White   | 53%      |
| Chinese   | 28%      |
| South Asian (e.g. East Indian, Pakistani, Sri<br>Lankan)  | 8%       |
| Filipino  | 4%       |
| Southeast Asian (Vietnamese, Cambodian,<br>Laotian, Thai) | 3%       |
| Latin American  | 2%       |
| Japanese  | 2%       |
| West Asian (e.g. Iranian, Afghan)                         | 1%       |
| Korean  | 1%       |
| Black   | 1%       |
| Arab  | 0%       |
| Other   | 3%       |



## We know Canadians



leger360.com









# **Appendix B** Notification materials

#### Postcard



#### False Creek South Lands: **Opportunities for the Future** Share your thoughts: February 1 t

The City of Vancouver is exploring the lo of 80 acres of City-owned lands in False is seeking public input about how these [ used to help address priorities, such as th climate change, social issues and suppor economy.

We will use your feedback to help inform decisions about the City-owned lands in South. In the short term we will be comp hear into an engagement summary report post on our website. Public input from th will also inform the City's broader Vanco

City of Vancouver | False Creek South Lands



#### We want to hear from you

Between February 1 and 28, 2021, you can learn more and participate by visiting ShapeYourCity.ca/FCSLands, to:



Submit a survey C through Talk Vancouver



Sign up for an online information

- session and Q&A: • Wednesday, February 17, 2021 6:00 – 7:00 p.m.
- Thursday, February 25, 2021 6:00 - 7:00 p.m.



₩,

Email us with your thoughts at

FalseCreekSouth Lands@vancouver.ca





#### Information bulletin

City of Vancouver Information Bulletin February 1, 2021

#### City seeks input on future of False Creek South lands

The City of Vancouver is seeking public input about how 80 acres of City-owned lands in False Creek South could potentially be used to help address city-wide priorities such as the housing crisis, climate emergency and local economy.

False Creek South is the site of a 1970s visionary development and legacy, which became a model for progressive urban planning, nationally and around the world.

The City wants to know what Vancouver residents think about a potential update to that original vision, consistent with the community's history as an inclusive, affordable, livable urban neighbourhood, while also potentially addressing public priorities such as housing options.

The City's approach to exploring more housing options on City-owned lands in False Creek South would be based on:

- Retaining public ownership of the lands
- Providing clarity for those with homes on land currently leased from the City
- Potentially phasing in a new vision for the area incrementally, over time.

This work is connected to, but independent from, the City's <u>False Creek South</u> community planning process which paused in 2018.

The City will be seeking input until February 28, 2021, and the feedback will be used to help inform long-term decisions about the future of False Creek South. Public input from this engagement will also inform the City's broader <u>Vancouver Plan</u>.

#### About False Creek South lands

These lands are located between the Cambie and Burrard Street bridges on the south shore of False Creek, and there are approximately 1,800 residential units—both market and non-market—on leased lands which are owned and managed by the City on behalf of all Vancouver residents. There are additional units on private lands in the community.

Share your thoughts

We want to hear from you about options for the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South, which will help shape our city for the benefit of current and future generations. Here's how you can get involved:

- Participate in the Talk Vancouver online survey

COV – FCS Public Engagement Notification Material

**CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT** 

January 27, 2021

#### Information bulletin continued

|            | - Attend an online information and Q&A session   |
|------------|--|
|            | <ul> <li>Attend an online information and Q&amp;A session</li> <li>Send us an email</li> </ul> |
| Vis        | sit ShapeYourCity.ca/FCSLands for more information.  |
|            | -30-   |
| Civ<br>604 | edia Contact:<br>vic Engagement and Communications<br>4-871-6336<br><u>edia@vancouver.ca</u>   |
|            |  |
|            |  |
|            |  |

COV – FCS Public Engagement Notification Material

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT

January 27, 2021 2

#### **Social posts**



...





12 Retweets 4 Quote Tweets 21 Likes

#### **Talk Vancouver email**



#### Stakeholder email



| Meeting type  | Dute                  | THING   |
|---|-----------------------|---------|
| Small Group Meeting (False Creek South residents and<br>stakeholders) | Tuesday February 16   | 12-1 pm |
| Small Group Meeting (City-wide stakeholders)                          | Tuesday February 16   | 6-7 pm  |
| Small Group Meeting (City-wide stakeholders)                          | Wednesday February 17 | 12-1 pm |
| Public information and Q&A session                                    | Wednesday February 17 | 6-7 pm  |
| Small Group Meeting (False Creek South residents and stakeholders)    | Thursday February 18  | 6-7 pm  |
| Public information and Q&A session                                    | Thursday February 25  | 6-7 pm  |

Please register for an online event by clicking the name of the event above. We encourage you to register in advance, as space is limited. We will send a link to join the meeting when we confirm your registration. Visit ShapeYourCity.ca/FCSLands for more information.

#### Sincerely,

False Creek South Lands project team FalseCreekSouthLands@vancouver.ca Shapeyourcity.ca/FCSlands

# **Appendix C** Engagement materials

#### Shape your City page



# About False Creek South Fact Sheet (English)

## 

## About False Creek South



## **About False Creek South**

False Creek South is located between the Cambie Street Bridge and Burrard Street Bridge on the south shore of False Creek. In the 1970s, the City transformed industrial land in this area into a unique community with a mix of housing, park lands, amenities and waterfront access. This visionary development created a legacy that became a model for progressive urban planning, nationally and around the world.

The City of Vancouver owns and manages 80 acres of this land on behalf of Vancouver citizens. The rest of the land is either privately owned or owned by other levels of government.

When this neighbourhood was first built in the 1970s and 1980s, much of the land was leased by the City to tenants via 60-year leases, with most of these leases expiring in the next 15 to 25 years. No new housing has been built in False Creek South since the 1980s.



False Creek South pre-development (1970s, looking northwest)

Vancouver is situated on the unceded traditional territories of the x<sup>w</sup>məθk<sup>w</sup>əýəm (Musqueam), S<u>k</u>w<u>x</u>wú7mesh (Squamish), and səlilwəta**ł** (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations.

## **Current Housing Types**



- Special Needs Residential Facilities
  - Seniors Non-market
  - Strata Market

False Creek South is a primarily residential neighbourhood, with approximately 1,800 units on leased Cityowned lands. There is a range of housing types for both renters and owners, which include:

- Leasehold strata (townhouses and condos)
- Co-op housing

□ Non City-owned

Property

- Social housing
- Long-term care homes
- Non-market rental (including seniors housing)

## **Other Current Land Use**

Public land in False Creek South includes 22 acres of park and three kilometres of seawall, as well as three marinas (two of them Vancouver Park Board marinas). There are also a number of mixed developments. including four mixed residential-commercial buildings, as well as an elementary school. Granville Island and Senakw are not on City-owned lands.

## **Demographics**

Today, False Creek South's population makes up about one per cent of Vancouver's population. Compared to Vancouver's population overall, the median age of those living in False Creek South is higher than the city's average, the median household income in False Creek South is also higher than the average, the number of families with children is lower, and the proportion of those who identify as a visible minority is lower.



### 2016 Census Data: False Creek South and Vancouver Overall

5,597

False Creek South

54.3 Median Age

**17%** Visible Minority

\$78,176 Median household

13% Pop. in low income

\* Source: 2016 Statistics Canada Census

Vancouver

631,486 Population

> **40.7** Median Age

**52%** Visible Minority

\$65,327 Median household incomes

**19%** Pop. in low income household

### **Opportunities for the future**

With many leases expiring in the next 15 to 25 years, the City has a responsibility to consider potential long-term use of its lands to help address priorities, such as Vancouver's housing crisis. Also, current residents are seeking more clarity from the City regarding the future of their leases. In exploring the future of these lands for the next 50 years and beyond, the City will strive to balance the interests of current neighbourhood residents with those of Vancouver residents who own this land.

We're seeking public input about how City-owned land in False Creek South could potentially be used to help address the housing crisis and contribute to achieving other priorities such as accelerating action on climate change, increased focus on equity and critical social issues and protecting and building the local economy.

This city-wide public engagement is connected to but independent from the City's False Creek South **neighbourhood planning program**, which is on hold. We will use your feedback to inform long-term decisions about the City-owned lands in False Creek South. In the short term we will be compiling what we hear into an engagement summary report which we will post on our website. Public input from this engagement will also inform the City's broader **Vancouver Plan**.

Share your thoughts: visit **shapeyourcity.ca/FCSLands** and take the survey



Vancouver's Housing Crisis and Cityowned Lands in False Creek South Fact Sheet (English)



Vancouver's Housing Crisis and City-owned lands in False Creek South



## Vancouver's Housing Crisis and City-owned lands in False Creek South

As Vancouver's housing crisis continues to impact residents across all income levels and living situations around the city, new approaches, tools, and partnerships are needed to ensure that Vancouver continues to support a diversity of incomes, households and cultural communities.



## **False Creek South**

With many leases in False Creek South expiring in the next 15 to 25 years, the City has a responsibility to consider potential long-term use of its lands to help address priorities, such as Vancouver's housing crisis. Also, current residents are seeking more clarity from the City regarding the future of their leases. In exploring the future of these lands for the next 50 years and beyond, the City will strive to balance the interests of current neighbourhood residents with those of all Vancouver residents who own this land.



Using some of the City-owned lands in False Creek South could be an option to help address Vancouver's housing needs. Housing types could include:

- **Purpose-built rental** buildings built and designed expressly for long-term rental accommodation
- Family housing units with two or more bedrooms
- Seniors housing units for seniors over 55 or those close to 55 with a disability
- Workforce housing units for working people making low to moderate incomes in proximity to their workplace
- 'Missing middle' diverse housing options, such as townhomes, duplexes, fourplexes, cottage courts, and multi-family apartment buildings that fill the gap between single-family homes and higher density apartments

- Co-op non-profit, often subsidized housing controlled by resident co-op members who have a vote in decisions concerning the operation and maintenance of their building
- Social housing rental buildings with rent amounts that are subsidized, making it more possible for people with lower incomes to find housing they can afford
- Accessible and adaptable housing housing that is accessible to people of all ages and abilities
- Indigenous housing housing available to Indigenous families and individuals
- First-time homeowners housing market housing on leased land at a price attainable to first-time homebuyers.

### Housing Vancouver strategy

Vancouver has adopted the **Housing Vancouver strategy**, with 10-year goals to ensure that housing is available for families, young people can afford to buy a home, and people of all incomes and backgrounds can participate in their communities. Progress has been made in the three years since the strategy was launched, however more needs to be done to address our city's housing crisis.



### Vancouver Affordable Housing Endowment Fund

The City has proposed that all City-owned non-market housing be consolidated into a single portfolio through the Vancouver Affordable Housing Endowment Fund (VAHEF). The mandate of the VAHEF is to preserve and grow the City's affordable housing stock in a sustainable way. Learn more about VAHEF here.

We're seeking public input about how City-owned land in False Creek South could potentially be used to help address the housing crisis and contribute to achieving other priorities such as accelerating action on climate change, increased focus on equity and critical social issues and protecting and building the local economy.

This city-wide public engagement is connected to but independent from the City's False Creek South **neighbourhood planning program**, which is on hold. We will use your feedback to inform long-term decisions about the City-owned lands in False Creek South. In the short term we will be compiling what we hear into an engagement summary report which we will post on our website. Public input from this engagement will also inform the City's broader **Vancouver Plan**.

Share your thoughts: visit shapeyourcity.ca/FCSLands and take the survey



#### Translated About False Creek South Fact Sheet – Traditional Chinese



#### 關於南福溪



#### 目前的其他土地用途

南福溪的公共土地包括 22 英畝的 局游船碼頭)。這裏也有多個混合開 湖島或Senakw。

溫哥華市政府 | 關於南福溪 | 2021年2月





來源: 2016 年加拿大統計局

#### 未來的機會

隨著不少租約會在未來 15 至 25 年內到期,市政府有責任考慮對土地的潛在長期使用,以幫助解決各 種迫切問題,例如溫哥華的住屋危機。此外,現時的居民希望市政府能提供更多有關租約未來情況的資 訊。在探索這些土地未來 50 年及以後的發展時,市政府會努力平衡目前的社區居民與擁有該土地的 溫哥華居民的利益。

我們正在徵詢公眾意見,共同探討如何利用南福溪的市政府擁有土地,以解決住屋危機和其他緊 迫問題,例如加快應對氣候變化、更密切地關注公平和重要社會問題,同時保護和建設當地經濟。

這項涵蓋全市的公眾意見活動與本市的南福溪鄰舍規劃計劃(目前暫停)有關,但彼此獨立。您的 意見將可幫助作出南福溪的市政府擁有土地的長期決策。而在短期內,我們也會將收集到的意見 彙編成意見摘要報告,並在我們的網站上發佈。透過這項活動所收集到的公眾意見也可以為市政 府制定更廣泛的溫哥華計劃提供有用資訊。

分享您的看法:請瀏覽 shapeyourcity.ca/FCSLands 並完成問卷調查



#### **Translated About False Creek South Fact Sheet – Simplified Chinese**



当前房屋类型

#### 关于福溪南

福溪南位于福溪南岸的甘比 工业用地改造成一个独特的 体。得益于这种极富远见的引 划的典范。

温哥华市政府代表温哥华市民拥有 80英亩的土地。其余土地是私有的 府部门拥有。

在1970年代和1980年代首次建 市政府通过60年的租约将大部分 户,其中大部分租约将在接下来的 到期。自1980年代以来,福溪南一 房。

温哥华位于 x\*\*məθk\*\*əýəm (Musque 让传统领土上。

**温哥华市政府 |** 关于福溪南 | 2021年2月

ê

BM
 CT
 CT

福溪南社区以住宅为主,在市政府排 主的住房类型,包括:

 租约分契式产权房(Leasehold) 别墅和公寓)

- 合作社房屋(Co-op housing)
   非市场化的出租单位(Non-ma 包括长者屋)
- 包括长者座)

#### 当前其他土地用途

福溪南的公共土地包括22 英亩的一局游船码头)。这里还有许多混合开 湖岛或Senakw。

温哥华市政府 | 关于福溪南 | 2021年2月

福溪南如今的人口约占温哥华人口的百分之一。 与温哥华的总体人口相比,福溪南居民年龄的中 位数高于城市平均水平,而福溪南家庭收入的中 位数也高于平均水平。社区内有子女的家庭数量

比较少,而可见少数族裔的比例也较低。



| <b>5,597</b>    | 631,486         |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| 人□              | 人口              |
| <b>54.3</b>     | <b>40.7</b>     |
| 中位年龄            | 中位年龄            |
| <b>17%</b>      | <b>52%</b>      |
| 可见少数族裔          | 可见少数族裔          |
| <b>\$78,176</b> | <b>\$65,327</b> |
| 家庭收入            | 家庭收入            |
| 中位数             | 中位数             |
| 13%             | 19%             |

福溪南

2016年人口普查数据:

福溪南和全温哥华

温哥华

低收入家庭的 人口

低收入家庭的 人口 ·来源: 2016 年加拿大统计局

#### 未来的机会

人口状况

随着许多租约在未来 15 到 25 年内到期,市政府有责任考虑对土地的潜在长期使用,以解决各项紧迫 问题, 如温哥华的住房危机。此外,当前的居民期望市政府提供有关其租约未来情况的更多信息,在探 索这些土地未来 50 年及以后的未来时,市政府将努力平衡当前社区居民与拥有该土地的温哥华居民 的利益。

我们正在征求公众意见,共同探讨如何利用福溪南的市政府拥有土地,以解决住房危机和其他紧 迫事项,如加快应对气候变化,加大对公平和关键社会问题的关注并保护和建设当地经济。

这项涵盖全市的公众意见活动与本市的福溪南邻里规划计划(目前暂停)有关,但彼此独立。我们 将利用您的反馈意见来帮助作出有关福溪南的市政府拥有土地的长期决策。在短期内,我们还会 将听取的反馈汇编成意见摘要报告,并发布在我们的网站上。这项活动中收集的公众意见还将帮 助市政府制定更广泛的温**哥华**计划。

分享您的想法:访问 shapeyourcity.ca/FCSLands 并接受问卷调查



#### Translated About False Creek South Fact Sheet – Punjabi



#### ਫਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਉਥ ਬਾਰੇ

ਫਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਊਬ, ਫਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਦੇ ਵਿਚਕਾਰ ਸਥਿਤ ਹੈ। 1970 ਦੇ ਦਹਾਕ ਭਾਈਚਾਰੇ ਵਿੱਚ ਤਬਦੀਲ ਕਰ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਪਹੁੰਚ ਮੌਜੂਦ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਦੂਰਅੰਦੇਸ਼ੀ ਵਿ ਤੇਰ 'ਤੇ ਅਤੇ ਵਿਸ਼ਵ ਭਰ ਵਿੱਚ ਪ੍ਰਗਤੰ

ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ ਸਿਟੀ ਦੀ ਸਰਕਾਰ, ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ ਦੇ ਨਾਗਰਿਫ ਏਕੜ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਦੀ ਮਾਲਕ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਇਸਦਾ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧਨ ਕ ਜਾਂ ਤਾਂ ਨਿੱਜੀ ਮਲਕੀਅਤ ਹੈ ਜਾਂ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਦੂਜੇ ਪੱਾ ਹੈ।

ਜਦੋਂ 1970 ਅਤੇ 1980 ਦੇ ਦਹਾਕਿਆਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਇਸ ਇ ਬਣਾਇਆ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ, ਜ਼ਿਆਦਾਤਰ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਸਿਟੀ ਦੀ ਕਿਰਾਏਦਾਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ 60-ਸਾਲਾ ਦੀ ਲੀਜ਼ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਲੀਜ਼ 'ਤੇ ਇਹਨਾਂ ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਜ਼ਿਆਦਾਤਰ ਲੀਜ਼ਾ ਅਗਲੇ 15 ਤੋਂ 25 1 ਰਹੀਆਂ ਹਨ। 1980 ਦੇ ਦਹਾਕੇ ਤੋਂ ਫਾਲਸ ਗ੍ਰੈਕ ਸਾਊ ਰਿਹਾਇਸ਼ ਨਹੀਂ ਬਣਾਈ ਗਈ।

ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ x‴məθk‴əýəm (Musqueam), : ਸਮੁਰਦ ਨਾ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਪਰੰਪਰਾਗਤ ਪ੍ਰਦੇਸ਼ਾਂ 'ਤੇ ਸਥਿ

ਸਿਟੀ ਆਫ ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ | ਫਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਊਥ ਬਾਰੇ | ਫਰਵਰੀ

ê

ਇੰਨੂ ਕਿਸਮ ਅਨੂਨ – ਪੋਰਰ ਦੀ ਹੱਦ ਕੇ ਆਪ – ਸਤਰ ਦੀ ਹੱਦ ਕੇ ਆਪ – ਪਾਰਕ ਕਿਹਾਰ ਕੇ ਕਿਹਾਰ ਵ ਹੱਤਿਸ਼ ਨਟੇਸ਼ਨ ਕਿਹਾਰ ਵ ਹੈ ਰੇਸ਼-ਨਿਹਾਨੀ ਵਰਤੋਂ ਖਾਸ ਜ਼ਰੂਰ ਹ੍ਰੇਸ਼ਟ ਸਟੇਸ਼ਨ ਬਿਹਾਰ ਵ ਹੈ ਰੇਸ਼-ਨਿਹਾਨੀ ਵਰਤੋਂ ਖਾਸ ਜ਼ਰੂਰ ਹ੍ਰਾਜ਼ਟ ਸਟੇਸ਼ਨ ਕਿਹਾਰ ਵ ਹੈ ਰੇਸ਼-ਨਿਹਾਨੀ ਵਰਤੋਂ ਖਾਸ ਜ਼ਰੂਰ ਹ੍ਰਾਜ਼ਟ ਸਟੇਸ਼ਨ ਕਿਹਾਰ ਵ

ਰਿਹਾਇਸ਼ ਦੀਆਂ ਵਰਤਮਾਨ ਕਿਸਮਾਂ

ਫਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਊਥ ਮੁੱਖ ਤੌਰ 'ਤੇ ਇੱਕ ਰਿਹਾਇਸ਼ੀ ਸਿ ਗਏ ਹਨ। ਕਿਰਾਏਦਾਰਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਮਾਲਕਾਂ ਦੇਵਾਂ ਲਈ ਕਈ

ਲੀਜ਼ਹੋਲਡ ਸਟ੍ਰਾਟਾ (ਟਾਊਨਹਾਊਸ ਅਤੇ ਕੇਂਡੋ)

• ਕੋ-ਆਪ ਹਾਉਸਿੰਗ

ਗੈਰ-ਮਾਰਕੀਟ ਕਿਰਾਇਆ (ਬਜ਼ੁਰਗਾਂ ਲਈ ਰਿਕ

#### ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਦੀ ਹੋਰ ਮੈਜੂਦਾ ਵ

ਫਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਊਥ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਨਤਕ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਵਿੱਚ 22 ਦੇ ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ ਪਾਰਕ ਬੋਰਡ ਮਰੀਨਾ) ਸ਼ਾਮਲ ਹਨ। ਬ ਨਾਲ ਹੀ ਇੱਕ ਐਲੀਮੈਂਟਰੀ ਸਕੂਲ ਵੀ ਸ਼ਾਮਲ ਹੈ। ਫਾ

ਸਿਟੀ ਆਫ ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ | ਫਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਊਥ ਬਾਰੇ | ਫਰਵਰੀ

#### ਅਬਾਦੀ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਅੰਕੜੇ

ਅੱਜ, ਰਾਲਸ ਗ੍ਰੈਕ ਸਾਊਬ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ ਦੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਦਾ ਇੱਕ ਪ੍ਰਤਿਸ਼ਤ ਹੈ। ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ ਦੀ ਸਮੁੱਚੀ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਦੇ ਮੁਕਾਬਲੇ, ਫਾਲਸ ਗ੍ਰੈਕ ਸਾਊਬ ਵਿੱਚ ਗਹਿਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਲੋਕਾ ਦੀ ਅੱਸਤ ਉਮਰ ਸ਼ਹਿਰ ਦੀ ਅੰਸਤ ਨਾਲੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਹੈ, ਫਾਲਸ ਗ੍ਰੈਕ ਸਾਊਬ ਵਿੱਚ ਐਸਤ ਅਮਦਨ ਦੀ ਐਸਤ ਨਾਲੋਂ ਵੱਧ ਹੈ, ਬੱਚਿਆਂ ਵਾਲੇ ਪਰਿਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਸੰਮਿਆ ਘੱਟ ਹੈ, ਅਤੇ ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ਟੀਗਤ ਤੱਕ ਹੈ ਘੱਟ-ਗਿਣਗ ਵੱਧ ਜੋ ਪਛਾਣੇ ਜਾਂਦੇ ਸਮੂਹਾਂ ਦਾ ਅਨੁਪਾਤ ਪੱਟ ਹੈ।



| <u>u.</u> ēd wa du                | NG. 4 60460                       |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| ਫਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਊਥ                   | ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ                           |
| 5,597                             | 631,486                           |
| ਆਬਾਦੀ                             | ਆਬਾਦੀ                             |
| 54.3                              | 40.7                              |
| ਔਸਤ ਉਮਰ                           | ਔਸਤ ਉਮਰ                           |
| 17%                               | 52%                               |
| ਜਟੀਗਤ ਤੌਰ 'ਤੇ ਘੱਟ-ਗਿਣਤੀ           | ਦ੍ਰਿਸ਼ਟੀਗਤ ਤੌਰ 'ਤੇ ਘੱਟ-ਗਿਣਤੀ      |
| \$78,176                          | \$65,327                          |
| ਘਰ ਦੀ ਔਸਤ ਆਮਦਨ                    | ਘਰ ਦੀ ਔਸਤ ਆਮਦਨ                    |
| 13%                               | 19%                               |
| ਘੱਟ ਆਮਦਨ ਵਾਲੇਂ ਘਰਾਂ<br>ਵਿੱਚ ਆਬਾਦੀ | ਘੱਟ ਆਮਦਨ ਵਾਲੇਂ ਘਰਾਂ<br>ਵਿੱਚ ਆਬਾਦੀ |
|                                   |                                   |

2016 ਦਾ ਜਨਗਣਨਾ ਡਾਟਾ: ਫਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਉਸ ਅਤੇ ਕੱਲ ਮਿਲਾ ਕੇ ਵੈਨਕਵਰ

\* ਰੇਤ: 2016 ਦੀ ਸਟੈਟਿਸਟਿਕਸ ਕੈਨੇਡਾ ਦੀ ਜਨਗਣਨਾ

#### ਭਵਿੱਖ ਲਈ ਮੈਕੇ

ਅਗਲੇ 15 ਤੋਂ 25 ਸਾਲਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਬਹੁਤ ਸਾਰੀਆਂ ਲੀਜ਼ਾਂ ਦੇ ਖ਼ਤਮ ਹੋਣ ਨਾਲ, ਸਿਟੀ ਦੀ ਇਹ ਜ਼ਿੰਮੇਵਾਰੀ ਬਣਦੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਤਰਜੀਹ ਵਾਲੇ ਮੁੱਦਿਆਂ, ਜਿਵੇਂ ਕਿ ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ ਦਾ ਰਿਹਾਇਸ਼ੀ ਸੱਕਟ, ਨੂੰ ਪਹਿਲ ਦੇ ਅਧਾਰ 'ਤੇ ਹੱਲ ਕਰਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਮਦਦ ਲਈ ਇਹ ਆਪਣੀਆਂ ਜ਼ਮੀਨਾਂ ਦੀ ਸੰਭਾਵੀ ਲੰਮੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੀ ਵਰਤੋਂ ਬਾਰੇ ਵਿਚਾਰ ਕਗੇ। ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਇਲਾਵਾ, ਮੌਜੂਦਾ ਵਸਨੀਕ ਆਪਣੀਆਂ ਲੀਜ਼ਾਂ ਦੇ ਭਵਿੱਖ ਬਾਰੇ ਸਿਟੀ ਤੋਂ ਵਧੇਰੇ ਸਪੱਸ਼ਟਤਾ ਦੀ ਮੰਗ ਕਰ ਰਹੇ ਹਨ। ਅਗਲੇ 50 ਸਾਲਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਵੀ ਵੱਧ ਸਮੇਂ ਲਈ ਇਹਨਾਂ ਜ਼ਮੀਨਾਂ ਦੇ ਭਵਿੱਖ ਹਿ ਪਤਰੇਲ ਕਰਨ ਵਿੱਚ, ਸਿਟੀ ਇਲਾਰੇ ਦੇ ਵਰਤਮਾਨ ਵਸਨੀਕਾਂ ਦੇ ਹਿੱਤਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ ਦੇ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਵਸਨੀਕਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ ਸੰਤਲਿਤ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਕੋਸ਼ਿਸ਼ ਕਰੇਗੀ ਜੋ ਇਸ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਦੇ ਮਾਲਕ ਹਨ।

ਅਸੀਂ ਇਸ ਬਾਰੇ ਜਨਤਾ ਦੀ ਰਾਇ ਮੱਗ ਰਹੇ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਰਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਊਬ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਿਟੀ ਦੀ ਮਲਕੀਅਤ ਵਾਲੀ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਨੂੰ ਕਿਵੇਂ ਵਰਤਿਆ ਜਾ ਸਕਦਾ ਹੈ ਜਿਸ ਨਾਲ ਰਿਹਾਇਸ਼ ਦੇ ਸੱਕਟ ਨੂੰ ਹੱਲ ਕਰਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਮਦਾਦ ਮਿਲ ਸਕੇ ਅਤੇ ਹੋਰ ਤਰਜੀਰਾਂ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਯੋਗਦਾਨ ਪਾਇਆ ਜਾ ਸਕੇ ਜਿਵੇਂ ਕਿ ਜਲਵਾਯੂ ਤਬਦੀਲੀ 'ਤੇ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਵਿੱਚ ਤੇਜ਼ੀ ਲਿਆਉਣੀ, ਬਰਾਬਰੀ ਅਤੇ ਨਾਜੁਕ ਸਮਾਜਿਕ ਮੁੱਦਿਆਂ 'ਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਆਦਾ ਧਿਆਨ ਅਤੇ ਸਥਾਨਕ ਅਰਥ-ਵਿਵਸਥ ਦੀ ਰੱਖਿਆ ਕਰਨੀ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਨੂੰ ਅੱਗੇ ਵਧਾਉਣਾ।

ਇਹ ਸਿਟੀ-ਵਿਆਪੀ ਜਨਤਕ ਸ਼ਮੂਲੀਅਤ, ਸਿਟੀ ਦੇ ਵਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਊਬ ਇਲਾਕਾ ਯੋਜਨਾਬੰਦੀ ਪ੍ਰੋਗਰਾਮ ਨਾਲ ਜੁਤੀ ਹੋਏ ਹੈ ਪਰ ਇਹ ਉਸ ਤੋਂ ਸੁਤੰਤਰ ਹੈ ਜਿਸ ਨੂੰ ਕਿ ਹੋਲਡ 'ਤੇ ਰੱਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ। ਅਸੀਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੀ ਫੀਡਬੇਕ ਦੀ ਵਰਤੋਂ ਫਾਲਸ ਕ੍ਰੀਕ ਸਾਊਬ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਿਟੀ ਦੀ ਮਲਕੀਅਤ ਵਾਲੀਆਂ ਜ਼ਮੀਨਾਂ ਬਾਰੇ ਲੰਬ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੇ ਰੇਸਲੇ ਲੈਣ ਵਿੱਚ ਮਦਦ ਕਰਨ ਲਈ ਕਰਾਂਗੇ। ਸਾਨੂੰ ਜੋ ਵੀ ਰਾਇ ਮਿਟੇਗੀ ਥੋੜ੍ਹੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਅਸੀਂ ਉਸਦੇ ਬਾਰੇ ਇੱਕ ਸ਼ਮੂਲੀਅਤ ਦੀ ਸੱਖ ਪਿਰੇਖਣ ਤਿਆਕ ਕਰਾਂਗੇ ਜਿਸ ਨੂੰ ਅਸੀਂ ਸਾਡੀ ਵੈੱਬਸਾਈਟ 'ਤੇ ਪੇਸਟ ਕਰਾਂਗੇ। ਇਸ ਸ਼ਮੂਲੀਅਤ ਤੋਂ ਜਨਤਾ ਦੀ ਰਾਇ ਸਿਟੀ ਦੀ ਵਿਸ਼ਲ ਵੈਨਕੂਵਰ ਯੋਜਨਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਵੀ ਸੂਚਿਤ ਕਰੇਗੀ।

ਆਪਣੇ ਵਿਚਾਰ ਸਾਂਝੇ ਕਰੋ: shapeyourcity.ca/FCSLands 'ਤੇ ਜਾਓ ਅਤੇ ਸਰਵੇਖਣ ਪੁਰਾ ਕਰੋ



Video



youtube.com/watch?v=8vLmC9PfiqE

Discussion Slides



## False Creek South Lands: Opportunities for the Future

# Welcome

# Thank you for your participation in the discussion about the future of the False Creek South lands.

The City of Vancouver acknowledges that it is situated on the unceded traditional territories of the x<sup>w</sup>məθk<sup>w</sup>əÿəm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and səlilwəta**4** (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations.





## False Creek South Lands: Opportunities for the Future



# What is this engagement about?

The City of Vancouver is seeking public input about how 80 acres of City-owned lands in False Creek South could potentially be used to help address the housing crisis, and contribute to achieving other priorities such as accelerating action on climate change, increased focus on equity and critical social issues and protecting and building the local economy.

This engagement explores the future of these lands, for the next 50 years and beyond, balancing the interests of current neighbourhood residents with those of all Vancouver residents who own this land.



# What's Next?

The city-wide public engagement period runs from February 1 to 28. We will use your feedback to help inform long-term decisions about the City-owned lands in False Creek South. In the short term we will also be compiling what we hear into an engagement summary report which we will post on our website. Public input from this engagement will also inform the City's broader Vancouver Plan.

## Ways to Participate

From February 1 to 28, you can:



Visit **shapeyourcity.ca/FCSLands** to learn more and complete a survey

| Ø | 88<br>88 |
|---|----------|
| 7 | Ξ,       |

Learn more, ask questions and provide feedback during an online information session and Q&A Wednesday, February 17 or Thursday, February 25



Email FalseCreekSouthLands@vancouver.ca

Share this opportunity with your networks



# How to ask questions

- 1. Click the "Participants" button to open the panel.
- 2. To raise your hand, click the hand icon. To submit a question or comment, type it into the Q&A window.
- 3. If your Q&A panel is open, the hand icon may be located higher up



If you're having technical difficulties, you can reach the host through the chat window, or call 604-873-7633.



## False Creek South Lands: Opportunities for the Future



# **About False Creek South**





# **About False Creek South**

### **1970s**

## Today



False Creek South is a unique waterfront community that became a model for progressive urban planning in the 1970s, when the City transformed industrial land into a neighbourhood known for its abundance of open space and innovative design.

The False Creek South neighbourhood is located between the Cambie and Burrard Street bridges on the south shore of False Creek, excluding Granville Island and Senakw.

The City of Vancouver owns and manages 80 acres of this land on behalf of Vancouver citizens. The rest of the land is either privately owned or owned by other levels of government.



## False Creek South Lands: Opportunities for the Future

## **Current Housing Types**



#### **City of Vancouver |** shapeyourcity.ca/FCSLands

If you're having technical difficulties, you can reach the host through the chat window, or call 604-873-7633.



# **Current Housing Types Continued**

False Creek South is a primarily residential neighbourhood, with approximately 1,800 units on leased City-owned lands. Most of the leases expire between 2036 and 2046. While there has been new housing built and proposed around False Creek in the past two to three decades, no new housing has been built in the False Creek South neighbourhood since the 1980s.

The City leases its land for about an equal mix of market and non-market housing. Housing types include:

- Leasehold strata (townhouses and condos)
- Co-op housing
- Non-market rental (including seniors housing)
- Social housing
- Long-term care homes



#### **City of Vancouver |** shapeyourcity.ca/FCSLands

If you're having technical difficulties, you can reach the host through the chat window, or call 604-873-7633.


### **Other Current Land Use**



Public land in False Creek South includes 22 acres of park and three kilometres of seawall, as well as three marinas (two of them Vancouver Park Board marinas). There are also a number of mixed developments, including four mixed residential-commercial buildings, as well as an elementary school.



## **Demographics**

Today, False Creek South's population makes up about one per cent of Vancouver's population. Compared to Vancouver's population overall, the median age of those living in False Creek South is higher than the city's average, median household income in False Creek South is also higher than the average, the number of families with children is lower, and the proportion of those who identify as a visible minority is lower.



#### **2016 Census Data: False Creek South and Vancouver Overall**

False Creek South

5,597 Population

54.3 Median Age

17% Visible Minority

**\$78,176** Median household incomes

13% Pop. in low income household

\* Source: 2016 Statistics Canada Census

Vancouver

631,486 Population

> **40.7** Median Age

**52%** Visible Minority

\$65,327 Median household incomes

**19%** Pop. in low income household



## Why are we engaging now?

With most leases expiring in the next 15 to 25 years, the City has a responsibility to consider potential longterm use of its lands to help address priorities, such as Vancouver's housing crisis.

The City manages these lands on behalf of all Vancouver citizens, so it's important that we hear from everyone. Also, current residents are seeking more clarity from the City regarding the future of their leases. In exploring the future of these lands for the next 50 years and beyond, the City will strive to balance the interests of current neighbourhood residents with those of all Vancouver residents who own this land.







## **Opportunities for the future**





## **Exploring the future of False Creek South Lands**

The City is exploring the future of these lands, for the next 50 years and beyond, balancing the interests of current neighbourhood residents with those of all Vancouver residents who own the land. Considerations include:

- How City-owned lands in False Creek South could potentially help address priorities in the best interests of all Vancouver residents, such as helping to address the housing crisis, stimulate the economy, improve equity and critical social issues, and accelerate action on climate change.
- Clarifying potential future uses for False Creek South lands for residents and businesses located on these City-owned lands.
- Ensuring decisions concerning the future of Cityowned lands are financially responsible.





### Vancouver's housing crisis

Vancouver is facing a housing crisis; the lack of housing that is more affordable to a range of incomes is making it hard for many people and families to live, work and build a future here.

The City is looking at many opportunities to address this crisis, such as potentially using City-owned land, including portions of the 80 acres in False Creek South, to create additional housing options that are more affordable to a range of incomes.



# Approach to exploring housing options

The City's approach to exploring more housing options on City-owned lands in False Creek South would be based on:

- Retaining public ownership of the lands
- Treating those with homes on land leased from the City in False Creek South fairly
- Respecting the original vision for False Creek South as an affordable, diverse neighbourhood
- Potentially phasing in a new vision for City-owned lands in False Creek South, over time





## **Opportunity to address Vancouver's housing crisis**

Using some of the City-owned lands in False Creek South could be an option to help address Vancouver's housing needs. Housing types could include:

- **Purpose-built rental** buildings built and designed expressly for long-term rental accommodation
- Family housing units with two or more bedrooms
- Seniors housing units for seniors over 55 or those close to 55 with a disability
- Workforce housing units for working people making low to moderate incomes in proximity to their workplace
- Indigenous housing housing available to Indigenous families and individuals
- Accessible and adaptable housing housing that is accessible to people of all ages and abilities

- 'Missing middle' diverse housing options, such as townhouses, duplexes, fourplexes, cottage courts, and multi-family apartment buildings that fill the gap between single-family homes and higher density apartments
- Co-op non-profit, often subsidised housing controlled by resident co-op members who have a vote in decisions concerning the operation and maintenance of their building
- **Social housing** rental buildings with rent amounts that are subsidized, making it more possible for people with lower incomes to find housing they can afford



# What does this mean for current leaseholders?

Leaseholders are seeking clarity about the future of City lands in False Creek South.

The Provisional Resident Protection and Retention Plan (RPRP), approved by Council in 2018, seeks to support local residents through any changes to City-owned lands, such as minimizing displacement, providing alternative housing options, and providing advance notice and transparency.





## **Other priorities**

In addition to housing, City-owned lands in False Creek South present a potential opportunity to help address other priorities, such as:



Use City-owned lands in False Creek South to test innovative urban planning and sustainability practices that can be replicated in other neighbourhoods



Create an equitable, diverse, and inclusive community



Plan for rising sea levels and shoreline stability



Enhance park space



Use City-owned lands to provide new entertainment and cultural spaces



Increase sustainable transportation choices, such as walking, cycling, electric vehicles and mobility devices, and transit



Help reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs)



Advance the City's Reconciliation efforts, working with Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh Nations and urban Indigenous partners



Create jobs and economic opportunities



## **Next steps**

We will use your feedback to help inform long-term decisions about the City-owned lands in False Creek South.

In the short term we will also be compiling what we hear into an engagement summary report which we will post on our website. Public input from this engagement will also inform the City's broader Vancouver Plan.





#### We want to hear from you!

We want to hear your views on questions in the Talk Vancouver survey, which include:

How important is it for the City to explore options to create additional housing that is affordable to a range of incomes in this location? What types of housing are most important?

For potential housing options, do you have views on phasing in new housing? Should market housing be used to pay for more non-market and affordable housing units? Other than housing, what other priorities do you think should be addressed?

Overall, with the expiry of most land leases taking place in 15 to 25 years, should the City explore the potential opportunity to increase affordable housing options, and address other public priorities, in False Creek South?



## How to ask questions

- 1. Click the "Participants" button to open the panel.
- To raise your hand, click the hand icon. To submit a question or comment, type it into the Q&A window.
- 3. If your Q&A panel is open, the hand icon may be located higher up







### **Share your thoughts**

| $\otimes$ | $\supset$ |
|-----------|-----------|
| $\odot$   |           |
| Ř         | $\supset$ |

We want to hear your views about options for the future of City-owned lands in False Creek South. Your participation will help shape our city for the benefit of current and future generations.



We encourage you to provide your comments via a short survey, available at **shapeyourcity.ca/ FCSLands** or by sending an email to **FalseCreekSouthLands@vancouver.ca** by February 28, 2021.

## Kirk&Co.

