

# Britannia

## RENEWAL

### Britannia Housing Forum

September 21, 2017, 6 – 9pm

Britannia Community Services Centre, Gym D

The Britannia Housing Forum, a 3-hour forum held on September 21, 2017, featured presentations and an interactive discussion on the potential of housing as part of the Britannia Renewal project. The session provided an overview of why housing is being considered as part of the Britannia Renewal, and engaged participants in a discussion around the potential opportunities and impacts of housing on the site. Approximately 50 people attended the forum.



Following an introductory presentation on the Britannia Renewal project, three speakers gave short presentations to help frame the public conversation.

- **Dan Garrison, Assistant Director of Planning- Housing Policy, City of Vancouver**  
Presented on City policy regarding housing and the context for housing in Grandview-Woodland and at the Britannia site.
- **Kira Gerwing, Manager, Community Investment, Vancity**  
Presented on Vancity's growing experience in non-profit and public housing development and operations, and the potential models available to Britannia
- **Bruce Haden, Architect, AIBC**  
Presented on public housing form, function and new and exciting housing projects here in Vancouver and around the world.

The short presentations were followed by a World Café style discussion, centred around the following questions:

- How would housing contribute to the mission and vision of Britannia?
- Who would the housing be for?
- How could housing impact programming?
- How could housing impact schools and students?

- What would be some of the housing parameters – form, density, height, access, location, views, etc.?

Participants spent 10-minutes discussing each of the questions. A group of volunteer table moderators and note takers from SFU, UBC and the local community moved from table-to-table, with one moderator and one note taker assigned to each of the five questions.

The session ended with each of the moderators presenting an overview of common themes and ideas on the question they were tasked with.



## Discussion Notes

### Question 1: How would housing contribute to the mission and vision of Britannia?

- Vision created by board a few years ago to give direction and guide through changes, through this renewal and development
- Doesn't think that housing adds to the vision or contributes to it; has lived in the area for years and as someone who has lived here for a long time doesn't think housing will add value
- Thinks that some examples shown in presentation show potential to link services at Britannia to housing
- Themes of "life" and "well-being" from M/V statements; not possible to have well-being if you are not securely housed, and there are a lot of people in this community who are not adequately or securely housed
- when we have a lot of insecurely housed people in the community, that undermines the health of the community as a whole
- if people are living on site, they will use the site/services (the school, seniors' services)
- as someone who lives in the neighbourhood, is excited at the possibility of housing
- someone sitting on the fence; in a way thinks there should be no housing, but if there were housing – likes idea of housing that is artful, enhanced by people who live there. But, doesn't think that having social housing connected to the community will solve the housing crisis; that's a different dimension. There's no one development that will solve the problem
- wouldn't want to see the renewal of Britannia compromised; wonders if it is possible to accommodate it all. He thinks that how much room would be allocated to housing is a critical factor. There is a housing crisis in Vancouver and Britannia could be a good way to contribute. His children can't afford to live here, we need some assistance for low income households
- something that is unclear to people; we have a large site at Britannia with many elements. Most of this land is owned by the school board, a small portion is owned by the city (the pool+)
- secure housing is critical to personal well-being; having security is a baseline for well-being and housing is a fundamental issue (providing security through housing)
- housing can be a part of mission/vision as long as community is part of the process every step of the way; doesn't want housing that is just stuck in
- housing is important for security, but Britannia is a partner in a partnership; people living in the housing have to see it as a partnership. There are neighbours that have concerns about the site
- depends on the nature of housing, how it's operated, who it's operated by; depends on finding the right partners
- as someone who lives in co-op housing, it's a very specific model of community engagement. Other piece around social connection in M/V statements could be housing (in addition to community centre) can be a way to increase social connections and community dynamic. Can be a way to connect people, not just a space for people to live. It could also mimic the model of a community centre (working together); could be aligned with the mission and vision if managed and designed appropriately. Don't want people just living there for housing, want people who understand the community
- interest in aging in place, idea of staying there for an entire lifetime important. Avoids potential of eviction for rezoning. This is a way to help people enhance their well-being by aging in place
- Grandview developing about half as fast as the north shore; if population is to triple, then will need lots of housing

- Having secure housing allows people to achieve happiness, contribute to community; if affordable, people have more to give back to the community and the community benefits – improves the local economy
- Security of tenure would be really important; if there is to be housing, it should be secure to meet the mission/vision
- Many of the elements of the vision/mission go both ways; housing for people living in it could help them build connections, make social connections
- How could housing bring those elements to the larger community through housing?
- Could create people with a greater sense of ownership of the community; could be a positive or not
- Housing could be seen as being included in the mission because more and more housing has become a critical community service. Having housing could deepen Britannia's ability to meet the values articulated in the mission/vision. Broadens community
- Sees life and well-being being enhanced by living at the same place as where services are offered (reduces need to commute). But, would people living at Britannia have priority over people not living at Britannia?
- Hard to determine whether or not housing fits within the identity of Britannia when there is a larger housing crisis in the city. Trying to find a way to mash housing in to Britannia's identity. Doesn't think that housing fits in to the vision/mission of Britannia
- Can think of a lot of things that could enhance the well-being of the community, but may not be achievable. Hard to see housing as fitting in to Britannia, but on the fence; keeps coming back to the available space and competing priorities for this space
- "forced diversity of occupants" to create diversity of programs, could make things more vibrant as the neighbourhood around gentrifies; could build bridges across social strata – but seems skeptical that this could actually happen
- all programs and services are open and accessible to everyone in the community (schools, services), could be great for people living in housing but for rest of community what would the benefit be? How does it enhance vision/mission for rest of community? Are there trade-offs affecting those who aren't benefiting from the housing?
- we have housing all around us, we have people that own their own houses living in the neighbourhood. Whether there is housing at Britannia or not, people will come and use the services and facilities. Do we force Britannia's vision and mission on people that would be living in this housing? Concerned that this might create a "pressure" or requirement that people feel like they need to participate in programming
  - but thinks that there is a real need for housing, and biggest issue in a person's life is loneliness; people are always being welcomed in to the Britannia community, in this way aligns with Britannia's mission
- mutual effect of housing in terms of atmosphere and culture of community centre; clear demarcation of housing and community space and welcoming/belonging for whole community; community centre will proceed whether or not there is housing. Housing can give people some sense of ownership
- issue with co-op housing only works if residents are all contributing. Thinks that most people will align with the mission/vision, but that there will always be some people that aren't interested in contributing to the larger community, it's inevitable
- housing could create an environment that allows people to participate in programs, but can't have living in housing be contingent on participating in programming
- such a need for housing, but would housing be imposed on richer areas? NIMBYism issue

- “word-wise” it aligns, but a person’s community is what they make it to be. Some people want to be left alone and that is ok for their well-being
- not sure if housing aligns with the M/V; doesn’t want to start with the assumption that housing can work as long as it’s done right.
- Doesn’t agree that there should be housing because there is already a wide range of housing available in the neighbourhood, what will it add to this site? He thinks that there is already diverse and flourishing community
- One of the only places that we could have non-market housing, just don’t want to overdo it.
- We really need to help people who are homeless and getting priced out of rent; very few opportunities for social housing in this neighbourhood. This community does already have lots of social housing, but we can still use more
- Thinks that housing can contribute to M/V, there is a need for social housing and if community revitalization is an avenue for that it’s a good opportunity
- If housing were to be on property, would align with the M/V as it stands, but M/V are always evolving which is something to consider
- Adding social housing is capacity building, but feels it would inhibit the community’s centre’s ability to serve everyone in the community; possibly two competing user groups
- Thinks a small-scale project could be a case study or trial as a model for other areas. A large project could be a big disaster if overdone, but worth giving a try on a small scale
- Concern for safety in the area
- Speaker examples seem in line with vision + mission of Britannia.
- Cannot have wellbeing without housing.
- Precariously housed people means the community’s overall wellbeing is decreased.
- Housing needed for wellbeing.
- On the fence – social housing will not solve the whole problem – Just a drop in the bucket, better than nothing!
- How much will be devoted to housing?
  - Land/space
  - If possible to add housing to renew Britannia, then yes we should do it
  - Housing does fit mission x2
  - Housing could fit mission x2
- Does it fit mission? 4x: Yes.
- Yes: When you’re secure, you can give back by providing security.
- Yes: If as long as the community is a part of the process the whole time.
- Yes: If everyone is coming to build houses, must build partnership.
- Yes: If there is potential to create community through housing! Need to match community and the community centre model.
- Need to select people that really understand community.
- Yes, because “age in place” – need to be able to stay.
- No renovation because of rezoning.
- Change is coming!
- Security of tenure is huge. Not for profit housing.
- 2x: Yes, 1x: maybe, 1x: no, 1x: I don’t know.
- Yes: Housing is a critical community service.
- Yes: “Life would be a lot nicer if I was closer to services” – I want to live here, I don’t want to commute here.

- Maybe: But it could go both ways.
- No: Private property is the problem, if we need public housing.
- Diverse neighborhood – Diverse programming but will it work?
- I don't know: Great for people that get the housing, but what about everyone else?
- What are the tradeoffs?
- 4x: Yes, 1x: Maybe, 1x: I don't know
- Yes: People are still coming here regardless of there being more housing.
- Yes: I think [it does fit] there is a huge need.
- Yes: Community Centre will do its thing regardless.
- Yes: It could support programs, but it should not be a requirement to support housing.
- Maybe: Probably would align, but some people will just not engage.
- I don't know: I don't know, it is a complicated issue. It aligns word wise, but it's the people who have to make the community.
- 5x: Yes, 2x: Maybe, 1x: no
- Yes: This is one of the only areas that we could have non-market housing.
- Yes: Very little opportunity left for non-market housing.
- Yes: Prices are going up all the time, more social housing NOW! This is an avenue for that.
- Yes: But mission always evolving, so need to keep in mind.
- Yes: Must do it right + try it out, fits mandate if done right.
- What about safety of the kids? Do it somewhere else.
- Have to consider if kids are being exposed to more danger.
- Have to consult the parents of the kids! Not just people who work at Britannia.
- Maybe: Community Centre might end up focusing just on the group that lives there.
- Maybe: Not sure – Frustrating – the assumption that this will be good, it is rezoning.
- No: it is already dense + mixed enough here – but we should try.

## Question 2: Who would the housing be for?

- Need a diversity of people
- There's an opportunity for different agencies to run different types of housing on site with a percentage being subsidized e.g., seniors, indigenous housing, women-led family housing.
- Must take care of vulnerable people BUT ordinary people are also being pushed out.
- Different types of housing to suit different needs with supports in place e.g. supported independent living, indigenous homes, and homes for people with mental health issues BUT must be supports in place.
- Low income
- Seniors
- People with disabilities
- Single parents
- Diversity is most important - not just one demographic
- Diversity that represents local community based on % of local demographics
- Artists, writers, musicians in residence
- Long-term housing for 'whole of life' needs
- Mixed - not a specific demographic, e.g., "artist baristas"
- "Where does temporary shelter fit in?"
- Concern that it will be for "niche groups"
- Needs to support all stages of life and changes in families
- Affordable housing for larger families with 3-4 bedrooms
- Need to be a focus on seniors - there is not enough housing for seniors in the area - needs to be especially for those already here.
- Indigenous housing - there is a vibrant population here who care deeply about the elders, having elders mixed in will help keep families intact
- Intergenerational housing, having a mix of youth, elderly, families, etc.
- Must be adaptable over time
- "Not 'ghettoize' just with one type of demographic
- Seniors need to be around others
- A mix of groups to avoid loneliness
- One type of group does not encourage community
- Sharing of knowledge and support will occur if there is a mix
- Low income housing
- People with disabilities
- Seniors
- People in service industries
- Students - there is the potential to work within the complex and share knowledge between generations e.g. students helping seniors, seniors helping with kids and single moms.
- Encourage looking out for each other

- "It's hard to say until we know what it will look like"
- Start off with single parent families and slowly introduce others if it works.
- MUST be safe for children - there are too many predators in the area already - needs to be family focused.
- Indigenous and elders housing
- "Everybody deserves housing - it should be for whoever is eligible"
- Need to support the members of this community - even those on moderate incomes who are falling through the gaps and are not eligible for subsidized housing but who still struggle
- Include singles as well as families here is no lack of need for almost any group
- Needs to avoid the criminal element and the problems that are associated with low income and poverty.
- Concern about the school nearby if this happens
- Need to help the homeless especially those who live on or near site already.

### Question 3: How could housing impacts schools and students?

- Kids in housing going to school is beneficial - no need for transportation. Helpful for single moms.
- Could co-op work between parents for childcare after school be an option?
- 5th generation neighbourhood member- why would they think that housing would be ok on school grounds? I.e. Eric Hamber doesn't do this. Why should we? Is this just because we are an 'inner city' school?
- Where's the guarantee that people that need housing will actually get it?
- What could we do for the kids at the library right now? Why are we focusing on housing on site when we need more computers at the library?
- Agreement that more computers at library are needed.
- We should put the question to the students and parents of said students about housing needs, requirements and desires?
- Request for after school program, daycare, childcare.
- Will the school benefit from this?
- Situate apartments very carefully. Only certain types of families should be able to reside here.
- Seniors need to be located near the senior centre.
- Families should be near family services.
- Depends on type of housing.
- Its positive for secondary and any age of student. Diversity is good, it's their community
- Shared space is happening already. People of all ages and circumstances come and go as it is.
- Why would we dilute an educational bubble with housing? It would interfere with our educational goals. It's nonsense.
- Predators are a threat here. They would be more of a threat with housing.
- Empty areas are dangerous.
- Many intimidating black areas now. There would be no more dark little pockets with proper development.
- Cohesive community available with this new housing.
- Intergenerational melding happening if housing is incorporated.
- If housing is incorporated with somewhat low-rise housing, 4-6 levels and 5-6 units per floor, this would be positive addition
- I'm not convinced it would enhance the site. Maybe it could co-exist but may not be symbiotic. I don't see this as constructive. There may be rules and regulations from the school on acceptable residents.
- I don't have a clue, maybe negligible effects.
- Could we set up housing that is just for families?
- Parents like it when they don't have to ferry their kids to school. Streets are insanely busy in the morning and afternoon with carting kids in speeding cars.
- Think it's a great idea to welcome more families.
- Criminal issues with some people?
- Would there be a condition that if you live here your kids must go to school here?
- Neighbourhood schools need more support. Bonding happens when you walk to and from school. You get to know the neighbourhood well and the kids you go to school with as you are socializing before and after.
- Before and after school programs are good.

- Bad idea. Concern that social housing brings problems and needle issues. Low income and no income people are a problem. This individual believes that social housing means problem people. Only a few individuals made this kind of inference but they were very strong voices.
- Do we need a definition of social housing for future feedback that reflects the broad range of individuals that could take advantage of social housing?
- Screening necessary for applicants to living in on-site housing.
- Housing is right outside of the door as it is. There are apartments behind Gym D. Any issues can be handled.
- More students needed for the school.
- The school put fences up to keep undesirable activity out of the grounds. Right now, security is an issue.
- Housing puts “eyes on the street.” It’s positive.
- How do you get safety issues taken care of?
- How can people say green space should be used for housing? That’s offensive.
- There should be recreational space on top of school. There could be multiple uses of roof tops (referencing video example).
- Concerns that adults would negatively impact the school. Also, there would be positive impacts.
- School board must be part of the discussion.
- Shared space can be a beautiful zone. We street proof kids anyways. How would this be different?
- We don’t want unsavory people mixing with kids.
- Who is unsavory? Welfare recipients and unemployed.
- Schools should be responsible for students.
- Parents and teachers are entrusted with teaching kids to be safe.
- Mean kids bully the marginalized right now. Unlikely that with housing there would be any change in this.
- Where is the green space? What’s going to happen to it? How is it going to be protected?!
- If we are tripling the population, as will happen with this country with immigration, where is everybody going to go for green space?
- Everyone loves single family homes. How is this going to work?
- We need to slow the immigration to Canada as there will be no green spaces left.
- Strathcona would love to see programs for parents to develop skills while parents are at school. They are envious about what Britannia does.
- Yes, to housing - it would increase the viability of school attendance.
- Would schools impact who could be onsite? I.e.- court-ordered people?
- Principals can tell problems students from other schools to stay away- how could you do that here?
- Screening? Scrutiny of tenants? Is introducing more adults on site a good thing?
- Individual is concerned about how would their autistic child be with housing. If people aren’t welcoming how does that affect everyone? If child is violent, what affect would that have on the child’s family? How could you continue to guarantee that they are welcome there? Child has violent episodes which she believes/knows would restrict her family and her autistic child
- We have adjacent housing already with mixed families and mixed needs.
- How does funding work for this? This is complicated.
- Pros/Cons: high school babysitters or more dope smokers.

#### Question 4: How could housing impact programming?

- Noise – complaints from housing residents. Concern. Britannia Space large enough to have space to have loud events. Concern housing will ‘quieten’ the space and the programs. Housing will impact type of events at night.
- Community – but with outsiders, has no commitment to community.
- Housing priced out will lessen diversity.
- Housing will have a large impact for programs/services.
- Diverse Community - diverse interests, which will impact services programs.
- Community to provide for needs of community. Housing takes away from space.
- Diversity of residents – impact programs. Is positive – brings more people.
- Impacts housing – more people will use programs. Currently programs used to max now.
- Would have to expand program to accommodate.
- Housing adds to diversity.
- Currently have large max. usage.
- Housing will increase demand on programs. Will this mean less programs?
- Facilities will be used more. Britannia has lowest cost to use programs.
- Revitalization will attract more people to use programs. Regardless of housing, programs will be used more whether housing here or not.
- Concern. Britannia has facilities to serve community regardless of housing here or not.
- How many units of housing?
- Housing will bring synergy, more people, more diverse, more eyes on site (at night residents)
- Housing on top of facilities. Events outside of Britannia – noise.
- Will impact programs.
- Living on site – will more likely use the programs and services.
- If no housing, will remain status quo.
- Housing – accessibility. More people more demand.
- Housing – lessens program space – but shouldn’t - built above facilities.
- Funding for programs? How allocate housing and programs?
- Different types of residents. Richer diversity, housing seniors, families, etc. Help diversify types of Brit’s programs offered.
- Currently Brit’s programs cover a lot of diversity. May be missing a few niche areas.
- Housing will not impact programs regardless.
- Housing – programs more accessible – to people living there on-site.
- Housing will increase base of users – more children
- May need new programs. On site residents –accessible to programs.
- Revitalization will help programming.
- More housing – feel safer (more people around)
- Housing whether have or not – will not impact programming activities.
- Noise – agreed would be a concern.
- Currently already have noise from events in the park adjacent to Britannia.

## Question 5: What would be some of the housing parameters – form, density, height, access, location, views, etc.?

- low height (3-6 storeys) to protect the views
- co-housing, intergenerational homes, housing for people at different life-stages
- small units with shared spaces, “dorm” style
- a variety of unit types, sizes, usable/livable layouts, from small (dorm style) to big (up to 7-bedroom) units
- accessibility
- places for people to cross their paths, interact
- passive buildings, energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainability
- good quality materials and execution
- free form, character, creativity
- on the edges, corners of the development
- make sure the potential housing does not overwhelm the site; other users should not be excluded from the activities on the site
- housing has to co-exist with the activities of the community centre
- protection of green spaces, community gardens
- parking debatable (underground parking vs. no parking at all – active transportation/transit)
- “the height question” – the higher you go, the more money you can earn; but high buildings can destroy peoples’ views → what is the current zoning regulations on the site?
- 3 to 4 storeys, no more than 6 (might vary across the site since it’s on a hill)
- the more units, the more administration needs (no interest to be “in the housing business”)
- clusters of units to form a community → small number of units, perhaps 6, less than 10
- should the housing units go all the way to the ground or should there be other use on the ground floor – probably not
- dorm type of housing (as presented) a good idea for students (or anybody, in school, school age, someone who is okay with this type of living – sharing and spending time together) in some areas of the development
- flexibility of the space → adaptability over time/implemented over different time frames – “things do change”
- it would be nice for everyone to have a view
- development should be architecturally viable and sound
- accessibility for everyone → ramps and elevators
- housing to have a unique character, allow some customization (not necessarily to the degree of what was in the presentation)
- preserving green space (yes, it’s the mandate, but important)
- not square block-form, free-form, curvier, not a lot of glass (energy efficiency)
- density: the amount of space available for Britannia services should be a priority (also no funding should be taken from community centre development)
- due to the lack of housing in Vancouver it is a no-brainer to include it in Britannia
- thought should be given to sustainability, livable spaces with good, usable layouts, accessible
- use of good quality materials, good design, well built
- agree with only using air space parcels and protecting the views of the mountains → preferred not to have a lot of layers (storeys) added on site
- housing is very important – but has to fit within the guidelines

- could have a design competition
- the housing should match the Britannia space
- make it community-focused → inclusion of older people, designed for the people who already use it, not make it a destination attraction (like a wave pool)
- important to consider the effect of a development on property values, consequentially taxes → people concerned about the property taxes of housing in vicinity
- has to fit in the community
- height restrictions, 4 to 5 storeys
- should be on the outskirts of the site, with an entrance from the outside
- quality over style, using good materials → non-toxic material, renewable energy, no plastic elements
- taller buildings better than single family homes, multiuse, solar power → to reflect the anticipated changes in the community
- passive buildings
- rising density of traffic, consequentially pollution → question of including parking: should promote walking, cycling, fewer use of a car, car-sharing; could institute that “committed pedestrians” have a priority in renting – “if you don’t have a car you get bonus points”; maybe no parking at all
- but, people who use active transportation/transit would need to have jobs in the neighbourhood – where to get those jobs?
- maximize the amount of people living in smaller units, with the community centre being their living room
- lots of community gardens
- a variety of unit sizes/types
- “this is a premature question...”
- providing a diversity of housing; family units
- a courtyard → important that the residents can co-exist with loud public events
- increase green space
- ideally not on the Britannia site, but close → if on the site, then on a corner or edges
- school is currently gated – what does that mean for housing
- there is a lot of talk about family housing – what about the people in other stages of their life?
- important to provide privacy, some distance – “people walking by your window” – the impact of other uses on housing
- intentionality, what residents’ contribution could be, sense of ownership
- interactions in the shared spaces between people who are visiting and those who live there – important not to exclude outside users from using the space
- how many units – consider history of the site → repatriating homes to the land
- “bring back the trees”
- housing should be facing the McLean Dr., W side → to be part of both the neighbourhood and the centre (“buried” into the retaining wall, push it back a bit)
- don’t make it too high to not shade other houses
- have underground parking
- areas where people can interact and cross paths
- shared green/outdoor space
- a range, a mix of unit types
- accessible
- multi-use common space for activities

- provide 3-bedroom units, at least 2000 sq. ft.
- housing for artists/singles/seniors → the idea of micro apartments, “dorms” with shared areas – for single people to spend time with others – multigenerational homes (to increase social capacity, knowledge exchange)
- include big, 6-7 bedroom units to serve different cultures
- passive buildings, sustainable, LEED certified
- provide enough of a mix of unit types – ageing in place, mobility issues
- houses that allow co-living of people of different walks of life
- no isolated towers
- more than one building
- The higher they go, the more money they will make off it. But at some point, the higher you go it destroys the view and changes the community. Tall housing often means luxury housing.
- Question someone had: how high are they zoned for?
- 3 to 4 stories is ideal.
- No more than 6; 4-6 seems reasonable.
- They’re on a hill so 4 stories might only be 4 stories at ground level on one side.
- Concerns around administration of housing – who would manage? They’re not in the housing business.
- 6 households seems like a good cluster.
- 10 families on one floor is a bit too many; less than 10 families per floor ideally.
- Parking underneath.
- Dorm room ideas for some of the students (either older high school students or university aged students).
- Flexibility of the space – can we recapture the space as recreation space later. Adaptable spaces. Things change over time.
- It would be nice for everyone to have a view if possible.
- Accessibility -ramps, elevators.
- No towers.
- Diversity of building form – having character come out. Each building should have its own character and express the character of the people living there. Perhaps some customization available so people can make it their own.
- Want the housing stacked.
- Free form – tired of blocks. Something that’s curvier, not a ton of glass (glass loses energy in the winter and allows it to get too hot in the summer)
- Like the idea of more original construction and better construction with regard to functionality
- Good quality building materials; sustainability (passive house); livable spaces with good layouts – not a lot of corridors. Durability of materials. Multi-functionality of spaces. Accessibility (wheelchairs and such).
- Use airspace parcel, don’t infringe on greenspace.
- Perhaps a design competition.
- Don’t want to create too many requirements/not too prescriptive because then housing might not happen.
- Have community focused housing and community focused amenities (example given: lots of older people in the neighbourhood so don’t have a wave pool in the public pool because that would attract people from elsewhere).
- Concerns around property taxes and an increase in property taxes due to development.

- Housing needs to fit into the community and be non-intrusive. Height no more than four or five stories. Ideally on the edge of the site facing onto the street so people in the housing have access to the street and it's less intrusive.
- Quality over style. A lot of quality in the workmanship and materials over non-durable materials. Non-toxic materials. Sustainability is important (renewable), no plastic.
- Mixed-use makes sense. Solar powered would be nice.
- No towers (although one person wanted a tower)
- Passive housing is important.
- When you have more people you get more traffic and more cars.
- Britannia as a precinct -> Emphasize walkability – pedestrian and cycling over cars. Emphasize car share rather than people having their own cars.
- Perhaps near transit.
- Perhaps don't build any parking at all to encourage people moving in who are mainly pedestrians.
- The ideal is people living within walking or cycling distance of work – but the question is where would these jobs be located?
- Bike parking.
- Don't consider co-housing because the community centre already would function as a sort of living room for residents.
- Various forms of housing (ranging from family oriented 3 bedroom units to micro spaces).
- Community gardens and gardens.
- Ground oriented buildings.
- Space big enough for families.
- Housing that would meet the diversity of needs in the community.
- Good soundproofing.
- Central courtyard with housing facing the back.
- Providing acoustic privacy.
- Ideally housing would not be on the Britannia site itself and instead on an adjacent site; but if it's going to happen it needs to be in a corner somewhere/on the periphery and not in the centre of everything.
- Not gated housing (referencing the fact that they recently gated the school – which they are very upset about).
- “All housing should be family housing” – it's not good to build housing where people can only live there for a certain stage of their life. An “artist's studio” is not fitting if the artist has kids or an ageing parent who needs to move in with them.
- If the housing is separate from the thick of things, it helps with the sense of ownership of the space. It might be too much to be in the middle of everything all the time.
- If you have housing on top of the community space, it may feel to people who don't live on the site that the people living on top of the site “owns” the space in a way. (Although there was some disagreement about this at the table).
- Long history of dispossession of this site before the 77 houses which were lost. Ideally the housing would address the history of dispossession.
- Housing on Maclean facing the street (on the far west site of the site). Partially close the street itself so you have more greenspace. This would be a way of having housing here on the site but in a way that would be similar to the neighbourhood but still on the Britannia site. Tuck the housing in and make it less obvious. Have housing facing housing.
- Don't make it high enough to block sun. Reduce shadowing.

- There must be parking. Parking is at a premium in this area.
- If things are supposed to be community focused, no high rises.
- Areas where people can cross paths and make people interact. If it's just another apartment building there won't be that community aspect.
- Shared spaces, shared backyards or courtyards
- Variety of sizes (bachelor, 1 bed, 2 bed, 3 bed)
- Accessibility (wheelchair, elevators, accessible counter heights)
- Common outdoor and indoor space (and a good size space at that)
- Ideally 3-bed would be at least 1,200 sq ft.
- Dorm living/co-housing – have something suited to single and young people.
- Inter/multi-generational housing.
- Perhaps 6 or 7 bedroom places for immigrants.
- Sustainability/passive house/energy efficient/solar panels/LEDs.
- Didn't have enough 1 bedrooms in another housing development where someone lives/Is involved in.
- Ability to age in place is important.
- A form that promotes connection and is for all walks of life.
- Make sure people can make visual connections.
- At least two separate housing buildings.



## Britannia Renewal Housing World Café

September 21st, 2017

6:00pm

Event opens, food is served

6:30

Introduction—Susanne Dahlin, Britannia Planning and Development Committee Chair

Opening prayer and acknowledgements

6:40

Introduction and Agenda overview— Jennifer Marshall, Urban Arts Architecture

Guest Speakers

- Dan Garrison, Assistant Director of Planning— Housing Policy, City of Vancouver
- Kira Gerwig, Manager— Community Investment, Vancity
- Bruce Haden, Architect, AIBC

7:15

World Café Overview and Moderator Introductions

Rotation discussions on the following questions:

1. How would housing contribute to the mission and vision of the Britannia Community Services Society? (see statements attached)
2. Who would housing be for?
3. How would housing impact programming?
4. How would housing impact the Secondary and Elementary schools?
5. What would be some of the housing parameters? Consider form, function, height, density. (see documents attached)

8:15

Report back by moderators

8:45

Wrap up and question period

8:55

Appreciations and close





## ***Vision***

To be a catalyst for social connection, capacity building and integration of services in our community while celebrating diversity, and enhancing the life and well-being of everyone who lives, works and plays in our community.

## ***Mission***

To develop, coordinate and support a wide range of excellent programs and services for Grandview-Woodland and Strathcona, by working with community members, partners and local agencies.

## **Programming Principles:**

### **Enhance Community Connectivity**

We offer fun, inclusive, innovative programs, spaces, and services that foster passion, enthusiasm, positive community involvement, and a sense of belonging and identity. We provide a space for social action, a place where people living in Grandview Woodland and Strathcona meet to discuss local area and neighborhood matters and work together to solve them.

### **Promote Health and Wellness**

We operate from a holistic approach and offer members a broad range of programs and services that engage different abilities and interests across the life span. Our approach is grounded in recreation, sport, fitness, arts, culture, education, learning, social interaction, nutrition, and social development. We promote the improved mental, emotional, physical, and spiritual health of our community, recognizing that health is impacted by personal, social, economic, and environmental factors.

### **Foster Social Justice and Equity**

We seek to create programs that encourage meaningful participation in our communities that may lead to social change. We strive to address social and historical inequities by advocating and acting in collaboration with vulnerable community members, and commit to Reconciliation.

### **Embrace Accessibility**

We offer welcoming, safe, barrier-free programs, services and environments. We proactively seek ways to respect and accommodate the unique needs of populations within the community. We do this through social interaction, cultural awareness, physical space design, equipment, economic, and environmental means.



### **Facilitate Cultural Interaction**

We promote sharing, learning, and understanding through programs and services that celebrate diversity and encourage cross-cultural interactions. Cultural practices and the sharing of food are important aspects of these celebrations.

### **Activate Networks**

We build bridges with individuals, networks, and agencies to benefit from each other's expertise and resources to achieve our mission, vision, and objectives as a Society. We facilitate access to resources for individuals, networks, and agencies.

### **Pursue Sustainability**

We use resources responsibly to sustain and ensure longevity of programs and services. We are stewards of the built and natural environment. We maximize utilization through sharing of resources and revenues.

### **Integrate Innovation**

We integrate current trends and are responsive to the emerging needs of the communities we serve, developing programs and services that are flexible, original, and relevant to our unique community.

### **Ensure Accountability**

We inform, involve, and include our community, participants, partners, members, and funders in our work. This encompasses the design and evaluation of programs and services. Programs and services are shown to be relevant through evidence of participation and need in the community.

Britannia Community Services Centre  
Planning and Development Committee

## Housing Guidelines

Revised Draft for review by Planning and Development Committee 09.19.2017

Preamble: These principles were created by the Planning and Development Committee's Housing Working Group as a framework for discussion about potential housing on the Britannia site. This is not a declaration for or against housing on the site but simply a working document to open an informed and healthy conversation with the Britannia community around the question: "If the community deems housing a desire/need for the site: how and where should it exist, what should it look like, and for what purposes? This is just one of many conversations to have as we continue to seek community input on all possible futures for Britannia as part of a larger community consultation. These principles should be understood in the context of Britannia's existing land use principles (March 2017), as well as broader community directions arising from the 2016 Grandview Woodlands Community Plan (see specifically: Grandview Woodlands Community Plan Direction 6.1.4 (p.48)).

1. All land on the Britannia site must continue to be 100% publically owned
2. Any potential housing must be 100% affordable non-market social housing
3. Any potential housing should be planned and designed as a complement to the existing primary purpose of the Britannia site as a community amenity and resource. Housing should be purpose-built and managed for a diverse tenancy that reflects the unique character of the neighbourhood and can benefit from the supports and services available on site and participate in the development of a healthy, inclusive community.
4. Any potential housing should be designed with a clear demarcation of housing and community space in order to maintain the feeling of privacy and security for residents as well as the sense of welcome and belonging for the whole community
5. In keeping with the commitment of the Britannia partners to community leadership, any potential housing should be operated with a management model that supports ongoing resident engagement in their tenancy and in the broader Britannia site.
6. Any potential housing should be managed in strong collaboration with Britannia site partners, working with residents and the broader

- community to develop and maintain a symbiotic relationship between the community amenities and resources and housing on site.
7. Any potential housing should be designed to maximize public greenspace as outlined in item #1 in the Britannia Land Use Principles (March 2017).
  8. Any potential housing should be designed to preserve mountain and city views from across the site as outlined in item #2 of Britannia's Land Use Principles (March 2017).
  9. Any additional adjacent land acquired to extend the site should also be considered as a location for additional affordable non-market social housing.

DRAFT

## Appendices

### A. Britannia Land Use Principles (March 2017)

#### Britannia Renewal Land Use Principles

These principles work to increase green space in the community, preserve views across the Britannia site, emphasize the importance of a public and open consultation process, and preserve Britannia's public land for public community centre uses. These principles are intended to be part of a larger visioning process that includes both internal and external stakeholders. This visioning process has been outlined in detail in *Britannia Renewal Stages and Steps in the Planning and Design Process* (December 11, 2015). In the visioning process, open discussion among internal stakeholders and the public leads the planning and design process for Britannia Renewal. While these principles lay some groundwork for such discussions, they will also be added to or expanded upon through them. They are meant to be a baseline, not an endpoint, for all discussion of the renewal of Britannia.

**1. Increase publicly accessible green space on the Britannia site and/or add green space adjacent to the site.**

*Rationale:* Since GW has been identified by the City of Vancouver as a park-deficient neighbourhood, we see the Britannia renewal as an opportunity to add green space/park space to the neighbourhood by reducing building footprints and recapturing some of the paved and built up areas of the 18-acre site.

**2. Preserve and enhance public views to the mountains and downtown across the site by maintaining or increasing open space, adding only buildings of moderate height and scale as necessary for community centre requirements and community benefit.**

*Rationale:* Grandview Park and the Britannia site together make one of the few open public spaces in the neighbourhood with views onto the mountains and downtown buildings. The views, sense of space, and openness are a fantastic public asset for the neighbourhood and for Britannia users. These must be preserved with the renewal of the centre and therefore new building heights should be restricted to reflect this. Any needed height should be restricted to community centre uses only and "air space parcels" should not be leased or sold for other private uses.

**3. Retain and revitalize the heritage secondary school (Britannia Secondary).**

*Rationale:* This building and school is very important to the history, beauty, and present-day uses of the site.

**4. Ensure that any external partnerships proposed during the Renewal process are transparent and be presented as part of the public discussion, agreed to by consensus of the existing stakeholders in consideration of the results of the public discussion.**

*Rationale:* Britannia currently operates through a complex, rich, and longstanding set of partnerships between the VSB, the VPL, the Vancouver Park Board, the City of Vancouver, and the Britannia Board. New partnerships run the risk of interrupting existing partnerships making the process of renewal that much more difficult to finalize.

**5. Ensure that agreements among the current land holding parties regarding land swaps or other ownership arrangements of the existing site land are transparent.**

*Rationale:* Similar to point 4 in that it is preferred that the public consultation and decision making process should not be hampered by additional encumbering agreements.

- 6. Prioritize all parts of the Britannia site, including potential air space parcels, for community centre, school, library, and green/open space use. All parts of the site must remain fully accessible to the public and community.**

*Rationale:* Due to the significant increase in density planned for the neighbourhood with the finalization of the new Grandview Woodland Community Plan, and the small number of new public amenities planned for the neighbourhood, especially park space, it is not acceptable that existing amenity space be turned over to private uses. Rather residents of this neighbourhood, old and new, will need to maximize the uses of existing amenity space for public use.

- 7. Prioritize meeting the existing and long term growth needs of the community for services and amenities throughout the renewal of Britannia. Services and amenities include but are not limited to open spaces, green spaces, gathering spaces, meeting and community engagement spaces, arts and cultural spaces, recreation spaces, seniors' spaces, child and youth spaces, food spaces, library, school, and other community centre uses.**

*Rationale:* Similar to Point 6. However, this point also asks us to think of the future, not just the immediate future, or the future envisioned by the Grandview Woodland Community Plan, but generations into the future. As the whole city densifies and housing becomes more compact, preserving our public land for public use, and building in durability and flexibility to adapt to changing use over time becomes especially important.

- 8. Ensure community support for the Britannia renewal by funding it through measures other than increasing density in this neighbourhood or others. Specifically, densities should not exceed what has been proposed in the Grandview Woodland Community Plan.**

*Rationale:* During the Renewal, we wish to be able to build as much consensus across the community of users as possible. We anticipate that funding needs may exceed the \$100 million dollars approved in 2014 through the Capital Plan Borrowing vote. Increasing the density of allowed development is one process that the City of Vancouver uses to achieve community infrastructure funding. Increases in density may sometimes be welcomed and other times opposed. Neighbourhood residents must be able to respond to development proposals in the way that they believe best for the neighbourhood without thinking that they are sacrificing needed neighbourhood amenities in the process. We also wish to avoid having neighbours pitted against each other.

*Approved by the Britannia Board of Management, 7<sup>th</sup> of March 2017*

web: <http://britanniarenewal.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Britannia-Renewal-Land-Use-Principles.pdf>

**B. Grandview Woodland Community Plan 6.1.4 A bullet 2 (p. 49)**

“Seek ways to mobilize air space parcels in the Britannia site to achieve plan objectives for social housing through co-location with other public facilities, provided there is no loss of green space.”

Citation: City of Vancouver, “Grandview Woodland Community Plan”. Approved by Council July 28, 2016. Published April 2017. Accessed online 8/30/2017. web: <http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/grandview-woodland-community-plan.pdf>

DRAFT