

Summary of Survey Responses: Metro 78

Written by *Belgravia Community Planning Committee*

Proposal Likes & Dislikes

Asked about general likes or dislikes about the proposal, respondents had positive opinions on the overall appearance and frequently felt density near the LRT was a good use of space. What was disliked was the proposal's height and mass, the lack of provided parking, and that the extra density sought was pushing things too far.

Proposed height (6 storeys)

Responses were overwhelmingly against 6 storeys, but divided on if 4 storeys as outlined in the ARP was appropriate, or should be lower. Concerns generally centered on the precedent-setting nature of 6 storeys, the contrast and potential impacts to surrounding developments, and as a way to reduce unit numbers to minimize impacts on traffic and parking congestion.

Inclusion of Commercial Space

Respondents were slightly more favorable to having commercial space in the buildings. Those in support were looking for services like day-care, pharmacies, and doctor offices, or small-scale commercial options such as grocers, convenience stores, cafes, and bakeries. Those opposed felt area services were already sufficient and concerned on the traffic added commercial might bring. There was no support for bars or late-hour businesses.

Some respondents also outlined that the lack of commercial venues in the community was why they felt vehicle ownership was necessary for living in the area and was directly impacting traffic numbers.

Special Considerations around LRT Station

Respondents wanted to make sure development did not negatively impact access to the LRT station including handicap accessibility, and frequently identified it as a suitable location to promote increased density and transit-oriented development, though stressed limiting how much. The development was seen as blocking noise to the near-by area, and could enhance the safety of the LRT station.

There were concerns the loss of the existing turnaround would be a problem for LRT kiss-and-rides, and that this development may create a 'wall', clashing aesthetically with the neighborhood and dividing the neighbourhood from the LRT.

Belgravia Traffic Congestion

Traffic congestion is widely viewed as a significant problem, particularly entering and exiting the community via 76 Ave during peak hours. Respondents were frequently frustrated with current conditions and wanted to ensure conditions would not get worse, fueling many negative sentiments against the proposal.

No Tenant Parking

There was some support for a 'carless' building for its environmental impacts and appeal to carless citizens. However, the slim majority were skeptical and in opposition to the idea; concerned tenants would have some cars and park in the street or rent spaces from neighbours. There was also a concern that the number of proposed visitor stalls was insufficient and would bleed over onto nearby streets.

Current Parking Restrictions

As a means to better discourage rogue tenants, the option for adjusting parking restrictions was proposed. A slim majority felt that existing parking restrictions should remain while others generally felt restrictions should be more severe. There were also a number of comments that enforcing current restrictions needed to greatly improve.

Amenity Contributions from the Developer

A wide array of suggestions were received, with the most frequent being upgrades to Charles Simmonds Park, improvements to the Belgravia rink, and League facility improvements. The Plaza received some backing, but was not in the forefront of what community members wanted to see.

Plaza Amenities

In the event the plaza was a contribution inevitability, respondents were polled on what things they did and did not want to see included. Responses frequently mentioned wanting to see benches/seating, greenery, intentionally designed spaces & furnishings for play, some form of water feature, consideration of history, and for overall good lighting.

Objected items centered on perceived security risks, potential for vandalism, litter, and noise & air pollution. Respondents wanted to feel safe, so proper sightlines and designs separating play from general pedestrians were encouraged.

There was a common theme that respondents weren't sold on the idea this plaza was a community benefit. Concerns were that the plaza was too small, too shady/windy, and would only be useful for residents of the development.