

# Public Consultation Results

The CCAP Update process provides for a variety of public consultation opportunities.

To date, Public Consultation efforts have included Open Houses in July and November 2006, each of which involved individual and group stakeholder meetings, display at City Hall, public presentations in Council Chambers, and posting of information on the City's website. Input was collected in the form of surveys and letters, the results of which are summarized below.



Summary of Survey Results — CCAP Open House 1 (July 2006)	
PROPOSED PLAN FEATURES	DEGREE OF PUBLIC SUPPORT AS PER SURVEY RESULTS
Vision, goals, principles, transit-oriented development, village attributes & “Build Green”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>74-78% support</li> </ul>
Population scenarios of 120,000 & 156,000 residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>64% favoured 120,000 versus 32% for 156,000</li> <li>61% preferred to give up jobs rather than park space if required to make a choice</li> <li>General agreement that the proposed amenities would support 120,000, but probably not 156,000</li> </ul>
20% Affordable Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>43% support</li> <li>Strong recognition of the need for affordable housing, especially in light of low paying jobs and high market housing costs</li> <li>Concern over the cost of achieving this goal, especially in light of the cost of providing adequate public amenities, park, and services</li> </ul>
Top three preferred public amenities to provide	1. Parks 2. Community Centres 3. Libraries
Top three preferred business opportunities/ programs to pursue	1. Office & Live/Work 2. Retail 3. Light industry
Preference regarding the type of “Centre of Excellence” the City Centre should become	1. “Sports & Wellness” and “Arts & Culture” 2. “Heritage” and “Sustainability”
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the survey results indicate solid support for most features, concern over the cost of achieving the plan (e.g., parks, affordable housing, amenities, etc.) was regularly expressed and requires attention.</li> </ul>

Summary of Survey Results — CCAP Open House 2 (November 2006)		
PROPOSED PLAN FEATURES	DEGREE OF PUBLIC SUPPORT AS PER SURVEY RESULTS	
	APPROVE OR HIGHLY APPROVE	DISAPPROVE OR HIGHLY DISAPPROVE
“Land Use & Density” Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>54% (38 responses)</li> <li>Respondents generally liked the mix of uses and density and, in some cases, wanted an expansion of the plan's higher density areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>35% (25 responses)</li> <li>Respondents were mostly concerned that the plan provides for too much density and that this could result in increased crime, traffic congestion.</li> </ul>
“Open Space & Amenity” Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>59% (38 responses)</li> <li>Respondents generally indicated support for the plan's parks and riverfront.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>31% (20 responses)</li> <li>Respondents were concerned that the plan provides too little park space and some would like to see the Garden City Lands used for more park, or for farming.</li> </ul>
“Mobility & Accessibility” Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>59% (39 responses)</li> <li>A more pedestrian and cycle-friendly environment can only improve the quality of life in Richmond.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>29% (19 responses)</li> <li>Respondents were concerned about traffic congestion and do not believe that transit and other features will get people to stop using their cars.</li> </ul>
“Built Form & Urban Design” Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>63% (39 responses)</li> <li>Respondents generally liked the concepts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>31% (19 responses)</li> <li>Respondents generally were concerned with density.</li> </ul>
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The connected street network is good, but more work is required if the City hopes to successfully manage traffic congestion downtown and on bridges.</li> <li>Too much growth. Too much density. Too many high-rise buildings. Too much crime.</li> <li>Ensure that Richmond and the City Centre does not exceed its environmental “carrying capacity” and that all environmental issues are addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Take steps to provide much needed services to existing residents today, as well as services for future residents (e.g., transit, hospital, schools, churches).</li> <li>Strive for balance: jobs/residents, great city/great farmland, employment/parks.</li> <li>Strive for high quality design/architecture and an “Island City by Nature” character.</li> <li>More public consultation is needed.</li> <li>Garden City Lands should be reserved for agricultural uses and/or park.</li> </ul>	