

SEYMOUR LOCAL PLAN – HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of our Housing Survey is to guide the District Council in its decision-making process for future developments in the Seymour Area. Please feel free to answer any or all questions. We welcome your comments.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

Considering areas that are familiar to you, what is your opinion regarding recent housing developments east of the Seymour River?

	excellent	good	fair	poor
Design quality of:				
58/ Houses	7 (12%)	42 (72%)	8 (14%)	1 (2%)
59/ Townhouses	8 (14%)	39 (66%)	11 (19%)	1 (2%)
56/ Apartments	5 (9%)	27 (46%)	17 (30%)	7 (13%)
Landscaping of:				
59/ Houses	5 (8%)	37 (62%)	16 (27%)	1 (2%)
59/ Townhouses	7 (12%)	33 (56%)	18 (31%)	1 (2%)
55/ Apartments	3 (5%)	31 (51%)	16 (29%)	5 (9%)
Access by AUTOMOBILE to:				
57/ Shopping	14 (25%)	32 (52%)	5 (9%)	6 (11%)
53/ Schools	12 (21%)	28 (46%)	9 (17%)	4 (8%)
57/ Community facilities	9 (16%)	33 (55%)	10 (18%)	5 (9%)
Access by BUS to:				
52/ Shopping	0	15 (25%)	14 (23%)	23 (41%)
46/ Schools	0	13 (21%)	14 (23%)	19 (41%)
42/ Community facilities	0	12 (20%)	17 (29%)	23 (41%)
Access by FOOT to:				
56/ Shopping	3 (5%)	24 (40%)	16 (29%)	13 (23%)
49/ Schools	3 (6%)	28 (46%)	12 (21%)	6 (12%)
54/ Community facilities	1 (2%)	20 (33%)	20 (33%)	13 (24%)

COMMENTS: 25 COMMENTS

B. CURRENT HOUSING MIX IN SEYMOUR

1. Seymour currently has a mix of rental, privately owned homes and co-ops. Is this current mix satisfactory or should it change?

OWNERSHIP TYPE	CURRENT MIX	IDEAL MIX
a) Owner-occupied	77%	
b) Rental	12%	
c) Co-op	4%	
d) Non-profit rental	1.9%	
e) Co-housing	0%	
f) Other (trailers, houseboats, etc.)	5.1%	
Total	100%	100%

2. The types of housing in Seymour include single-family homes, many newer townhouses, several older apartment complexes and a few newer ones. Is this mix satisfactory or should it change?

** PRINT ALL ANSWERS BELOW (G TO M)*

ACCOMMODATION TYPE	CURRENT %	IDEAL %
g) Single-family, large lot (66 ft.)	65% for both	66.5%
h) Single-family, small lot (40 ft.)	large & small lots	62%
i) Townhouse	11.6%	13%
j) Apartment -- 3-storey	13.8%	11%
k) Apartment -- 6-story	2.9%	2%
l) Secondary suite	6.4%	6%
m) Other (trailers, houseboats, etc.)	.3%	.3%
Total	100%	100%

3. Do you feel that there are more appropriate locations for the different housing types mentioned above?

SUGGESTED LOCATIONS	OWNERSHIP TYPE (a - f)	ACCOMMODATION TYPE (g - m)
<i>- SEE ATTACHED TABLES -</i>		

COMMENTS: 19 COMMENTS

C. SENIORS HOUSING IN SEYMOUR

Due to the age distribution of the population in Seymour, the next 30 years will find the number of seniors increasing dramatically in this community.

1. How should we plan for this change in age distribution? (✓ on items which are the most feasible to you, adding comment if you wish)

- a) do nothing 1 COMMENT 2 (3%)
- b) identify housing needs for seniors and reserve land for this use 1 COMMENT 27 (39%)
- c) encourage seniors to stay in their family home 5 COMMENTS 37 (51%)
- d) accommodate some in seniors housing 3 COMMENTS 32 (51%)
- e) accommodate as many as possible who choose to remain in Seymour 1 COMMENT 30 (43%)
- f) other (e.g.) 17 COMMENTS (17%)

2. If you believe that more senior housing should be provided, what kind of housing is preferred? (✓ on items which are the most feasible to you, adding comment if you wish)

- a) small townhouses or up/down duplexes for 55 - 75 year-olds 3 CMTS 34 (49%)
- b) small apartment suites with common space 3 CMTS 19 (28%)
- c) congregate care - complex with small units with kitchenette, common dining room, housekeeping services, but no medical care 0 CMTS 25 (36%)
- d) care facility such as the Kiwanis Care Centre - common dining room, housekeeping with a range of medical services 1 CMT 30 (43%)
- e) shared living facility (Abbeyfield model) usually a large house for 10 - 15 with common dining room, some housekeeping, usually a "housemother" 0 CMTS 18 (26%)
- f) other 19 COMMENTS (28%)

3. Do you feel that there are particularly appropriate locations for Seniors housing?

SUGGESTED LOCATIONS for SENIORS HOUSING	SENIORS HOUSING TYPE (a - f, as per 2 above)
- ALL FROM BELOW	
- SMALL TOWNHOUSES	
- SMALL APARTMENTS	
- CONGREGATE CARE	
- CARE FACILITY	
- SHARED LIVING	
- OTHER	

COMMENTS: 30 COMMENTS

D. REPLACING OLD HOUSING STOCK

1. Is there any neighbourhood where it would be desirable to permit consolidation of smaller lots into larger lots for more luxurious homes?

(65%) 13/29 (75%)

Yes/No (circle one) If Yes, state where 110 SUGGESTIONS

2. Are there any neighbourhoods where it would be desirable to permit larger lots to be subdivided into smaller lots for single-family dwellings?

(32%) 15/30 (67%)

Yes/No (circle one) If Yes, state where 18 SUGGESTIONS

3. Are there any specific locations where consolidation of lots might be permitted to allow for duplexes, small apartments?

(45%) 21/26 (55%)

Yes/No If Yes, state where 22 SUGGESTIONS

4. Do you feel strongly about any areas where current zoning and lot size should be retained – that is, no change?

(58%) 19/24 (42%)

Yes/No If Yes, state where 19 SUGGESTIONS

E. WHY DO YOU LIVE IN THE SEYMOUR AREA?

60 COMMENTS

F. WHAT IS YOUR BIGGEST CONCERN ABOUT HOUSING IN SEYMOUR?

62 COMMENTS

- G. This part of the questionnaire requests information, for statistical purposes only, about you and your existing housing situation. We do not require your name or address; however, we would like your postal code, which will enable the variations in housing from zone to zone to be confirmed.

1. About you (please check):

- 65/ 68/ a) Are you an owner ^(97%) 66 or a tenant ^(3%) 2
 b) Your age: under 25 ^(3%) 2; 25-40 ^(49%) 12; 40-60 ^(59%) 40; over 60 ^(21%) 14
 c) Your Postal Code: 604 RESPONSES

2. Your residence:

- 66/ 68/ 65/ a) house ^(92%) 54; duplex ^(2%) 1; condo ^(11%) 7; apartment ^(2%) 1; other ^(5%) 3
 b) how many years: 0-5 ^(21%) 16; 6-10 ^(28%) 17; 11-20 ^(18%) 12; 21-30 ^(10%) 7; +31 ^(22%) 14
 c) square feet of finished floor area:
 less than 1000 ^(5%) 3; 1000-2000 ^(45%) 27; 2000-4000 ^(51%) 33; +4000 ^(3%) 2
 d) does it contain an occupied secondary suite: yes ^(5%) 4; no ^(3%) 6
 OF THOSE W/ "HOUSES" ONLY: yes ^(5%) 4; no ^(3%) 4

3. The occupants of your residence:

- 65/ 10/ 15/ 6/ 9/ a) adults ^(6%) 4; ^(77%) 25; ^(14%) 9; more than 4 ^(3%) 2
 b) infants 1 8; 2 2; 2-4 \emptyset ; more than 4 \emptyset
 c) elementary school children 1 6; 2 8; 2-4 1; more than 4 \emptyset
 d) secondary students 1 3; 2 3; 2-4 \emptyset ; more than 4 \emptyset
 e) post secondary students 1 6; 2 2; 2-4 1; more than 4 \emptyset
 PROFILE OF THOSE ABOVE (a-e)

4. If you require further information, leave your

Name _____ Phone number _____

SEYMOUR LOCAL PLAN HOUSING QUESTIONNAIRE

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

Q1. *Opinions re: recent housing developments east of Seymour River?*

Comments	# of
some houses are too large (ie. Dollarton area near Cates Park)	2
bus connection/services between Ron Andrews & Roche Pt. still needs improving	2
need to resolve traffic problems	2
provide adequate public transit systems connecting residential areas to shopping, recreational and community facilities (ie. between Blueridge and Parkgate Centre)	2
good/excellent with exception of those in Deerfield	1
good for respondents, depending on where one lives	1
support moderate growth of all types of housing that preserve natural habitat	1
need more pedestrian linkages between homes and schools	1
expectation for completion of the new Parkgate Community Centre	1
need to control automobile exits from Parkgate Shopping Centre to Seymour Rd.	1
lack of parking facilities in the Ron Andrews area	1
develop bike paths in conjunction with open-space system, and not along the hwy	1
a wide range of comments to be offered on housing developments	1
no more new housing developments in the Seymour area	1
design quality ranges from 'fair' to 'good', but leaking problem still exists	1
access by foot to schools is generally good on local pathways	1
housing design quality in Northlands area is poor due to its excessive size	1
a second road in Dorothy Lynas area is needed	1
short-haul buses and school buses are needed	1
housing accommodations should be developed surrounding major community facilities and service centres	1
transportation linkages between the Seymour area and other areas in Lower Mainland should be improved	1
need a policy to regulate maintenance of rental properties in accordance with the general housing quality of the neighbourhood	1
condo developments on the Reserve land should take into consideration the preservation of existing trees	1
access to shopping, schools, and community facilities by car and by foot are good when Parkgate is built	1
access by foot to shopping, schools, and community facilities in the Blueridge area is poor	1
access by car to shopping, schools, and community facilities are "too easy and at the expense of pedestrian and cyclists"	1
better lighting is required along footpaths leading to shopping, schools, and community facilities	1

B. CURRENT HOUSING MIX IN SEYMOUR

Q1. Current housing mix 'satisfactory' or 'change' it?

Comments	# of
at least 80% of housing developments should be owner-occupied or current percentage should be maintained	33
at least 65% of housing developments should be in the form of single-family houses on lots with a frontage of 40 feet or larger	32
lower percentage of single-family housing developments	4
6-storey or higher apartment buildings shouldn't be allowed	4
secondary suites should be permitted only in owner-occupied, large houses	2
too many rental units (ie. Maplewood) in comparison with owner-occupied ones	1
need more housing accommodations for single people	1
need high-quality, co-op housing accommodations (ie. near Old Burrard school)	1
has always been primarily single-family and owner-occupied in nature, and should stay the same	1
undesirable to locate low-cost housing developments adjacent to those of higher-value housing developments	1
need gradual transition from single-family housing developments to townhouses, and then to low-rise and high-rise apartment buildings	1
owner-occupied and/or co-op housing development in the form of townhouses, single-family houses on small lots, and 3 to 6 storey apartment buildings can be accommodated in the Mt. Seymour Pkwy and Blair Range areas	1
any changes in the housing-type composition shouldn't result in an increase in net population	1
residential lots with a 40 feet frontage are too small for the development of single-family houses	1

C. SENIORS HOUSING IN SEYMOUR

Q1. Plans for change in this age distribution?

a) Do nothing?

Comments	# of
people should be more self-reliant and responsible	1

b) Identify housing needs for seniors and reserve land for this use?

Comments	# of
yes	1

c) Encourage seniors to stay in their family home?

Comments	# of
provide home services	1
provide secondary suite	1
...if suitably supported	1
yes, change building code for better accommodations of seniors	1
most important	1
yes	1
...if there is enough support services	1

d) Accommodate some in seniors housing?

Comments	# of
...if in need	1
O.K.	1
"What is seniors housing?"	1

e) Accommodate as many as possible who choose to remain in Seymour?

Comments	# of
not realistic here	1

f) Other?

Comments	# of
provide hot lunches at community centres for seniors	1
there are other ways of accommodating seniors (ie. subdivision of large houses)	1
(c) and (d) can be accommodated with appropriate (health) supports	1
need to realistically and accurately determine the need for seniors housing	1
Burrard Band is providing a lot of low-cost housing, an atrium, and a new Kiwanis Care facility	1
Burrard Band is considering to congregate care and/or seniors housing	1
secondary suites; some duplexing in existing neighbourhoods	1
reserve municipal land for future seniors accommodation	1
sheltered housing (ie. groups of townhouses, collages, apartments) with 24-hour resident caretakers and each unit with an alarm available to alert these caretakers	1
secondary suites/townhouses developed for seniors	1
some facility housing to include small houses/ townhouses/duplexes for grannies	1
smaller homes with small gardens; could accept tasteful duplex, quadplex for owners waiting to downsize	1
a market research of seniors and their children, and then make seniors housing for seniors ONLY – is this discrimination?	1
provide services to those remaining in their homes (ie. health maintenance, etc.)	1
any developments for seniors should be (located) adjacent to library, shopping, and medical facilities	1
allow granny suite in Coach house style development (ie. strata subdivision of single-family houses) on single-family lots	1

Q2. Kinds of housing preferred?

a) Small townhouses or up/down duplexes for 55-75 year olds?

Comments	# of
no steps	1
single-level and garden	1

b) Small apartment suites with common space?

Comments	# of
with one bedroom, at least	1
privacy and community	1
no high-rise (apartment)	1

d) Care facility such as the Kiwanis Care Centre?

Comments	# of
these are all aimed at different market groups, and all needed at different stages where privacy is not relevant	1
	1

f) Other?

Comments	# of
seniors should be encouraged to stay at home and assisted as much as possible	1
all of the above (a - e) as needed	1
see (f) of Q1 above; modifications of ideas presented in (c - e) are listed here	1
strata condos for healthy seniors who can afford, and who want to live in their own apartments	1
one-level housing	1
cluster-like townhouses	1
small houses on small lots	1
medium-size townhouses, all on one level	1
we like the "Atrium", but we aren't quite old enough yet	1
sheltered housing (ie. groups of townhouses, apartments, etc.) with 24-hour resident caretakers	1
granny flats on large single-family lots	1
most of the above have some merit; it is a very personal choice -different strokes for different folks!	1
offer retirement ranchers on strata basis, covering ground	1
small houses (one-level ranchers/duplexes/quadplexes) on small lots with garden	1
buy into, with proceeds from home sales, progressing care campus co-financed with Provincial Baseline funds	1
small duplexes or townhouses on one-level, plus small gardens	1
land-based housing (multifamily) of variety of sizes & needs (ie. handicap access)	1
combination where seniors stay in same neighbourhood (ie. congregate care); keeps family together	1
3-storey with elevator apartments	1
more mixed-use developments in commercial areas with apartments above	1

Q3. *Appropriate locations for Seniors housing?*

Comments	# of
close to greenspace, amenity areas, recreational facilities, and having flat and safe footpaths (ie. Deep Cove, Dollarton and Maplewood)	14
near transit, medical centres, and shopping facilities (ie. Parkgate Mall), but must be a quiet place	11
Windridge (ie. CMHC Northwood Land)	5
Northland	3
Mt. Seymour Pkwy area	2
provide more options to keep housing affordable (ie. cutting down luxury items)	1
preserve large, privately-owned rugged terrain	1
make care available at seniors home	1
attractive, well-designed housing can fit anywhere	1
next to the Kiwanis Centre	1
Blair Range	1
Southeast corner of Mt. Seymour Pkwy	1
in neighbourhoods where homes can be developed into duplexes without disturbing the existing characteristics of the neighbourhoods	1

D. REPLACING OLD HOUSING STOCK

Q1. *Permit consolidation of smaller lots into larger ones for more luxurious homes?*

Comments	# of
Deep Cove and Seymour	6
Northland	2
Panorama Drive	2
Indian Reserve	1
luxurious homes are already enough	1
Riverside	1
Blueridge	1
no 'monster homes'	1
wherever possible	1

Q2. *Permit larger lots to be subdivided into smaller ones for single-family dwellings?*

Comments	# of
Maplewood and Dollarton	4
Mt. Seymour Pkwy	3
wherever permitted	2
nowhere	2
Northland, Blueridge, Deep Cove and Indian River	2
close to Cates Park	1
wherever this kind of development can be accepted by existing neighbourhoods	1
woodlands	1
near schools	1
in neighbourhoods where 33' lots would be able to accommodate tasteful homes	1

Q2. Permit larger lots to be subdivided into smaller ones for single-family dwellings? (cont'd)

Comments	# of
between Seymour River, west and Northland	1
areas along 'water edge'	1
Beachview and Roslyn areas where 100' frontage lots exist	1
only areas where infrastructure and services are improved, and can support the increase in dwellings	1

Q3. Specific locations where consolidation of lots might be permitted?

Comments	# of
Mount Seymour Pkwy	7
Maplewood and Dollarton	6
no more apartments until traffic issues have been resolved	2
near shopping centres	2
along the main transportation facilities	2
Blueridge and Windridge areas	2
Riverside	1
Northland (ie. CMHC Land)	1
in areas where such development is possible	1
between Seymour River and Northland	1
Cates Landing	1
semi-waterfront area	1
Parkgate	1

Q4. Areas where current zoning and lot size should be retained?

Comments	# of
Blueridge	4
Seymour	3
most areas	3
Northland	3
Parkgate	2
Roche and Garibaldi	2
Deep Cove	2
Downtown	1
Roslyn Boulevard	1
Beachview	1
Baycrest	1
areas close to nature	1
no change until the infrastructure is improved	1
areas along Panorama Drive	1
Indian River	1
Dollarton	1

E. WHY DO YOU LIVE IN THE SEYMOUR AREA?

Comments	# of
a lot of beautiful greenspace, forest and wildlife	38
easy access to hiking areas, trails and mountains	22
friendly neighbours and reputable community identity; good for bringing up kids	15
close to downtown, Vancouver	10
clean air	6
close to ocean	6
reasonable price; newer houses on small lots	6
it has everything to lead a peaceful and useful life	4
no through traffic	4
have been living here all my life	4
less density	3

F. WHAT IS YOUR BIGGEST CONCERN ABOUT HOUSING IN SEYMOUR?

Comments	# of
increase in traffic volume and inadequate infrastructure	21
rapid increase in housing development and residential density (ie. condo and multi-family rental accommodations)	17
destruction of the natural environment (ie. cutting down trees)	11
lack of high-quality housing accommodations for senior citizens	6
lack of community facilities and services (ie. schools, transit and rec. facilities)	5
lack of affordable family-oriented, mid-size housing accommodation	4
transformation from a healthy, single-family, middle-class community into an undesirable one; loss of traditional community identity	3
degradation of privacy and view quality	2
lack of high-quality housing design (ie. architecture and landscape architecture)	2
inability to maintain the current housing mix	2
Seymour residents' resistance to changes	1
increase in transient residents	1
homogeneous community characteristics	1
increase in property tax	1
lack of rental housing accommodation in the form of single-family detached house	1
lack of a wide range of housing choices (ie. for younger people)	1
lack of vacant residential lots for the construction of single-family homes	1
inappropriate development of low-cost housing adjacent to high-value, single-family detached houses/townhouses	1

B.3

PREFERRED LOCATIONS HOUSING TYPES												
Area	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	M
Northlands	4	1	1				2	3	3	1		
Cove Forest	1						1					
Mountain Forest	1						1					
Cates Landing	1											
Blueridge	1						1					
Parkgate		1										
Parkgate North	1							1				
Maplewood	2	1	2					3	4	4	4	
Seymour Pkwy	1	2	1					3	4	4	1	
Arne McDonald Way	1	1						1	1	1		
Roche Point	1		1									
Deep Cove		1						1	1	1		1
Lonsdale		1									2	
Blair Range		1	1					1	1		1	
Windridge									1			
Mystery Crescent							1	1				
near 2 nd Narrows										1		
shopping centres								1	1	1		
new areas								1	1			
all locations	1											
nowhere	1	1								1	1	
mixed/near commercial		1										
small units here/there			1	1								
floating homes												1

C.3

APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS FOR SENIORS HOUSING						
Area	A	B	C	D	E	F
Parkgate	4	2	3	2	1	
next to Kiwanis Centre	1					
Blair Range	2	1	1			
Deep Cove	1					1
Parkgate						
Indian River	1					1
Mt. Seymour Pkwy	1		1			
commercial/transit	1	1	1			
Windridge				1		
Blueridge	1		1			
Northlands	1					1
Maplewood		1				