



QUEEN ELIZABETH PARK  
PLAZA DESIGN

GVRD/ VPB Open House, June 25, 2003  
Responses to Questionnaire

31 FORMS WERE RECEIVED.

**1. The vision for the Plaza design is to provide a beautifully landscaped plaza area with a water feature, covered multi-use structures, a wedding pavilion and sculpture displays. What is your opinion of the overall concept as presented?**

**Support - 30                      Oppose - 0                      Not Sure - 1**

- < Looks beautiful - such talented landscape design work!
- < I like the naturalistic layout as opposed to the previous more rigid layout like the edge treatment allowing easy access of the reservoir deck.
- < Be a great place for weddings.
- < Contains unusual & potentially popular amenities. Transforms a family underdeveloped space.
- < Very beautiful.
- < General concept good. Like the trees.
- < Concept is great. But why a water feature that can only be looked at? That's such an uptight philosophy!
- < Very well designed and conceived! Great job!

**2. What is your opinion of the following items in the design:**

**A. Water fountain**

**Support - 30                      Oppose - 1                      Not Sure - 0**

- < Nice to have water fountain that has life in the Park and the birds love the water.
- < I may like the presence of a smaller secondary fountain possibly replacing one or more of the tree mounds, possibly 3 fountains. (Sense of being surrounded by water).
- < As long as it can be kept operational. Would prefer not to have a fountain if it ends up abandoned like the previous water feature.
- < I have "very" fond memories of playing around and on the little man-made creeks and bridges. **Very** sad to see there's none in the new design.
- < A must! Would continue with legacy of the old fountains.

**B. Multi-purpose structures**

**Support - 29**

**Oppose - 0**

**Not Sure - 2**

- < I like the reintroduction of wood decking and framing. I like the ability to pass from one platform to the next.
- < More water support. I like the reintroduction of wood decking and framing. I like the ability to pass from one platform to the next.
- < Definitely nice to have a covered area. So that it is not too obtrusive.
- < Very well done.

**C. Wedding pavilion**

**Support - 29**

**Oppose - 0**

**Not Sure - 2**

- < Always have weddings in the QE Park.
- < The intersecting arch design seems attractive as well as the size of the pavilion.
- < This venue could become so successful that it might need full-time supporting staff.
- < I support if the user are charged a fee.
- < Hope that it will not dominate the area.
- < Again a fantastic idea - more newlyweds would come to use the Park.

**D. Sculpture displays**

**Support - 30**

**Oppose - 0**

**Not Sure - 1**

- < Should have figures in tai-chi display. The park has tai-chi history for over 20 years.
- < I like the location of the sculpture on the lawn next to the fountain.
- < Enhance character of the park.
- < A small number of tasteful items.
- < Nice.

**E. Washrooms**

**Support - 31**

**Oppose - 0**

**Not Sure - 0**

- < Essential for aging population.
- < Need more.

- < Existing washrooms should be made available early in the morning (not early enough now)! Should modernize/upgrade the existing washrooms.
- < Upgrade the existing washrooms. Opening hours made earlier.

- < Robust washrooms always a welcome feature - must be designed so they can be kept clean.
- < Always need more washrooms in Lower Mainland parks.
- < A basic necessity, but are there enough?

**3. Previously there was parking for 210 cars. The present design will reduce the parking area to provide parking for 141 cars and 10 buses. What is your opinion on this reduction in parking?**

**Support - 22                      Oppose - 4                      Not Sure - 5**

- < There tend to be an excess of parking available - and too little parking for buses.
- < The “subway” should have a stop at the door.
- < Could only judge usage needs with parking frequency study. Don’t know if less parking availability could be a problem?
- < I oppose this because it will increase street parking.
- < Presumably roadside parking will accommodate the rest.
- < The only worry is the exhaust fume from the buses might affect the recreation areas around. Would be nice if some kind of partition could be provided.
- < Add parking along perimeter, esp. @ Nat Bailey. More aesthetically pleasing parking.
- < Parking used to be free when I was growing up, now you have to pay, then you are going to take parking space away, what’s next !!
- < Live within walking distance - prefer greenery to parking. Perhaps to balance the loss of parking a bus route could be altered to provide better alternative access so people who cannot walk (well) can still reach the park.
- < Not good - unless you can provide a reliable and efficient public transit system. Bus route that includes going up mountain?
- < More parking spaces should be available.
- < The Park can handle this amount. Parking was not really an issue before was it?

**4. While not part of the current project scope, a viewing tower has been suggested at the entrance to the plaza that would provide a 360 degree view of the city. This would require a separate fund raising initiative. What is your opinion of this initiative?**  
**Support - 19                      Oppose - 10                      Not Sure - 2**

< To save the trees - charge fees for the tourists - they don't pay taxes. It's their choice to pay or not to pay.

< It's a great place to see the city from.

< Don't like location. It will distract from the ambiance of the plaza, breaks up the open expanse of the sky that is an attractive feature of this location. Other locations may be suitable for a viewing platform even at the cost of some trees.

< Good.

< Perhaps a giant waterslide combination tower, with observation deck and snacks, etc. would go a long way to pay for the project.

< Incompatible with atmosphere and uses of QE Park.

< But would like to see a minimum charge imposed on all users while tourists should not be charged too much. Therefore a good group rate should be provided for tourists.

< It's best to have a large platform at the top so more people can be up there at one time - charge user fee.

< Too much of taxpayers monies will be used up.

< While it would be nice to have an unobstructed view, I do not think that it would be possible to create such a structure that would not stick out like a sore thumb. It would be difficult to create something that would be in harmony with the existing conservatory. I am very pleased to hear that the work to date is on schedule and on budget. Well done!

< I strongly urge that this tower be built!! The view up top is absolutely spectacular with tourist arriving. This would give them a view of the City that would awe them and with a potential Olympics this would enhance our City's appeal.

< A fee should be charged to the viewing tower to cover the cost.

**5. Other comments?**

< Would like to see more security provided to guard public property in public parks!

< I think we need to charge tourists to visit Quarry Garden.

**6. How often do you use the park?**

Regular (daily activity for most of the year)	- 17
Moderate amount ( a few times a month)	- 12
Occasional ( a couple of times a year)	- 2