

From: [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)
To: [Saffron Henderson](#)
Subject: RE: Norquay
Date: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 11:31:01 AM

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website (http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit vancouver.ca/publichearings.

Thank you.

From: Saffron Henderson s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 11:30 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Norquay

I oppose the Norquay Plan Implementation rezoning.

Respectfully,

Saffron Henderson
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2013 9:18 AM
To: Linda Light
Subject: RE: Further to last night's meeting on Norquay

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website (http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit vancouver.ca/publichearings.

Thank you.

From: Linda Light s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 11:49 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; Robertson, Gregor; Reimer, Andrea; Affleck, George; Deal, Heather; Carr, Adriane; Jang, Kerry; Ball, Elizabeth; Louie, Raymond; Meggs, Geoff; Stevenson, Tim; Tang, Tony
Subject: Further to last night's meeting on Norquay

Dear Mayor Robertson and Council members:

I wanted to follow up on last night's meeting in order to correct some misinformation that was provided by one of the City Planners - I think Paul Cheng was his name. He was responding to concerns about the lack of zoning in the Norquay proposal that would protect heritage homes on smaller lots. He said that it would be inappropriate to use RT-8 zoning or something similar to what is used in Kits for two reasons:

- the RT-8 zoning in Kits outright prohibited demolition of heritage or character homes that had not been significantly altered over the years
- the lot sizes in East Vancouver (generally 33' x 120') are much smaller than those in Kits (generally 50' x 120') - I can't remember if he gave that second number in his response or only in his conversation with me after the decision was taken on the proposal - but it is clearly his view)

His first statement was simply wrong, which he acknowledged to me when I spoke to him after the decision was taken. The RT-8 zoning allows demolition of any house, but gives a significant FSR advantage for retention. If a house built before 1931 that has not been significantly altered is retained and retains its character (according to a chart of character features), the allowed FSR is .75. If it is

demolished, the FSR for the new build is .5. This is a significant difference that has been more or less successful in retaining character housing stock in Kitsilano since the bylaw was introduced.

His second statement was also misleading. While I do not know if the lot sizes in Norquay are, on average, smaller than they are in Kits, I do know that it is misleading to imply that there are not *many* 33' (or smaller) lots in Kits. I would even go so far as to assume that a 33' foot lot is, in fact, the standard lot size in Kits. Certainly, many Kits character homes are on these 33' (or even smaller) lots. If a distinction had been made in the RT-8 zoning between smaller and larger lots, there is no doubt that we would have lost a huge portion of our heritage housing stock in Kits by now. I don't know what Mr. Cheng meant when he said, "you can't just impose a bylaw from one area of the city onto another area." If a bylaw works in one area of the city to retain heritage housing, and retention of heritage housing is a goal in another area of the city, I would think that any reasonable person would want to consider implementing the same or a similar bylaw in that neighbourhood.

To approve a new bylaw for Norquay that encourages retention of heritage homes on larger, assembled lots, but not on smaller single lots just doesn't make sense to me - and it clearly didn't either to most of the people who spoke last night. Neither does it make sense that there is a "modest" (I suspect that means "insignificant") FSR advantage to retaining a house built in Norquay before 1940. If the advantage to retaining a character house is not significant enough to encourage retention, why include it? With respect, either Council wants to find ways to retain heritage/character homes or it doesn't. Mr. Cheng said in conversation with me after the decision that another difference between Kits and Norquay in terms of retention of character homes is that "there are only about 300 character homes in Norquay". My response to that was "then all the more reason to try to retain them". As more than one speaker said last night, it is important to retain as many of these character homes as possible in order to provide some *historical context* to a neighbourhood that is going to be so significantly changed by new development.

I raise these issues after the fact because the approval of this bylaw without any further instruction to strengthen the heritage retention piece was made on the basis of wrong information. In their summary comments, several of the councillors referred to Paul Cheng's explanation of "why you can't just impose one community's zoning on another community" or else stated that they were satisfied with the planners' explanations of why those two aspects of the proposal (the narrower rowhouses and the weaker heritage retention component of the bylaw) did not conform to the Norquay Plan. It was pretty frustrating to hear this, given that I knew that significant pieces of the information on which they were basing the heritage part of their decisions was simply wrong, and there was no way for me to correct this information given that the window for public comment had closed. No convincing argument was put forward last night that the RT-8 zoning for heritage retention wouldn't be effective in encouraging retention of character homes in Norquay just as it has in Kitsilano.

I would also like to make one further suggestion regarding the other issue that was so consistently raised last night - the reduction in the allowable width of row houses from 16' to 13.3' (or 12' on corner houses, if that is the case). I think that such a significant reduction indicates a need for a comprehensive, formal (and transparent) evaluation to assess the impact of such narrow houses on affordability, livability, and community. Since presumably affordability (and not developer profit margins) is the big driver behind this decision, let's see what impact it really does have on affordability - and at what cost? How much more affordable are these narrow houses? Do people want them? Do they like living in them? How long do they stay in them? If they buy them and then move soon afterwards, how does this affect the community? If they "work", then we know that they offer potential for development in other areas of the city. If they don't, then it's important to know that - for the future of both Norquay and other areas in the city.

Thank you for reading through this lengthy email and for considering whether there is anything that can be done at this stage to strengthen the heritage retention component of this zoning, given the errors which formed the basis for some of Council's thinking on this.

Sincerely,
Linda Light

Isfeld, Lori

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 10:26 AM
To: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: FW: Norquay plan

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website (http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit vancouver.ca/publichearings.

Thank you.

From: Ron And Mary s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, April 09, 2013 10:41 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Norquay plan

I oppose the Norquay Plan Implementation rezoning

I oppose the 2220 Kingsway rezoning

We are being disempowered one development at a time.

Ron Martens

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2013 9:11 AM
To: Olive Stogrin
Subject: RE: 2220. Kingsway

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website (http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit vancouver.ca/publichearings.

Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

From: Olive Stogrin s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2013 11:30 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: 2220. Kingsway

I oppose the Norquay plan Implementation rezoning. I oppose the. 2220 Kingsway rezoning.

To have build such massive appartments In this area .what are the benifits to the residents that live here????? I don't see any ,except over crowding , no parking no parks for the amount of residents that would be moving here THIS is not Honk kong !!! This is Vancouver!! Lets leave this area looking like it is part of Vancouver. The only people that will benifit are the realtors ,they benifit not the Norquay residents that live in houses.&smaller type appartments. That have families living in the area.

Olive Stogrin