

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Krishna Alluri s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 1:59 PM
To: Public Hearing; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; Fe Alluri; Krishna Alluri
Subject: Oakridge Centre Rezoning Public Hearing

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

Please refer to the Rezoning Application for 650 West 41st Avenue (Oakridge Centre).

Please note that I had expressed on several occasions during open sessions on this subject at Oakridge Centre since last year. Regrettably, very little attention was paid to requests and remarks that were not in line with those from the representatives of the Developers (Ivanhoe Cambridge) as well as from the City. The officials had no interest what so ever. It appeared that they had made up their minds no matter what the public would like to say. This is a total disregard to the Vancouver residents and public in general.

Hopefully, this message that is now addressed to the Mayor and City Council members as a whole, would be read and duly considered. Here are our requests and comments:

1. SIZE OF DEVELOPMENT:

YES, for modest increase of the development of Oakridge Centre premises, as proposed previously.
NO, NO, NO for the size and the magnitude of development presently proposed.

2. HEIGHT OF PROPOSED TOWERS:

NO, NO, NO for the proposed 4 to 5 towers up to 40+ stories. Please limit to a maximum of 20 stories.
NO, NO, NO for the remaining towers of up to 12+ stories. Please limit to a maximum of 6-8 stories.

3. COMMUNITY SPACE IN PROPORTION TO COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL SPACE:

Proposed commercial and residential space is EXCESSIVE in comparison to the COMMUNITY SPACE for the library, children, adults and seniors centre. While the proposed space for the commercial and residential amenities are several fold, there is none or marginal increments to the community space. No consideration is being made to the obvious change in the demographics with baby boomer population retiring and joining the seniors. The proposed size for the new Seniors' Centre is exactly the same as that of present. The proposed size for the Vancouver Public Library branch in Oakridge is also the same as that of present. This makes no sense that with such a large proposed development no consideration is given to increase the community spaces. Incidentally, these spaces are in maximum use most of the time already.

4. GREEN SPACE:

Proposed Green Space at the ground level is grossly inadequate. Oakridge Centre at present provides welcoming green areas, all or most of which is proposed to be replaced. This is deplorable.

5. GREEN SPACE ON ROOF TOPS:

Proposed green space would be largely on the roof tops. This is not well thought off. Oakridge Centre and the surroundings are located at nearly the highest spot in Vancouver, where residents already are experiencing frequent ghastly winds in the relatively low heights around. The proposed roof top green spaces at much taller buildings would not serve the purpose for the community.

6. ACCESS AND SURROUNDING ROADS

The easy access to Oakridge from nearly all the directions is one of the major attractions at present. A major access from the West is on the West 41st Avenue, which is proposed to be closed. This would hamper the easy access. Please retain this access, which would also facilitate distancing the proposed towers along the West side away from the many existing towers along the other side of the fence. This will largely satisfy most of the present residents around Oakridge Centre as the view, light and wind would not be drastically affected.

7. PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE BACK ALLEY FROM WEST 41ST TO WEST 45TH AVENUE.

At present this alley is used by the residents of the towers behind the Oakridge Mall on the West side and for the access for cleaning, garbage and recycling trucks. Many of the residents have their car parking areas facing this back alley and many users are seniors as well. Proposed increase in the width and increasing the access to other uses thereby increasing the traffic would seriously affect the present residents.

8. PROPOSED CONCENTRATION OF PARKING FACILITIES POSE DANGERS.

The proposed parking facilities would largely concentrate in the centre of the overall development. This excessive concentration of vehicles in the middle of a large development could be hazardous due to fire and vehicle accidents and security issues.

9. CANADA LINE

One of the justifications for the development appears to be due to the existing Canada Line. In reality this facility is already in full capacity. Moreover, there is a overall development of the Cambie Corridor, which would increase the public use substantially. The proposed size of the commercial and residential amenities would make the Canada Line grossly inadequate and could lead to undesirable effects.

Many thanks for providing this opportunity to express our thoughts on the proposed Oakridge development.

Looking forward to your consideration of the requests and comments.

With kind regards,

Krishna Alluri (Dr)

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 11:47 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Development of Oakridge Centre

From: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential **On Behalf Of** Kelly Ip
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 11:06 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Development of Oakridge Centre

Dear Mayor and Council,

I live neither at nor close to Oakridge Centre but a frequent shopper with my wife at the Mall. The Mall has come a long way since it was open in 1959 and has gone through many changes, positive I may add.

When we moved to Vancouver in 1970 from Ottawa where there was no mega shopping mall within the city limit (those who were in Ottawa in the sixties would remember the biggest shopping centre was the St. Laurent Mall near Orleans east of Ottawa), we were delighted to find such a shopping Mecca not far from where we lived (Adera & West 58th). We went there almost every week, either shopping or window shopping.

Oakridge Centre, besides the shopping mall, also has a few residential and office towers which accommodate many residents and businesses and is becoming more in demand since the completion of the Canadeline at Cambie and West 41st. That's one of the best things happened in Vancouver in recent times since Expo 86.

I agree that the land use at Oakridge is under-utilized but do we need such a big development with towers as high as 45 storeys? I can't believe the magnitude of the development proposed by Westbank Corp on land owned by Ivanhoe Cambridge on this 28 acre site. I love to see the expansion of the mall so that I don't have to go to Richmond and Burnaby but not that many towers which would add 2,800 units to the existing number (if I remember correctly) near a primarily single family house and townhouse neighbourhood.

I urge Council to take another look at this proposal by the developers and make sure the development on this site is consistent with the dream, possible or impossible, that Vancouver is continuing to be the most livable city and striving to become the greenest city in the world.

Your leadership in the matter is much appreciated.

Regards,

Kelly

--

Kelly Ip

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 12:04 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Redevelopment Plan

From: Lunasgate
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 12:03 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: Drobot, Dwayne
Subject: RE: Oakridge Redevelopment Plan

The Honorable Mayor and City Council of Vancouver,

Born in Vancouver in 1951 I have witnessed the ever changing mosaic of Vancouver over the decades. The majority of new projects have been a welcome addition to the beauty of our city while at the same time serving the needs of the ever increasing population.

An increased height of a multi residence / business type complex in a location such as the current project at the south end of Cambie Street, which is of lower elevation, is certainly acceptable. The aggressive impact of similar or higher buildings at the Oakridge elevation is not.

The immediate effect on the surrounding area of multiple towers up to 45 stories in a higher location such as Oakridge has not been fully considered . With this proposed construction the developers have either failed to address or purposely ignored the sensitivities of the local community.

An overly tall complex will be neither welcome nor esthetic in an area which has been traditionally single family home oriented.

Extreme height buildings should be solely constructed in the Vancouver city core or in outer areas where they will not negatively affect the local residents.

While I believe Vancouver will always benefit from well thought out and planned housing / business complexes , I , as a taxpayer just a few short blocks from 41st and Cambie, have no desire to see this bullying and intimidating architecture dominating the Oakridge landscape.

Over time the Skytrain- Cambie corridor will be redeveloped with adequate multiple residence buildings filling the need for high density housing. Therefore there is no reason whatsoever to go forward with this current scale plan. The new Oakridge towers must be kept to a height of 20 stories or less.

Please note the neighbouring city of Richmonds' development of high density housing in the Richmond Oval area. A similar scheme could be implemented for Oakridge and other residential areas as the need for more compact housing arises.

In addition, with regard to the social housing aspect of the new development, I believe the allocation should be increased to 50% of total residence units. Such an increase will provide even more desperately needed affordable housing for residents of Vancouver who are unable financially to purchase outright a home of their own.

Thank you for taking the time to address my concerns.

Yours truly,

J.E. Hillier

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

A large rectangular grey box redacting the signature and any handwritten notes.

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 12:24 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Comments on Oakridge Development by June Lau

From: L Leong s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 12:09 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Re: Comments on Oakridge Development by June Lau

To Whom It May Concern

Here are some points to consider regarding the Oakridge development :

SCOPE OF PROJECT

- 28.3 acre rezoning or 8 city blocks
- 10 towers with 45? storeys
- 3 mid- rises with 13? storeys
- increase office (424,260 sq.ft.), doubling the current square footage.
- increase retail (1,384,716 sq ft.), 2.6 times more than current space.
- 2,914 residential units, totaling 2,761, 388 sq.ft., 54 times more than the current 50,400 sq. ft. This includes 290 social housing units and 290 secure market rental housing units.
- 5,400 for commercial, 1,570 for residential totaling 6970 spaces
- 6 acres at the rooftop of the shopping mall will be considered a park from now on.

IMPACT SCOPE

- estimate of more than a decade and half of construction in this area would be chaotic, messy, disruptive and lowers the quality of life.
- overcrowding due to density of both commercial and residential units brings increases in crime and personal safety

- this projected mall will bring the current problems in managing the people and vehicular traffic during the major holiday periods like Christmas currently encountered by mall like Metrotown
- traffic issues of lengthy delays, gridlock, congestion and accidents goes hand in hand with increased numbers of vehicles, bikes and pedestrians.
- street parking on neighbouring streets will be even crazier especially factoring in the commuters pick ups of users of the Canada Line
- Canada Line must increase frequency and add train length to accommodate a larger ridership. Already financially challenged, where is the funding for Translink?
- visually a cluster of these proposed extremely tall highrise towers is unsightly for the Queen Elizabeth park area and totally out of place
- developing Oakridge, the developers propose to give Vancouver a real park at 2.83 acres in return. But the proposed roof top park's access presumably will be limited to the residents of Oakridge and thus not open to the public as it is located on the roof tops of private residences.

Based on the above, I believe that a step back from desired growth is necessary to maintain a quality of life for Vancouverites that is an envy by many as the scale of this present project is extremely large and bring with it questionable gains.

Sincerely

June Lau

March 4, 2014

Mayor Robertson and Council
City of Vancouver
453 W 12th Ave, Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

RE: Oakridge Re-development

Dear Mayor and Council,

I have resided in the Oakridge area for the last fifty years, and I would like to convey to you my deep concern with many of the elements of the proposed plans for the redevelopment of Oakridge Centre. The scale of the new development is enormous, and I am particularly troubled by the following elements of that plan.

The existing traffic and transportation infrastructure is inadequate to handle the increases in population, shoppers and vehicular traffic. Existing public transportation to Oakridge is limited in its capacity to handle the planned increases. Unless the provincial government is prepared to provide new funding, existing public transport will be unable to provide the level of service required, and car traffic will increase as a result. The massive increases in traffic will clog major streets and increase traffic on smaller side streets and arterials. The traffic will also increase the level of air and noise pollution in this area significantly.

The inclusion of an elevated park in the complex is simply ridiculous on two counts. People need and want ground level park space that enables them to play, garden and enjoy nature. The proposed large water feature is not only inappropriate in our climate, but it is also a potential structural hazard.

The amount of new public amenities that are being promised is insufficient for the growing population of our area. Granted, the community centre, seniors centre and library will be able to serve the six thousand new as well as existing residents. Our area, however, is increasing by tens of thousands of new people.

The duration of the redevelopment is unacceptable. Redevelopment projects should not take ten years. If it is so large that it needs a decade or more to complete, then it is surely too large.

Finally, I do not believe that the City has planned adequately for this level of change, and I urge you and City Council to reconsider this project, and listen to my concerns and those of other local residents.

Sincerely yours,



Joyce Currie

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

cc Moira Stilwell, MLA

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Penny/Tony Wilson s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 10:19 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: re Proposed Oakridge development

Dear Mayor Robertson and Members of Vancouver City Council,

We are writing to express our concerns about the proposed development on the Oakridge site. We commute daily along 41st Ave. and frequently shop at Oakridge Mall.

The development proposed will result in at least 5,000 more residents on the Oakridge site. The densification is too intense for the proposed infrastructure to handle without negative effects on the local people.

The following problems are inevitable:

Parking will be inadequate. Parking at Oakridge is already dangerous and a frustration, especially during weekends. If we can't park readily then we will choose to no longer shop at Oakridge. Many of us are not cyclists.

Local transit will be overwhelmed. Translink will need to need to significantly increase the number of trains and their frequency, with thousands more users at that location. Where will they find the funds to do that? How will the station cope with these numbers?

The Oakridge skyline will look incongruous with the rest of the neighbourhood. 10 new towers, some over 40 stories tall! You've got to be kidding! Spreading towers along Cambie north and south, and along 41st Ave east and west, would give a more balanced look to the area and would reduce the intense densification at Oakridge. So many towers in such a small area are going to cause significant issues with lack of light and privacy.

Finally this project is against the reasons many of us choose to live on the west coast: clean air, space to move, living close to Nature, knowing your neighbour. The project wreaks heavily of greed and dysfunctional decision-making.

Sincerely,

Dr. Tony Wilson and Penny Wilson

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Lisa Gardner s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 7:51 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge Development

Dear Mayor and Council,

Why are you destroying the nature of residential neighbourhoods with high-rise towers, huge high-rise towers?

You say, we need room to put people, but why do so many European Cities Not have high-rises to the extent that our city has?

If you insist on high-rise towers, can you not contain them to very specific areas of our city?

By developing high-rise towers randomly around the city - you destroy the nature of the residential neighbourhoods. Residential neighbourhoods are a place to escape the rat-race, wind down, come home, relax, retreat into the garden, walk the streets, listen to the birds, breathe the air,

I note that the Mayor has purchased a home in an area where traffic is being cut-back and controlled....He has found a nice quiet neighbourhood in which

to live, quiet streets, parks, view of the ocean. How fortunate for him.

Residents in Oakridge and the surrounding neighbourhoods will, if the City and the Developers get their way, have a view of ugly, menacing towers, which will also block their sunlight and shade their homes and gardens.

If you absolutely must develop towers, can you not restrict their height to a reasonable 10-12 stories?

I have visited Oakridge Centre for years. If you develop Oakridge to the level that you have proposed, I will not be shopping at Oakridge any longer, I would not venture in to that kind of cramped, densely populated madness.

Lisa Gardner
Vancouver resident,
Born St. Paul's Hospital
Concerned Citizen
Concerned Citizen for future generations!

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Mary Watterson s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 6:41 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge Mall Redevelopment Proposal

Dear Mayor & Council:

As a steadfast and proud Vancouverite, and having been born here some decades ago, I am extremely concerned about the proposed redevelopment of Oakridge. Being a Dunbar resident, I shop in Oakridge on a regular basis. However with the proposed construction work and the accompanying challenges of chaos, traffic disruption and parking problems, I will have to find alternative retail stores. In addition our family doctor works at Oakridge and if the proposed redevelopment is approved, I will find medical services that are not in Oakridge. The parking itself will be an absolute nightmare – for people in the work force, there is often little time to waste searching for a parking space, and for the elderly, a large community of the elderly live in the area, often using transit or riding bikes is not an alternative. For those outside the immediate area, but who frequently shop or have medical appointments at Oakridge, it is all very well to suggest Canada Line – but the Line itself is already obsolete with its small cars and infrequent runs, while building dense housing along the Line continues in south Vancouver and Richmond.

It is outrageous to present the redevelopment as coming with a "Park". It seems that City Hall considers the citizens of Vancouver to be idiots incapable of seeing beyond the marketing of such nonsense. Indeed, if City Hall considers a landscaped roof a park, then it is conceivable that next we Vancouverites may be told that the real parks are going to be rezoned to dense residential status, and that the roofs will provide greenery for us to breath and the birds and wildlife to survive.

I hope that you will re-consider the proposal and move toward a more equitable solution including use of the length of the corridor and not to focus on such a small area.

Vancouver has prided itself in being one of Canada's most liveable cities – it is hoped that the short sightedness of the proposal will be rectified. If not, we are in great danger of having a beautiful region of our city destroyed– for residents, vendors, service providers and others who frequently come from other areas of the city and the Lower Mainland to do business or meet friends in the Oakridge area.

Yours sincerely

Mary Watterson

Mary Watterson
Dr. TCM, Registrar

College of Traditional Chinese Medicine
Practitioners and Acupuncturists of British Columbia

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 4:38 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge - it is too much!

From: Susan Sheehan s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 4:28 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge - it is too much!

Dear mayor and councillors:

I am writing on behalf of myself and my sister, an owner in the Terraces condominium, to indicate our concern about the proposed redevelopment of Oakridge to be considered by yourselves on Monday March 10, 2014.

We do not support this proposal - it is simply too much!

Specifically:

1. The number of buildings and the heights of the buildings are inappropriate in this long-established residential neighbourhood. Such large buildings will block the light of all of the area to the east, north and west of the planned construction. It goes well beyond the previous plans of more acceptable maximum 24-storey buildings as set out in the City's existing policy statement.
2. In our view, attempts to consult on the now-proposed scale of development have been totally biased by the use of developer-funded and designed "questionnaires" and charming young things in the mall, who simply ignore or fend off concerns.
3. There has been a recent change in the plan for the Terraces itself. It is completely unclear what this change means and we are unaware of any consultation.
4. The City's commitment to a park has not been met. A roof reached only by elevators or escalators or stairs is not a park.
5. So-called "amenities" are not going to be provided for 10 years and they seem to be of questionable value in some cases: what is the point of a day care and a seniors centre on the 4th floor?

In conclusion, we ask that you act responsibly and send this proposal back to the developer to revise it to be more in keeping with the neighbourhood and the existing policy statement and to carry out meaningful, independent, consultation.

Thank you for your consideration,

Susan Sheehan/Ardith Shane

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 4:42 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Development

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

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
From: P Chow
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 4:38 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Fw: Oakridge Development

Mission and values

The City of Vancouver's mission is to create a great city of communities that cares about our people, our environment, and our opportunities to live, work, and prosper.

Above is the City of Vancouver's mission statement . . . Will you be staying true to this when you look at the proposed Oakridge Development?

1. Air Pollution, Crime and noise. By putting a 40+ floor high rises into the area plus the developments across from QE park, the Cambie street traffic will increase substantially which will induce more traffic jams , noise, and car exhaust into the neighborhood. More people also means more garbage and crimes such as drug dealer, car thief and street beggar among the streets. I have been living in this area for more than 30 years. Much of the residents in this area are like me, old and retire and enjoy a good walk around our relatively peaceful neighborhood. By the city's sudden action of introducing large amount of middle age people into our neighborhood, it would change our enjoyment of our surrounding for the reasons listed above.

Please stop the 40+ floor high rises development in the Oakridge.

2. Safety . . . We are not Yaletown or Coal Harbour or Beach Avenue. We have chosen to live here because we like the environment and will retire here if possible. Look at the demographics of the neighborhood its older than the Yaletown or Coal Harbour and therefore in putting up a 40 plus storey building if there is a fire or power outage will these people be able to walk down the stairs??? I work in a 36 storey tower and once a year we have a fire drill and we can barely make it down! What if someone has a heart attack and lives on the 40th floor would the paramedics make it in time for them to be saved? Will you be asking the developers for extra dollars to put in another fire and paramedic hall for both the building and personal to serve us?

3. Transportation . . . You want to keep the City green but will you be able to when you have so much growth along Cambie as well as the Oakridge Development and Marine Drive Development? Currently the Canada Line is not able to handle all the riders. Will you be asking all the developers for extra dollars to fund the expansion of Canada Line and putting in more stops. Translink is broke so we won't be able to get more from them!

It would be great if you could lower the building height (25 would be more reasonable) ask for more money from the developers to be put against extending the Canada Line and increasing the stops

and for money to build and fund more fire stations and paramedic stations. All we ask is that you make sure that you make the decision as if you were living in the area and that you stay true to your mission and values statement . . . that's why you were voted in!

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 10:30 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: In Protest

From: Dong, Ken s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 10:29 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: In Protest

Dear Ladies and Gents,

I am writing to state for the record my disapproval for the humungous real estate project proposed for the Oakridge Centre.

Born and raised in Vancouver (now aged 54) I am disappointed with the scale and scope of the project.

It drastically changes the character of the community to which I was accustom as well as the skyline.

The huge increase in density will bring:

1. congestion leading to many social and economic inefficiencies.
2. A much larger carbon foot print
3. common social problems as a result of many people live in close quarters
4. parking challenges

During the construction phase, small businesses will suffer from a drop in traffic as people avoid the area. Current residents will be tormented by the noise and traffic slow down.

I am not against growth and economic prosperity, I just feel that the scale of this growth is excessive.

Thank you
Ken Dong

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, delete this e-mail and destroy any copies. Any dissemination or use of this information by a person other than the intended recipient is unauthorized and may be illegal. Unless otherwise stated, opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the author and are not endorsed by the author's employer. Please be advised we cannot accept trading instructions via Email.

Le présent message, ainsi que tout fichier qui y est joint, est envoyé à l'intention exclusive de son ou de ses destinataires; il est de nature confidentielle et peut constituer une information privilégiée. Nous avertissons toute personne autre que le destinataire prévu que tout examen, réacheminement, impression, copie, distribution ou autre utilisation de ce message et de tout fichier qui y est joint est strictement interdit. Si vous n'êtes pas le destinataire prévu, veuillez en aviser immédiatement l'expéditeur par retour de courriel et supprimer ce message et tout document joint de votre système. Sauf indication contraire, les opinions exprimées dans le présent message sont celles de l'auteur et ne sont pas avalisées par l'employeur de l'auteur. Veuillez prendre note que nous ne pouvons accepter aucune instruction de négociation par courriel.

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 10:12 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Comments on Oakridge Centre Rezoning-Public Hearing
Importance: High

From: Take Saito s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 9:50 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Comments on Oakridge Centre Rezoning-Public Hearing
Importance: High

I am writing to express my opposition to the development as it is currently being proposed. Specifically, I feel that the height of the residential towers being proposed is too high at up to 44 storeys and the increase in density (2914 units) is not realistic for the area.

It is important for developers to consider the neighbourhood in which changes are being proposed. 44 storeys may be appropriate for the downtown core of Vancouver but outside of that area, even 15 storey buildings stick out from the surrounding landscape. I have been looking at other tower buildings in Vancouver residential areas and have found that they are under 20 storeys. It is hard to imagine a number of buildings being developed in the Oakridge area that are twice that size. It will have an irreversible negative aesthetic impact on the neighbourhood and will be visible as an ugly urban development from miles away. Although green space is included, it will be on the rooftop and not visible from street level so will have little impact on easing the concrete landscape.

There is already significant development going on along the Cambie corridor which is serving to increase the density along the Canada Line which is part of city council's goal. These are taking place in mostly low rise buildings which still fit in with the surrounding neighbourhood feel. Increasing density in the area further by over 4300 people (based on a conservative calculation of 1.5 people occupying each unit) will only serve to further reduce any "neighbourly character" and just further isolate people as strangers. A common complaint of people living in urban dense high rise buildings is that they don't even know the names of their neighbours and they go about doing their business in their own bubbles without interacting with anyone in their neighbourhood in a meaningful way. Change is happening much too quickly in the Cambie area and it is important to realize that such changes are irreversible. A building of 44 storeys is much higher than the initial development being proposed a decade ago and the only reason to justify a building of that size is greed on the part of the developer.

I also have concerns about the process of public notification that has taken place so far. In both the scale models that I have viewed as well as the artist's renditions of the project, the buildings are not being drawn to scale at the proposed 44 storeys. I find this practice very deceptive by the developer and lacks transparency. The developer should be making the effort to show the true impact of the size of the buildings they are proposing by making sure that things are drawn to scale. **This deceptive practice opens up the developer and city to legal action against them.**

The Vision city council has had a record of going through the process of public consultation "mainly for show" and in the end does what it planned to do anyway despite the majority of public opinion being opposed to the action. I urge the mayor and council not to do this and give serious consideration to the residents in the Oakridge-Langara area of which the majority are opposed to this degree of development. The mayor and council are elected officials who are supposed to be taking action in the best interests of the people who elected them.

I understand that change is inevitable and am open to the idea of some development of the Oakridge area but I am opposed to any construction of towers greater than 15 storeys.

Sincerely yours,

T. Saito

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 2:22 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Oakridge Development

From: James s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 2:20 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Oakridge Development

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

We have lived in the Oakridge area for 29 years. As Vancouver changes, we do realize that our city is trying to increase housing units, and Oakridge is part of that plan.

To be brief, we listed our top concerns.

1. Public transit - already Canada Line is packed during morning and afternoon rush hours. It is very difficult to squeeze onto the train at this time. One of our family members even goes into work 45 min earlier, just to be able to get onto the train. Furthermore, there are large number of housing units under construction at Marine Drive and Cambie. How will Canda Line handle so many people?
2. Density - 2914 dwellings is extremely dense for one area. We worry about traffic congestion and how one area can realistically support this very large increase in population.
3. Height - towers of 44, 41, and 36 stories are much too high. Remember that 41st and Cambie is one of the high points of land in this area. Going north or south from 41st slopes downwards. The surrounding neighbourhood will be dwarfed and shadowed.

We do realize that Oakridge will undergo development - but, we oppose the density and heights of the towers.

J. Leung

Vernadman, Bl.

Nov. 5, 2014

City Clerk's Dept.

Att. Mr. Robertson.

I have lived in the Oakridge area for over twenty years. I am very upset regarding the Oakridge Mall re-development proposal.

Here are my reasons:

a) Inadequate public consultation.

b) Far too big.

c) Where is the park space? a rooftop greenspace is NOT a park.

d) Traffic congestion will be terrible.

e) I have concerns regarding fire dept. access etc.

F). With approximately 6000
new residents - I hate to
think what our waiting
times at our hospitals
will be. Bad enough
now!

Please listen to the
tax payers concerns - remember
this is an election
year.

Respectfully
M. Little

C. C. M. STALLWELL

P. BELLMAN

Presentation for "Oakridge" Public Hearing on March 10, 2014 at City Hall

Mr. Mayor, Members of Council:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to you and address my concerns about the subject called "Oakridge".

I am a resident in the community of "Riley Park/South Cambie" for 60 years and am very well aware about the development – from the time when the lovely Oak trees had to make room for a shopping center.

At the time the Community was very much involved in the development.

The beauty of the Oak tree forest was very much on the mind of the community.

Vancouver had become the center of a very well known family department store and food center – located downtown known as "Woodward". The residents living South of Broadway loved to go shopping at Woodward, but did not like to go downtown fighting the traffic. The idea came to build a second store more south of Broadway, but still centrally located. 41st Avenue at Cambie seemed an ideal location, but did not make the community happy losing those trees. During the design stage there were a lot of discussions about how to keep the loss at a minimum. It turned out to become a nice Family shopping center. There also was (still is) a Seniors Center and some childcare.

Woodward eventually sold out 21 years ago and Oakridge has lost its lovely Family character, as more corporate business takes over. The community feels completely ignored and left out of this new development design.

The future of our Society seems to develop like this:

There are the Seniors (people live longer). The coming of age Seniors, presently called "Babyboomers". Then come the learning, studying, working adults and children. They often all live under one roof in a 2 storey and basement house and do NOT want to live in a High rise Tower.

These Towers are ugly, impersonal, overshadow the landscape of the lovely two storey family homes neighborhood and will overload the public transit system, which is already overcrowded.

They are NO community builders, but serve more like a bedroom community.

There is a shortage of public park space, which will be filled by rooftop green on the Towers. What an insult to nature and nature lovers and the "Vancouver 20/20 greenest city of the world".

Lisa Schwabe

s. 22(1) Personal and
Confidential

March 5, 2014

Mayor Robertson and Council
City of Vancouver
453 W 12th Ave, Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

RE: Oakridge Redevelopment

Dear Council Members and Mayor Robertson,

I am writing as both a member of the RPSC Community Visions and a resident of the Oakridge area. During the consultative process for the Oakridge re-development, the RPSC raised a number of concerns that have yet to be addressed in the current plan for the Centre. Here are topics, which we feel City Council should give more time and attention to before it decides the future of Oakridge.

♦City planners have failed to address the vital subject of increased traffic within our community. None of the Planning Dept. documents describe the traffic impacts of the project and how they will be handled. The resulting traffic caused by the increased population (+6000 residents), increased shoppers at Oakridge (+30-50,000/day) and increased workforce in the centre will cause serious harm to our community and the local environment.

- Based on parking space allocation (8540), there will be some 30-40 thousand vehicular movements in and out of the site each day.
- Increased traffic will cause significant increase in green house gases.
- Increased traffic will increase congestion along the two major arterials Cambie and 41st Ave.
- Increased traffic will impact secondary arterials such as 49th and 33rd Aves. both of which are showing significant increases in traffic volumes.

Impact: Without significant growth in public transport use and infrastructure, Oakridge will remain a car-oriented destination with many negative impacts.

♦The current plan provides neither analysis nor discussion of the impacts of the new centre on adjacent retail areas (Main, Fraser, Oak, Kerrisdale). There is a finite amount of retail dollars available. By creating a massive retail centre, the RPSC believes that the new Oakridge will draw significant amounts of spending away from existing merchants.

Impact: Neighbourhood retail centres will be hurt by Oakridge competition.

♦The Planning Dept. report fails to address the impacts of the large towers at Oakridge on Queen Elizabeth Park views. The centre lies directly in the view corridor out over the Strait and Gulf Islands. The RPSC has reviewed the plan and concludes that they will have a negative impact on view corridors from QE Park to the south. On two recent occasions, the City has acted to maintain view corridors to the north and to the east from the park.

Impact: If allowed at current heights, Oakridge towers will reduce views and make QE Park a less attractive tourist destination.

♦The Oakridge plan proposes a new community centre. However, it fails to address the central issues of overall population growth and the adequacy of the proposed facilities for the total population of Oakridge Cambie. The proposed facility is adequate for the current demand for amenities plus six thousand new residents. The RPSC anticipates that an additional fifty thousand people will be added to the area in the coming decade. The Planning Dept., however, does not include any population forecasts or planning for amenities commensurate with those increases.

Impact: Planned amenities will prove inadequate for the increases in population and result in strain on existing services.

♦Throughout this consultation process, City Planning has addressed the Oakridge redevelopment independently of the Cambie Corridor processes. It is, however, a central part of the City's density plan for the area. The residents of Riley Park South Cambie feel that the isolated planning of Oakridge is inadequate.

Impact: Further research and planning required including:

- *a projection of total population increases over the next two decades that includes Oakridge Centre, Cambie corridor, RCMP site, Oakridge Transit site, and Little Mt. site;*
- *projections for increased traffic in area and planning for amelioration;*
- *a realistic plan for increasing public transportation infrastructure to Oakridge;*
- *amenities planning adequate for the overall population growth in area;*
- *analysis of impacts on view corridors from QE Park and resultant impacts on viability of park as tourist destination;*
- *impacts on adjoining retail businesses and centres caused by the Centre.*

The RPSC urges City Council to request a thorough and technically sound analysis of the all of the impacts implicit in an expanded Oakridge Centre before it allows any increase in the size of Oakridge beyond those increases laid out in the 2007 Policy Guidelines.

Sincerely yours,


Norm Dooley

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 1:30 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Rezone 1920 SW Marine Dr.: Objection

From: Susan Siu s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 1:22 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Rezone 1920 SW Marine Dr.: Objection

Please take note that I object to the rezoning of the Casa Mia heritage to accomodate a senior care facility.

Susan Siu

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sent from my Sony Xperia™ smartphone

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 1:36 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Rezoning for Point Grey Hospital

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

From: Holly s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2014 1:36 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Rezoning for Point Grey Hospital

Hello,

I am a resident of Kitsilano residing on Cornwall Avenue. I am unable to attend the upcoming public hearing on March 13 due to my schooling. I would however like to voice my opinion in the matter by saying that I am opposed to the rezoning and building of the hospital on Cornwall Avenue. This area is a hugely popular beach destination in spring and summer and a great shopping and restaurant district year round. By building a hospital the peace and beautiful scenery that makes Kitsilano such a desirable neighborhood to live and play in will be lost. I hope this matter will be re-considered and moved to a more practical and realistic location. Thank you for your time,

Holly Hunter

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential