

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Civil rights Now s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 9:29 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: July 20 Public Hearing-Opposed

Dear Mayor & Council:

The Pearson Dogwood Policy Report (page 9) states: "Though some members of the wider disability community are unsatisfied with the proposed 4 and 6 unit housing model, current George Pearson residents are strongly in favour of the group living opportunities..."

That last assertion ("current George Pearson residents are strongly in favour of the group living opportunities") is called into question by these facts:

1. "As a means of encouraging participation, the Pearson Resident Council paid residents who participated in the ward information sessions \$10 for their attendance." *Vancouver Coastal Health - Resident & Family Engagement Report - Housing & Care Model, July 2017, page 3.*
2. "It is important to note that many Pearson residents who participated in information sessions and open houses did not voice their opinions during the engagement sessions. Many residents are not physically able to speak or not cognitively able to understand the content." *Vancouver Coastal Health - Resident & Family Engagement Report - Housing & Care Model, July 2017, page 4.*
3. "...residents were not asked to state their preferred type of housing..." *Vancouver Coastal Health - Resident & Family Engagement Report - Housing & Care Model, July 2017, page 4.*
4. The *Vancouver Coastal Health - Resident & Family Engagement Report - Housing & Care Model, July 2017*, report doesn't state whether the majority of Pearson residents support the Application.

And lastly:

"Although residents were not asked to state their preferred type of housing, some residents expressed a strong desire to live in the single units that will be included in the first phase of construction. Some of these residents were relatively new to Pearson, while others were longtime residents. Reasons these residents gave for wanting their own until included:

- Not wanting to share space with other residents (some cited having problems with roommates at Pearson)...

"I want to live in an independent apartment... more freedom to do what I want, more privacy." - Pearson resident...One resident expressed concern that there would not be enough one-bedroom units in the first phase for all those who wanted them." *Vancouver Coastal Health - Resident & Family Engagement Report - Housing & Care Model, July 2017, page 4.*

Vancouver needs 114, single bedroom, affordable, accessible units, to promote the independence of disabled voters, not "the proposed 4 and 6 unit housing model". Only a home of their own, not just a room of their own, will give disabled voters freedom.

Regards,

Paul Caune

Civil Rights Now!

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential



"The facts are too overwhelming to be denied or even struggled against—except by something stronger than a fact: an idea!" --Andre Laurendeau

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Mayor and Council Correspondence
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 9:13 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Rezoning Application for 500-650 West 57th Avenue (Pearson Dogwood)
PEARSON/DOGWOOD PROPOSED REZONING

From: Bevan s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2017 5:58 PM
To: Mayor and Council Correspondence
Cc: Bevan Wilson
Subject: FW: Rezoning Application for 500-650 West 57th Avenue (Pearson Dogwood) PEARSON/DOGWOOD PROPOSED REZONING

From: Bevan s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2017 12:24 PM
To: 'publichearing@vancouver.ca'
Cc: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: Rezoning Application for 500-650 West 57th Avenue (Pearson Dogwood)

When the development of these lands were originally proposed, there was to be a station for the Canada Line that was going to be integrated into the Development at the same time the project was to be constructed.

At a round table discussion a few months back at the Marpole Community Center, it came to light that the station is no longer part of the Development. There is somebody new in charge of the Proposal who basically told everyone at the meeting that we were all mistaken at the time of the initial proposal and that there never was to be a new station built at the same time.

He basically implied that we were all liars , and didn't know what we were talking about.

With this Project and the redevelopment of the Langara Estates there will be about ten thousand people with no access to rapid transit as originally promised.

THIS REDEVELOPMENT SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED UNTIL THE TRANSPORTATION QUESTION IS ADDRESSED AND INCLUDED AS AN INTEGRAL PART AS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED.

BEVAN & JAN WILSON

My name is Marjorie Ross, mother of Andrew Ross, who has been at GPC for nearly 5 years. I am requesting that this rezoning application only be granted on condition that some care units which accommodate 12 to 20 persons be provided and denied until suitable care for all persons residing at the GPC has been assured.

Andrew lived with me in our family home until 2011 when he had his last major stroke.

Our lengthy relationship with the medical system began at the end of 1979 when at the age of 5 he was found to have a massive, inoperable brain tumor which chemo and radiation arrested.

Over the last 37 years while I've spent thousands of hours with Andrew in medical facilities I've observed the performance of all levels of workers who provide various aspects of medical treatment and care in various settings. I'm at the GPC at least 5 days a week for a total of about 12 hours each week.

It appears that the various offsite administrators that have attempted to co-ordinate the development of the replacement facilities and offsite interest groups have not gained a realistic understanding of the amount and nature of the care many residents of GPC require to stay alive.

One of the first proposals included modules known as 'green houses' that would provide accommodation for 12 residents. Now it's down to suites with 4 to 6 bedrooms and individual units all in residential towers.

Recently I heard there is a move to all individual units. **Many residents cannot be safely left behind closed doors which individual units would necessitate.**

Many of the residents have **profound and multiple handicaps** such as not being able to breath or swallow or their own, no use of their limbs, nor can they speak. Many are incontinent. They cannot make financial decisions or plan a day's activities. Their disabilities are both physical and often mental due to accident, illness, and/or medication.

Many are more handicapped than Christopher Reeve. They are not like Rick Hansen who has one notable disability.

Persons with multiple handicaps seek secure care where **assistance is readily at hand**. Their needs are often frequent and urgent. They are not seeking their own home. Help at staying alive is what is wanted. A wide array of medical personal and attendants are needed to provide a safe place for these residents The limited number of care givers present in a suite of 4 to 6 persons even makes this arrangement precarious.

Realistically a setting which accommodates 12 to 20 persons provides sufficient staff to attend to routine and urgent care needs.

The updated proposed blue prints show an increased awareness of the space needed for easy movement of the unusually large wheel chairs many residents require that support oxygen

tanks, ventilators, and other life supporting equipment. In addition, the space needed in a kitchen for 4 to 6 residents to have meals prepared is insufficient as is the refrigeration, and storage for medical supplies.

Most residents get two baths or showers a week if any, (often because it is too painful or awkward) and few can use a toilet. There is no need for each resident to have an individual bathroom. It appears there is an image of the residents which isn't very close to reality.

My life experiences and responsibilities contribute to my ability to evaluate the proposed changes to the accommodation and care of residents at GPC.

By employing two care givers for many years, I was able to maintain my position as a college math instructor while Andrew's dad continued as a professor at UBC.

For over 30 years I've owned and managed several rental properties which contain bachelor to 5 bedroom suites which primarily house single adults who chose to live together. I have about 55 tenants.

There are some notable similarities between these suites and their occupants and the current proposal for the replacement of GPC.

Individual suites for the less severely handicapped should be planned for, but cannot be the goal of the redevelopment of GPC.

I doubt that the proposed changes in facility arrangement and care givers is sensible, realistic, or humane.

I ask that rezoning approval be contingent on some modules for housing 12 to 20 residents be stipulated as that would provide safe and cost effective care.

Ludwig, Nicole

From: dave symington s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 10:18 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Dogwood Pearson redevelopment

I urge you to reconsider your development proposal to provide Group homes in this redevelopment. They have had their day and provided a good transitional services in the past but are now outdated and do not fit the model of independent living and personal choice.

The proposed redevelopment includes four or six person units for people with disabilities. Such units, called "group models" or "Greenhouses" in the application, are group homes. (On page 36 of Section 1 of the Dec. 24, 2015 version of the application there is a floor plan labeled: "Typical 4 Unit Layout Independent Clustered or Group Home"). Group homes are not best practices for housing that promotes independence for people with disabilities.

Disability services expert Michael Kendrick stated in a May 31, 2017 letter to "Interested Persons" and COV's Persons with Disabilities Advisory Committee (PDAC): "Group homes have had their day and are now at least a generation out of date and that fact will simply deepen in significance and consequence as the field progresses forward. There is absolutely no evidence that the future leading edge of best practice shows any support for group homes in comparison to person centred options."

In a June 1, 2017 email to PDAC, Ross Chilton, CEO of the Community Living Society, stated "Those of you that I have met will know how concerned many of us are about the plans to replace George Pearson Centre (GPC) with congregate housing for up to six individuals with disabilities. You will also know that such models are now considered in Canada and internationally to be legacy systems that should not be replicated or expanded. Our organization for the last 39 years has limited any residential congregation to four individuals with disabilities and we recognize that even that number represented a compromise in our ability to individualize support. We are consistently moving to reduce and eliminate congregation and increase natural and individualized living arrangements including with former GPC residents."

An argument made to justify the inclusion of group homes in the Application is many current GPC residents want to live in them. The eight group homes of Phase One intended to house 40 people won't be ready until at least 2022. According to the minutes of the Pearson Residents Council meetings, 25 GPC residents have died in the last year and an half. Nearly 10% of GPC's 114 residents die per year. Therefore many of the GPC residents who've asked for group homes will be dead before Phase One is finished. The purpose of the GPC replacement units should not be to honour the dead but to enable the freedom of the living.

Thank you

Dave Symington
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: BG Burdick s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 10:50 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Pearson Dogwood Public Hearing

Mayor and Council Members:

First, let me just say that my honest impression, as I connect with people in Vancouver around the issue of densification, is one of *fatigue and exhaustion*.....at every level.

Those of us living in the city, who are attempting to distance ourselves from NIMBY "ism"and to try to see all the development, along every possible main thoroughfare, through open eyes...have a challenge before us. Our only gentle course of action is to do what I am doing here and/or speak before council.

As a very long term resident of Marpole it is particularly poignant in our neighborhood.

I have lived and worked in the area for 37 years. We have raised our family here, began our business here, employed local people....and have taken care of them. It was, and still remains, one of the most "affordable" (ridiculous word as nothing in Vancouver is or will be "affordable" in a very long while) West Side neighborhoods to reside, particularly as a renter, which I am not...but many friends are. Of course we have seen changes over the years, but they have been gentle, slow in coming, and yet more palatable to the Marpole residents.

Pearson Dogwood holds a special place in all our hearts as our children (and now grandchildren) have spent many hours with the residents during Christmas celebrations, Spring parties and all of us enjoying the parklike setting that exists in the midst of densely built homes and also some (now more) high-rises. We are always happy to see the lights on in the Therapeutic Pool area, especially on a dreary day.

Are we thrilled that there is a move afoot to consider new dwellings for this group of residents...absolutely!! Are we convinced that the new development proposal is the answer? ABSOLUTELY NOT!!

I have been to almost all consultations and open houses. MRC is an active participant in the information gathering process. We are in contact with the VSB as our concern for the children in the neighborhood is first and foremost...FOR EVERYONE...as it should be for you. We are intimately connected to the Cambie Corridor plan....no doubt too late.

We are the ones who are dealing with traffic issues and poor planning on the City's part to address this....which is shared by your own Planning Department and Transportation Department. We have done walkabouts, we have been firm but kind in our approach and concerns. We have practiced being consultative, been committed to working together, *and have been the first Community Centre to sign the JOA*, showing our willingness to participate in requests from the City...that make sense!!! The Pearson Dogwood Development does not!

Now all of you need to hear that this once "hidden" area has had enough High Rise development.

We have enough densification for the time being.

We do not want 5500 people jammed into that tiny area and 5500 more next door in 28 story buildings....plus others.

We have huge concerns over Traffic...and you have zero plans to control that or require any developer to provide a Canada Line Station...which was a massive selling point in all discussions at the open houses.

We want the people that are in the area now to feel safe and secure.

We would like you to stop with the "Affordable" moniker as it is impossible to quantify at best and impossible, at worst, to deliver on...especially until jobs and wages improve and foreign investment is addressed.

We would like to hear that VSB and City Council have connected on a realistic level...which we do not think is occurring.

So, you have your work cut out for you to come up with a development plan that serves the needs of the community and not simply the developer and the idea that densification solves our housing issues.

The people most affected by all this are saying that, at this point, it is horribly flawed.

Thank you,

(Mrs.) "B.G." Burdick

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Albert leung s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2017 3:12 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: July 20 public consultation

Mayor and Councilors,

I am a Marpole resident for the last twelve years. I am opposed to granting Permit to the proposed Pearson Dogwood project.

Below are my rationale and reason for opposed to the development under the current application :
No traffic plan has been developed to handle the amount of people and traffic within and around the development.

- There are no east west public transit between 49th and 70th avenue.
- North South public transit is congested to an unacceptable level already. Cambie and Oak Street is like a parking lot during rush hour. Cambie Street has not built out and Oak Street has not started yet. This project will add extra pressure to the North South main road and create high demand during rush hours.

There are no commitments to build the 57th Avenue sky train station as described in the Marpole Plan. The developer is going to pitch in \$20 million only. There will be heavy pedestrians traffic in the corner of Cambie & Marine and Cambie and 49th. These two areas are traffic black spot now already.

No school plan around the neighborhood. How are we going to handle schooling for this new development plus all the surrounding new developments.

The Therapeutic pool responsibility went back to VCH, again this is our tax dollar, benefits from this project diminished.

Many issues still are not resolved between VCH and the George Pearson residents. We have displaced these residents and arrangements must be made to their satisfaction before a permit is granted.

Based on the Feb 2017 resubmit Policy Statement two of the three Community Amenities items promised by the developer failed to happen. Sky train station on W57th Ave, YMCA on site. With a potential of adding so much density and so little benefit in Marpole, this is a project that brings negative impact to Marpole.

I suggest Staff and the Developer has to sit down and come up with a better arrangement to serve Marpole better. Reduce the density, improve the Amenities and develop a realistic traffic plan. We advocate a win/win and we do not want people come into Marpole and take away benefits only.

Respectfully,

Albert Leung
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential