

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Ludwig, Nicole
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 4:00 PM
To: Hildebrandt, Tina
Subject: FW: requested notes from rezoning presentation 4837-4861 Cambie St. July 10
Attachments: Mayor and Council.july 10.3.doc

Here it is.

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 4:04 PM
To: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: FW: requested notes from rezoning presentation 4837-4861 Cambie St. July 10

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: janice douglas s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 3:19 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: requested notes from rezoning presentation 4837-4861 Cambie St. July 10

This council can congratulate themselves on doing a number of things particularly well, farmer's markets urban agriculture, bike lanes view corridors and height density in the Olympic village and the list goes on. The amount of densification on the Cambie corridor is not one of them. It is too much.

At the time the Corridor plan was proposed, the community pleaded not to exponentially change the character of the neighbourhood.

It was pointed out to them that it was not reasonable to want to see the trees in the park when they looked east, nor have their quiet neighbourhood changed by adding up to 600 people per block, to be able to have the morning sun come into their yards or to continue to have personal privacy or to regret now shaded yards. We had to think of the greater good. We needed to utilize the transit corridor, regardless that it is often almost gridlock now north of 25th and the Canada line is well used and impossibly crowded at peak periods.

The Cambie Corridor Plan says that this density will provide more public benefits including livability and affordability, particularly family housing and facilities for young families.

In 1992 the city adopted High Density Housing for Children and Family Guidelines, an excellent policy were it to be followed.

It is currently unclear how any of the proposed developments meet these guidelines with the exception of incorporating the required percentage of family units. Note that a family unit is two bedrooms and could be as little an average of 800 sq ft. This is not truly livable family space

The current proposal acknowledges that the family units are for families with small children. What happens when the children get to be 7 or 8 or even older? The current proposal suggests there will be 30 family units. That could be 60 children! The guidelines call for a dedicated secure play area of a minimum of 130 sq meters or @1400 sq feet. The very small space at the back of the drawings did not reflect that reality or indicate the recommended appropriate play equipment. A room

adjacent to out door space for tricycles, strollers and large motor skill toys should be considered. Guidelines further suggest that all family units have dedicated private outdoor space @8x10 with clear sightlines from the **including birthday and holiday parties. . Experience has shown that rooms of at least 37 m² (@ 400 sq ft)provide for the greatest range of use. .**

The potential role of common indoor space in creating community interaction and safety should be fostered especially in light of the latest Vancouver Foundations’s report. Where are these rooms?

In keeping with priorities of both the corridor plan and the family housing guidelines schools need to be no further than .8k or .497 miles. Emily Carr, the nearest elementary public school at 25th and Oak is almost 2k and the kindergarten classes are full. The nearest playground which it is recommended be no more than a.4k walk is at Hillcrest park which is a almost 1.6k or 1 mile. It actually is connected to the daycare so is not always available. So will these families walk or take cars. Will they need more than one car? Where will they park two cars? How will these issues be addressed in a timely manner? The light at 29th crossing Cambie, by the way is too short to permit safe crossing by small children or seniors

The guidelines state and the corridor plan implies that families need and will have reasonable and effective access to essential community services and recreational amenities. As the neighbours of Little Mountain Place observed, Hillcrest is almost at capacity and that developer offered a neighbourhood house.

“If a new housing development would overload the existing neighbourhood facilities and services, consideration must be given as to how the additional demand could be accommodated. “

Currently our neighbours are poised at computers now to register children and grandchildren. The library, forced to scale back in it’s plans barely meets demands and has a very small children’s collection but we are talking about adding hundreds of children and families to the corridor.

HOW will the additional demand be accommodated and when? The developments are poised to start soon!

If you think I am belaboring the issue of children, that is just the point. Who does speak for the children?

Where is the oversight to make sure the guidelines are followed in these high density buildings and if they are not followed, why not?

Is there resistance to enforcing the guidelines?

Do we really not want children in these developments, even though the demographers say we need more children for economic health?

This is a critical issue to consider given that this is one small development but the first one setting precedents and you are talking about adding hundreds more family units within the plan

If we the residents of the neighbourhood are going to sacrifice our lifestyle what are we sacrificing it for? A developer told me that affordability isn't about price it's about price point. Tell that to hard pressed young families. If it can't be cheap then it should be livable especially according to the cities own guidelines. There are other alternatives such as Vancouver co-housing that could be looked at.

The Corridor plan says that the green park like setting will be strengthened and enhanced. How? As far as I have been told all the magnificent tall trees on private property will be razed. Doesn't sound like enhancement to me. Who is benefiting from this density as the proposal stands? Not the current residents,. Not the new families who will lack the very amenities they really need, not seniors who will also have over a mile to walk to get groceries, not the people driving or walking by who will see very mediocre architecture on a

major heritage road (even Bob Ransford referred to this in his weekend column and some of the urban design panel lamented it as well).

As a city that has award winning, talented architects they need to be called do better. Create something memorable.

In the interim the city will get more taxes and certainly the developers will do well and life will not be better, more livable or more affordable, just more.

The current plans are not really about making the corridor better for children and families. There is no evidence that the family units will be either really livable or affordable or generate more transit and walking use.

As a city that talks about sustainability we can certainly do better. If we say this plan is to make it more livable for families then let's do that.

I invite you to entertain wisdom , insight and even compassion and send these plans back to the drawing boards.

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 5:15 PM
To: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: FW: speaker at Public Hearing July 10/12 rezoning 4837-4861 Cambie
Attachments: Good evening mayor and councillors July 10 2012.pdf

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: Carey Murphy s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 4:36 PM
To: Affleck, George; Ball, Elizabeth; Carr, Adriane; Deal, Heather; Jang, Kerry; Louie, Raymond; Meggs, Geoff; Reimer, Andrea; Stevenson, Tim; Tang, Tony
Cc: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: speaker at Public Hearing July 10/12 rezoning 4837-4861 Cambie

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this very important topic. Attached is my speech that I was able to read some of last evening. Thank you to councillors Ball and Carr for asking me to submit my comments via email.

orphaning of single lot not consistent with CCPP basic principles, therefore application should be rejected there's your legal out.

Regards,
Carey Murphy
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

July 10/12. Public Hearing on rezoning of 4387-4861 Cambie St.

Good evening mayor and councillors,

I have spoken once before to council. This was about one year ago at the Cambie Corridor Planning program meeting. I have a few topics that I would like to cover in my 5 minutes, so we'll see how it goes but for the record they are:

The Riley Park South Cambie Community vision

The orphaned lot and set back from the rowhouses

The sensitive transition to the neighbours

Activate the lanes

Complete the community

RPSC community vision. Did you know that the section of the cambie corridor from 41st north actually already has a community vision? It is called the Riley Park South Cambie Community Vision. The community vision was a huge undertaking. Residents in the area who worked on this put in hours and hours of work. Comprehensive surveys were sent out to everyone in the area and even outside the area. And YES! the Canada line train stations are in the plan. The vision was recommended by staff and adopted on consent by council in 2005. The community vision created under city plan was intended to give certainty to residents ,city planners and anyone as to how this community would grow and develop over the long term, and by long term what is intended is over 20 + years, not 5. How is it the cambie corridor plan muscled its way in and brought with it housing types that were clearly "not supported" in the community vision. It's really sad because now the cambie corridor plan does not reflect what the residents saw for our future in the neighbourhoods that we love. It's scary. Now there is lots of uncertainty. The corridor is virtually for sale en masse. What are we up against? Here is our first zoning application in RPSC and this is where it begins. I really hope you all will recognize in your decisions and voting that this plan has come in and stomped all over a perfectly good plan that already existed. The Riley Park South Cambie Community Vision.

The orphaned lot. The cambie corridor plan clearly outlined that a single lot would not be orphaned. That 2 lots would be required for any development and any of the developers that spoke during the process leading up to the approval of the cambie corridor plan were vocal that a minimum of 2 lots would be needed for any development that they'd be interested in doing. Preferably more. So now we have this single orphaned lot. However Mosaic has paid for a study to show that it still has development potential IF the set back is increased to 20 ft from that orphaned lot. I'm skeptical on that. In theory it may have development potential but whether it is practical or viable to develop that single lot, I am not convinced. However, in order to give it that development potential the Mosaic's proposed building has to be pushed SO close to the row houses to the south. It's really outrageously close. Why? Why do the folks in the row houses now have to be the ones to pay a price? Seems terribly unfair to me. Perhaps Mosaic's plan should NOT have gone ahead because it orphaned a lot. That was certainly the rule when we were going over this cambie plan a year ago. No orphaning. Instead Mosaic got the green light and the lot is orphaned and the new building is too close to the row houses. I am concerned why a rule of 'no orphaning' is not being adhered to (and might I suggest reason enough to tell Mosaic, the application can't be approved) and I'm suggesting a greater set back from the row houses has to be achieved (presuming the application does get approved). I am also worried about a precedent setting that now overrules the 'no orphaning' rule.

Sensitive transition. 5 storeys is a tall structure to have across the lane from you and although this is under the maximum allowed per the cambie plan at that site, I would prefer to see 3 storey townhouses in all of the RPSC area

that's within the cambie plan. The scale would be better and I have heard over and over from many people who ask "why can't we have townhouses, like the ones on Oak?" or like the ones on Cambie around 44th or the Grace Estates at Ash and 26th. Townhouse or similar developments fit in a single family area, such as ours. And this is the type of housing that was approved in the Riley Park South Cambie Community Vision.

Activate the Lanes. The cambie corridor plan has a principle to activate lanes and have them be a place where people can enjoy being. Not relegated to garbage and recycling and fences and gates. I think activating the lane and making them a nice place to be is great. However, I am not convinced that Mosaics development will do that. I have read about retaining walls with greenery however I don't think there are any entrances let alone attractive and inviting entrances off the lane. There will be patios and common area on the lane side of the building, but in order for that to 'activate' the lane, it needs to be visible to someone in the lane, even if in a partially obscured way to provide some privacy. You need to kind of see the people on their patios, hear some voices. It can't be hidden behind a wall because then it does nothing to activate the lane. I hope the design plan will ensure that the lanes are activated and not subject to a wall, with greenery – because that's just a wall and the greenery may die or be pulled up or not be maintained.

Complete community. I don't see anything in this plan that creates a complete community. This was also a cambie corridor principle. There is nothing around 33rd and I don't see anything in the plan. There needs to be some coffee shop, bakery or juice bar (something)– there has to be a place for people to go and meet their neighbours and live the "complete community".

Thank you.

Carey Murphy

s.22(1) s.22(1)

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 10:11 AM
To: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: FW: Rezoning 4837-4861 Cambie Street, July 10 2012, item No 8 Speaker # 5
Attachments: City Council July 10, application 8.doc

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: Dominique Robeyns s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 1:31 AM
To: Public Hearing; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Rezoning 4837-4861 Cambie Street, July 10 2012, item No 8 Speaker # 5

Dear all,
Thank you for listing to my concerns tonight.
Please find enclosed a written copy reflecting what I said tonight.
Yours Truly,
Dominique

On 2012-07-10, at 3:03 PM, Public Hearing wrote:

Thank you for your email.

You will receive an acknowledgement that includes your speaker number for the item you have requested to speak to on the Public Hearing agenda.

Any updates regarding the hearing will also be sent to you by email. For all other general public hearing inquiries, a Meeting Coordinator will respond within one business day. U

July 11, 2012
Vancouver City Council
RE: rezoning 4837-4861 Cambie Street

Dear members of City Council,

Here is the written transcript of my presentation tonight

I agree with most of what the residents said previously. They were eloquent, well prepared speakers. I am coming here tonight, less well prepared, as I am a mother of 3 children, the youngest being 8 and the eldest 14, with a full time job. So I did have less time to prepare.

I however intended to express my opinion as a mother of a family living in the neighborhood. I live on 29th avenue West, next to Carol-Ann., further away from the development in question. This development is however the first in the Cambie Corridor development, across Queen Elizabeth Park, between 29th and 33rd. So I felt I had to make sure that it would set a good precedent.

First of all, I would like to express that I am in favor of development of the Cambie corridor. The issue however is the extent of development and how development happens.

City Council should be aware of the social implications of development of Cambie, as Carol-Ann brought up. I can recall a 80 year old lady sharing with me at one of the developers meetings, that she had decided to sell against her will. She was on a fixed income, living by herself. Her taxes had gone up by \$ 4,000, reflecting the increase in municipal evaluation and she could not, being on fixed income, afford this increase.

The development affects the quality of our community. Agents knock on doors and ask whether we would sell. We can resist their intrusions. However, I have an app on my iPhone called Realtor. It locates the MLS listings around where I am. Listings in my neighborhood around my house start by saying: "Investment potential; future Cambie corridor development project". Now would this attract families with children who could play with my children in my neighborhood?

My other concern, being the mother of children, is the extent of densification. It is simply too much. I am from Belgium and let's face it, North Americans are in love with their cars. There may be a Canada Line and Bus routes, people still will take their cars.

Mosaic has 43 parking spots for 41 residences. This is a 2000% increase in number of cars in the lane on those 2 lots.

I am concerned for my children, playing in the lane or on the street and the increased traffic in the block, on the streets and in the lane.

Because of the proximity of women and children, there are parking regulations in effect on our streets. Mosaic has 4 parking spots for visitors. Now is this realistic? 41 units and 4 spots for visitors? Where are the other visitors going to park? No they won't all come with the Canada Line.

So because I want to preserve my family's neighborhood, because of my concerns for increased car traffic and its inherent risks, I firmly believe that Mosaic's development is too large. I looked at the Cambie Corridor Plan. The buildings in that section are suggested to have a net FSR of 1.5-2.0, Mosaic proposes 2.05.

The plan also states 5.15 "In special circumstances, including sites between 33rd and 29th Avenue around Queen Elizabeth Park, a narrower frontage is appropriate. In these cases, a maximum building frontage of 120 ft

FROM THE DESK OF

«FIRST» «LAST»

is desired to maximize views through and past buildings in recognition of the significance of Queen Elizabeth Park. Mosaic touts its building to be below the suggested frontage with a frontage of 123.' 6"?

Actually, reading through the Cambie Corridor Plan, felt often confusing. As if multiple author wrote the plan, leading to contradictory points. For example , often the text refers to vague special building designs directly across Queen Elizabeth park, that allow for public views. Then it allows 6 stories maximum as anywhere else, but not on King Edward, were the character is less. demanding.

Finally I wanted to bring it to the sense of community. I agree with previous speaker residents, that these sleeping boxes wont' build a community,. We need a smaller scale building, with more ways for residents to interact. Places to walk around and mix with neighbors. The gated boxed dormitories won't achieve this.

I fine, I am for the development by Mosaic, with the condition that it is scaled down below the maximum allowed frontage and FSR. Also it needs to be architecturally and on a communal level more interestingly integrated in the neighborhood of Queen Elizabeth Park .

Thank you for your attention,

Sincerely yours,

Dominique Robeys

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 9:29 AM
To: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: FW: Further comments re JULy 10th public hearing for rezoning 4837-4861 Cambie
Attachments: Further comments re JULy 10th public hearing for rezoning 4837-4861 Cambie
Importance: High

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: C Soong s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 12:39 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Fwd: Further comments re JULy 10th public hearing for rezoning 4837-4861 Cambie
Importance: High

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: C Soong s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 8:06 AM
To: mayorcouncil@vancouver.ca
Subject: Further comments re JULy 10th public hearing for rezoning 4837-4861 Cambie

Importance: High

Last night , as someone who has been in the neighbourhood for 60 years, I spoke against the present plans submitted for a 5 storey condo/townhouse development for the address above.

You heard the context within which I made my comments.

I wish to reiterate that whatever decisions you make in regards to this FIRST application for densification , as a result of the Cambie Corridor Plan, will set a precedent re density expectations that two developers will have with regarding their upcoming applications for the blocks north and south of the present proposal but as well with all the realtors/developers standing in the wings.

Infact as I left the meeting my neighbour in the next block told me that a realtor has recently knocked on her door saying that there was an interested buyer for their home who wished to invest in our 2 blocks west of Cambie(along West 29th, approaching the entrance to the Shaughnessy hospital site. Another example of the real estate speculation taking place in our area.

I am writing to-day seeking responses to the 3 questions I posed last night. They are-

1. What are the overall plans and goals you have as you continue planning densification for our neighbours and city-wide?

2 Does densification(eco-density)take precedence over ensuring neighbourhood liveability for residents?

3. What will you do to stop property/real estate speculation in our neighbourhood and the city at large?

I did not hear any comments/answers to these questions and would appreciate hearing your responses.

Thanking you in advance for your replies.

sincerely, Carole Anne Soong - a longtime resident in the blocks west of Cambie

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 7:09 PM
To: careymurphy@ymail.com
Subject: RE: Ccpp

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.

City Clerk's Office
City of Vancouver
Phone: 604-829-4238
Email: publichearing@vancouver.ca
Website: vancouver.ca/publichearings

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 6:39 PM
To: Carey Murphy
Cc: Affleck, George; Ball, Elizabeth; Carr, Adriane; Deal, Heather; Jang, Kerry; Louie, Raymond; Meggs, Geoff; Reimer, Andrea; Stevenson, Tim; Tang, Tony; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Ccpp

Rezoning has placards installed to advise of exactly what is happening not like the ccpp that said " come help plan the Cambie corridor" in the van courier. Residents did not understand that this is basically a rezoning that greatly enables zoning.

Sad.

Carey Murphy
Sent from my iPod