

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 4:49 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie  
**Attachments:** Rezoning cambie st4139-4187.pdf

---

**From:** Monique s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 4:48 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Re: Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie

To: Vancouver City Council

As I can not attend today's public hearing regarding the above rezoning applications I am attaching my concerns and comments.

Thank You  
Monique Choptuik

s.22(1) Personal and  
Confidential

To: Vancouver City Council  
Re: Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie St

## **Part 1- General Comments re: Neighbourhood Development**

### **Speed of Development**

I am concerned at the speed at which development is occurring within the neighbourhood without first evaluating how each new development affects/effects the others. We only have so many blocks and I don't want them all developed and then we say, "Oops we still need ...are," but there are no more lots that can be developed.

### **Change in CAC Allocations**

As someone living in the Cambie Corridor and specifically the Queen Elizabeth Park area I am concerned about the changes in the way the CAC's are allocated, specifically:

- Initially going from 100% of the CAC allocated to new or improved amenities in the community to 25%.
- **These changes were implemented without any public consultation** especially without any consultation with the people living within the Cambie Corridor who are directly affected.
- **There was no public consultation regarding taking 25% of the CAC and putting it towards the purchase of heritage bonus density.**

This means that only 25% of the monies collected will actually go towards new or improved amenities in the community. **A greater percentage of the CAC must be allocated to provide new or improved amenities in the community such as:**

- Safe pedestrian crossings across Cambie Street (maybe a pedestrian skywalk over Cambie Street and more actual pedestrian crossings)
- A children's playground
- Expanded or improved access and facilities at Hillcrest Community Centre

### **Orphan Lots**

I am also concerned with the continued use of knockout panels in parking garages to get around the Orphan lot provision in the CCP. This together with the

very loose interpretation of the neighbourhood plan and its guidelines (FSR, building setbacks, building lengths, lack of 20% rental within developments, and the classification of 2 bedroom units as suitable for families) serve to make the CCP not worth the paper it is printed on.

## **Part 2- Comments re: Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie Street**

- I am concerned about the orphan lot. The plan calls for the use of knockout panels in parking garages to share parking between the 2 developments. This is just a ploy to get around the Orphan lot provision in the CCP. I would like council to get clarification re: orphan lots. 1) Why was this provision put into the plan? 2) Can this lot be developed without “sharing the parking” i.e. is this a stand alone development)? 3) This is a family neighbourhood how many of these units will be suitable for families?
- This area is a family residential neighbourhood and 2 bedroom units are only suitable for families with one child in reality out of the 75 units only 10 units are really suitable for families. I am afraid that these units may be further reduced as the process proceeds.
- The Kompan Cottage Play Structure on the roof is a token children’s play area and only suitable for very young children.
- The building massing is still too big...height setbacks should wrap around to the South on building 2.
- This is another development that just passes by making changes and in some cases just token changes to pass. I know it is too late but once again I would like to say, not very many cities get the chance to redevelop a large part of their city. We should be showing the world what we can do....In architectural design, technology and dynamic complete liveable communities. **We need to raise the bar.**

I find this process frustrating. We should be asking how does this development add to the neighbourhood not can this site support this development.

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 4:47 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Rezoning of 4139-4187 Cambie

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

**From:** janice douglas s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 4:45 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Rezoning of 4139-4187 Cambie

We are writing to oppose the development.

1. Once again the Cambie Corridor plan has been superseded by the developers plan giving more density to the development than recommended in the plan resulting in extra massing and a wrap around building that definitely was not part of the plan. There was to be a gentle transition into neighbourhoods and no major buildings on side street until further rezoning. Why is it that developers get considerations but the citizens do not?

2. Density and community amenities.

The CAC's NEED to come back to our community. With the extra density from buildings already under construction there is enormous need for more community facilities. Heritage bonus density is fine and we agree with preserving heritage but we also want to preserve livability in our neighbourhood.

Play space for children is minimal and programs at Hillcrest continue to be difficult to get into. While there is a degree of walkability in a very rainy city it is not easy for parents of young children to find recreational spaces. What will the result of many more families be?

3. Greening of Vancouver

It is shocking to me when we talk about making this a green city, Leed etc the number of large trees and fabulous plants and shrubs that are simply mowed under. Trees on our lot are @0-50 years old and are nowhere the size of the trees that so far have received the axe and will continue to fall. I am aware the city arborist has looked at this but it still doesn't seem like a very green initiative.

4. Transit

City staff keep saying that Translink is responsible for increasing the Canada line capacity which is often already full. Density development seems to be based on the Canada Line and it is hard to imagine how it will accommodate the thousands of extra people. As new residents realize that the Line is not really viable for them they will continue to have cars. With developments not providing enough parking, new residents will certainly park throughout the neighbourhood and in the park.

Even bringing back a bus that goes directly downtown would be an improvement.

This development has not been thought through in terms of integration or real community planning.

We also fully support the submission being made tonight by Carey Murphy.

Sincerely Janice and Grant Douglas

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 4:42 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Rezoning Application for 4139-4187 Cambie Street

---

**From:** Todd Constant s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 4:29 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Rezoning Application for 4139-4187 Cambie Street

I would like to object to the rezoning application for 4139-4187 Cambie Street for the following reasons and expect that council looks at slowing the pace of development on Cambie corridor as the original plan was to build out the corridor over 20 years not 2.

- 1) CAC'S have been changed and are not going towards additional NEEDED community amenities like more space at the local community centre which can't increase the programs etc and is full of daycare spaces (the heritage aspect of CAC's is not acceptable and does nothing to address the concerns that the increase density on the community will have). Are you going to tell the new residences that they can't use the community centre as there is no space available. 100% of CAC's should go toward area amenities.
- 2) The primary building should be on Cambie with the townhouses edging the lane and courtyard and this development has the primary building wrapping on to 26th Avenue and therefore the massing goes against the Cambie corridor model. There are other developments in the area that do conform to the primary buildings on the main arterial and the townhomes edging the lane to the single family residences.
- 3) The orphan lot at King Ed and Cambie is not in the rezoning and should be. This corner especially sitting across the street from transit should be developed at the same time and if it is not the local residences would like to understand how and what density would be approved for the orphan lot. There has been talk that the FSR is massive if the orphan lot is developed at a future date. It is also my understanding that a rezoning application is in the works for the orphan lot and therefore the entire block should be put on hold and the two developers should present what they would like to see so that the area residences have the time to see what both developments look like.
- 4) Parking garage puts a strain on the local residences and therefore should be off of Cambie or 26th Avenue or King Edward and not at the back lane next to the single family residences. Some respect must be shown for the residences that still live there in single family homes.

Todd Constant  
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

"This e-mail, and any attachments included with it, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me by replying to this message and permanently deleting the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout thereof."

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 3:29 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: On not being silent: Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie Street & Rezoning 563-571 West King Edward Avenue.

**From:** David Orchard s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 3:20 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Fwd: On not being silent: Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie Street & Rezoning 563-571 West King Edward Avenue.

I support Carey Murphy and I live at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

14 actual rezonings at 5 more in the works is too much all at once. Slow down! For example, our children from l'ecole bilingue will be bicycling and walking to our temporary school for 2 years through the cambie corridor. Vancouver has a history of not taking into account vehicle traffic through construction zones and I've no interest in only 1 lane each way on cambie st.

I also completely that the CAC needs to be for community amenities. The gyms, spin classes, skate rinks, pool, phoenix gymantics and other facilities at Hillcrest are already full with huge wait lists. My wife has stopped going to the aquafit classes because she gets hit in the head, I've stopped going to the gym because I can't get on the equipment, and I've stopped doing lengths in the pool because it is so overcrowded.

Thanks,  
Dave

Her message that I agree with follows:

### Cambie Plan generally:

1. Where's the OFF button on Phase 2 rezonings? – “the Cambie plan will take decades to build out” they said when it was approved in May 2011. No. Already in the RPSC area of Cambie, I count 14 rezonings listed on the City's website and I am aware of at least 5 others that are “in the works”. That's 19! This is madness.

### Applicable to both 4139-4187 Cambie & 563-571 West King Edward :

1. Community Amenity Contribution. 25% of CAC going toward reducing the density bank. I recommend 5% at most. I've heard from others that it should be 0%. The elevated balance in the density bank has been a known problem for many years (since 2009 or earlier than that even) and to have to urgently deal with it now on the backs of the Cambie rezonings and to the detriment of the amenities that we need here is not right. Yes, 96% of the Vancouver survey respondents “believe in preserving heritage” however the same respondents said this about HOW to achieve heritage preservation: only 38% believed in “building new buildings in areas with low heritage values” and only 30% believed in “greater use of transfer of density”. Also, where is the extra density that DAVA et al are purchasing with CAC money going to “land”? It has to land somewhere in the City. Is it going to land here in our neighbourhood too? Do we give up community amenities AND take extra density that has to eventually follow? I've asked to see the specific Letter A (and 1 other rezoning that has already been approved in December 2013) that is mentioned in the council report “staff recommend that a letter of intent (Letter A) be submitted prior to the Public Hearing”. As of 1pm Feb 18th, I do not have the specific letter A that I asked the rezoning planners for. It is supposed to be submitted prior to the Public Hearing and I think it should be posted on the rezoning centre as a public document. It is part of the rezoning application.

## Applicable to 4139-4187 Cambie:

2. Design: There is a primary building on 26<sup>th</sup>. This is too much massing for a side street. The existing neighbourhood has been asking for the prescribed Cambie corridor model: Primary buildings on Cambie, townhouses edging the lane and a courtyard in between. See 5.1.14 page 71 of the Cambie Plan. Also see design plans for 563–571 West King Edward Avenue/755-795 W 41<sup>st</sup>/357-391 King Edward for 3 examples of the prescribed model. Why isn't DAVA told to put forth a design plan that conforms to the Cambie plan, especially where the neighbourhood has been asking for this since the very beginning?
3. Orphan Lot: 512 W King Edward is not in the rezoning. DAVA presents a plan for the development to show it still has potential to be redeveloped. Their plan shows an FSR of 3.26. This is WELL outside the range in the Cambie Plan of 2.0-2.5 FSR for Cambie and King Edward is even lower at 1.25-1.75 FSR. So, is it really OK to leave this lot orphaned? Does the existing neighbourhood have to accept 3.26 FSR for it to be viable? That's not OK. Also their floor plans for the orphan lot generally have smaller units than DAVA is putting in their own buildings. It includes 8 small units whose only windows will face DAVA's building, just a few feet away. Is this liveability? I understand the owner of 512 W King Edward is actually preparing a rezoning application right now and I recommend you wait to see what THAT is going to look like before approving this one. The two have to work together.
4. Location of Underground Parking. The best and safest location would be off of 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The proposed location is accessed from the lane. There is a T lane behind. Hilly, tight and blind corners, vegetation blocking sight lines. If lanes are to be activated to encourage pedestrian activity then would it not make more sense to keep the cars out of the lane? An exit/entrance off 26<sup>th</sup> can have a warning light installed to alert pedestrians on 26<sup>th</sup> that a car is exiting the underground (like Save on Foods has on 7<sup>th</sup>). If the entrance is off the lane, then pedestrians will potentially be struck by cars exiting the lanes on King Edward, 26<sup>th</sup> or Ash. You can't have warning lights in all of these 3 locations. Also headlights will shine directly into the DAVA's 2 storey townhouse building that will be located across from the T.

## Applicable to 563–571 West King Edward Avenue.

5. The Cambie Plan says that King Edward will be 4 storeys in height. 4.2.4 states "consideration for 6 storeys in close proximity to Cambie Street. Within 2 lots". The 2 lots closest to Cambie are 4099 Cambie and 571 King Edward. Therefore the building should be stepping down to 4 storeys sooner than it currently is. It currently has 6 storeys within 3 lots of Cambie Street. Approving this rezoning and allowing this very significant relaxation of the rule is the 'slippery slope' that will encourage other rezonings to insist on interpreting the rules the same way...to their benefit and to the detriment of the existing neighbourhood.

Thanks for reading.

Sincerely,

Carey Murphy

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 3:32 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: I oppose Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie Street & Rezoning 563-571 West King Edward Avenue.

---

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

**From:** Carey Murphy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 3:30 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** I oppose Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie Street & Rezoning 563-571 West King Edward Avenue.

### **Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie Street & Rezoning 563-571 West King Edward Avenue.**

**I oppose both rezonings as they currently stand. Both need additional work before being approved.**

My main message will be around these points.

### Cambie Plan generally:

- Where's the OFF button on Phase 2 rezonings? – “the Cambie plan will take decades to build out” they said when it was approved in May 2011. No. Already in the RPSC area of Cambie, I count 14 rezonings listed on the City's website and I am aware of at least 5 others that are “in the works”. That's 19! This is madness. There seems to be limitless resources available when it comes to rezonings. I do hear that neighbourhood planning has to wait though because there is not enough resources to go around.

### Applicable to both 4139-4187 Cambie & 563-571 West King Edward :

- Community Amenity Contribution. 25% of CAC going toward reducing the density bank. I recommend 5% at most. I've heard from others that it should be 0%. The elevated balance in the density bank has been a known problem for many years (since 2009 or earlier than that even) and to have to urgently deal with it now on the backs of the Cambie rezonings and to the detriment of the amenities that we need here is not right. Yes, 96% of the Vancouver survey respondents “believe in preserving heritage” however the same respondents said this about HOW to achieve heritage preservation: only 38% believed in “building new buildings in areas with low heritage values” and only 30% believed in “greater use of transfer of density”. The survey respondents would not agree with your methods to preserve heritage (which is both transferring density and new buildings). You've picked an answer to a question that suits your purpose but you've ignored the “how are we going to preserve heritage” question which is also in the survey. Obviously, there needs to be conversations with the public around heritage preservation. Topics like what is worth saving and at what cost? Also, where is the extra density that DAVA et al are purchasing with CAC money going to “land”? It has to land somewhere in the City. Is it going to land here in our neighbourhood too? Do we give up community amenities AND take extra density that has to eventually follow? I've asked to see the specific Letter A (and 1 other rezoning that has already been approved in December 2013) that is mentioned in the council report “staff recommend that a letter of intent (Letter A) be submitted prior to the Public Hearing”. As of 1pm Feb 18th, I do not have the specific letter A that I asked the rezoning planners for. It is supposed to be submitted prior to the Public Hearing and I think it should be posted on the rezoning centre as a public document. It is part of the rezoning application.



## Applicable to 4139-4187 Cambie:

- Design: There is a primary building on 26<sup>th</sup>. This is too much massing for a side street. The existing neighbourhood has been asking for the prescribed Cambie corridor model: Primary buildings on Cambie, townhouses edging the lane and a courtyard in between. See 5.1.14 page 71 of the Cambie Plan. Also see design plans for 563–571 West King Edward Avenue/755-795 W 41<sup>st</sup>/357-391 King Edward for 3 examples of the prescribed model. 2 of the 3 examples have been to UDP and both received 100% support from UDP. This illustrates quite well, that the professionals think the prescribed model is a better integration into an existing neighbourhood and offers a more sensitive transition to the existing neighbourhood. Dava's first model was outrageous in its massing and received 0% support from UDP. How it got staff's support, I do not understand. Their 2<sup>nd</sup> model is an improvement however it only marginally passed UDP (3-2). I observed the UDP meeting and the comments from the panel clearly show that they are not enamoured with this design at all.

Why isn't DAVA told to put forth a design plan that conforms to the Cambie plan, especially where the neighbourhood has been asking for this since the very beginning?

- Orphan Lot: 512 W King Edward is not in the rezoning. DAVA presents a plan for the development to show it still has potential to be redeveloped. Their plan shows an FSR of 3.26. This is WELL outside the range in the Cambie Plan of 2.0-2.5 FSR for Cambie and King Edward is even lower at 1.25-1.75 FSR. So, is it really OK to leave this lot orphaned? Does the existing neighbourhood have to accept 3.26 FSR for it to be viable? That's not OK. Also their floor plans for the orphan lot generally have smaller units than DAVA is putting in their own buildings. It includes 8 small units whose only windows will face DAVA's building, just a few feet away. Is this liveability? I understand the owner of 512 W King Edward is actually preparing a rezoning application right now and I recommend you wait to see what THAT is going to look like before approving this one. The two have to work together. The existing neighbourhood should not have to pay the price for a developer who was not able to secure the 4<sup>th</sup> property. Most Cambie rezonings coming forward include 3 lots or more. 2 lots combined is not common and one lot alone is very rare. It begs the question, how viable is a development on ONE lot only? Are the conditions around massing, economics, liveability actually achievable when there is ONE lot?
- Location of Underground Parking. The best and safest location would be off of 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The proposed location is accessed from the lane. There is a T lane behind. Hilly, tight and blind corners, vegetation blocking sight lines. If lanes are to be activated to encourage pedestrian activity then would it not make more sense to keep the cars out of the lane? An exit/entrance off 26<sup>th</sup> can have a warning light installed to alert pedestrians on 26<sup>th</sup> that a car is exiting the underground (like Save on Foods has on 7<sup>th</sup>). If the entrance is off the lane, then pedestrians will potentially be struck by cars exiting the lanes on King Edward, 26<sup>th</sup> or Ash. You can't have warning lights in all of these 3 locations. Also headlights will shine directly into the DAVA's 2 storey townhouse building that will be located across from the T where the 2 lanes intersect.

## Applicable to 563–571 West King Edward Avenue.

- The Cambie Plan says that King Edward will be 4 storeys in height. 4.2.4 states "consideration for 6 storeys in close proximity to Cambie Street. Within 2 lots". The 2 lots closest to Cambie are 4099 Cambie and 571 King Edward. Therefore the building should be stepping down to 4 storeys sooner than it currently is. It currently has 6 storeys within 3 lots of Cambie Street. Approving this rezoning and allowing this very significant relaxation of the rule is the 'slippery slope' that will encourage other rezonings to insist on interpreting the rules the same way...to their benefit and to the detriment of the existing neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Carey Murphy

s.22(1) Personal and  
Confidential

Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 2:13 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: On NOT being silent: Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie Street & Rezoning 563-571 West King Edward Avenue.

---

**From:** mike boyle s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 1:33 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Fwd: On NOT being silent: Rezoning 4139-4187 Cambie Street & Rezoning 563-571 West King Edward Avenue.

Mayor/council of Vancouver

Please note that I am in agreement with the Murphy/Bottomley email

They hit the nail on the head with

***“Why speak then? It won't make any difference anyway”. I hear you. I am compelled to speak because I feel strongly about what is happening around here. It's not OK. Staying silent means I have no objections. Hopefully my (our) comments will at least encourage debate among the councillors.***

I believe that the initial consultation process for the Cambie area was a sham - the wishes of the local residents were basically ignored and now we have continuous changes of the original ideas/Cambie plan.

I feel badly let down by this council and their 'planning' department - too much ink available for your rubber stamp.

your truly

Mike Boyle

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 2:43 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: I oppose the rezoning application for 4139-4187 Cambie Street

---

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

**From:** Carey Murphy and Clive Bottomley  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 2:32 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** I oppose the rezoning application for 4139-4187 Cambie Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

### I oppose the rezoning application for 4139-4187 Cambie Street

I attended the recent public Open Houses and UDP meetings for this application and while I find that Dava Developments has made some improvements to their previous design for this property I still **oppose the rezoning application for 4139-4187 Cambie Street** (at 26th Ave.) This application DOES NOT follow the built form guidelines of the Cambie Corridor Plan (CCP) which it should be governed by.

This development will back onto a small, quiet residential lane with 1 1/2 to 2 1/2 storey single family houses on the other side of this narrow lane. The first house across the lane is a newly built (in 2012) family home that will be there for a long time to come. This family built what they call their "dream house" and unfortunately had no idea that the CCP development was coming.

That said, Dava Developments has every right to apply to construct 6 storey buildings on Cambie street under the Cambie Corridor Plan. Their application sign erected on the site reads "... to construct two 6 storey residential buildings on Cambie street and a row of 2 storey townhouses on the rear lane..." If that is what they were going to do and if they adhered to the CCP Built Form Guidelines, then their application would have rightly stood a good chance of approval... but, that is NOT what Dava's application is asking for. Their plan goes against the Cambie Corridor Plan on several points.

### Point # 1 - Two storey townhouses on lane requirement / primary building on major street.

This is where my first objection to the proposed project is... Their plan is actually not for 2 primary buildings just on the major street of Cambie, as was intended in the CambieCorridor Plan, but instead, it asks for one primary building on Cambie and the other primary building on the small side street of West 26th Avenue, and this building is actually the larger of the two primary buildings. This building extends the entire depth of the lot (from Cambie to the lane) and takes up almost half of the width of their site (originally 3 single family lots). Their "row of 2 storey townhouses on the lane" actually becomes only a small townhouse covering about half of the site's lane frontage instead of a row of 2 storey townhouses running along the entire lane as described in the built form guidelines of the CCP. This requirement is evident in words (see below for excerpts), diagrams (page 38) and backed-up by artist concept drawings (page 31 & 37).

From the built form guidelines of the Cambie Corridor plan...

5.3.1 "Where feasible and where lot dimensions allow, **lanes should be edged with smaller scale residential buildings** in the form of townhouses or other compatible building forms **to reinforce the intimate scale and character of the lane**. They can be up to 2 storeys in height and should generally consider the design conditions for overlook and privacy found within the City's Laneway Housing policy".

The lot depth on the site is 150 feet, which is considered to be deep enough to require townhouses on the lane (130 feet is considered deep enough).

The newly built single family house (that will be there for many years to come) is directly across the lane from Dava Developments proposed building on 26th Avenue will be completely overlooked and have no privacy as the main building extends closer to the lane than is allowed in the guidelines and has many large decks oriented west facing that house and their yard as well as the rest of the neighbourhood. Even though the redesign has reduced the mass of the western side of the building somewhat and is at a 2 storey level right at the lane the 6 storey height still extends to far west to meet the

guidelines that call for a separate 2 storey townhome or lanehouse on the lane and it does not have the required 24 ft courtyard between the main building and the lane building.

The Dava Developments application is not in compliance with the guidelines on this issue.

The requirements for scale and massing to the lane to provide the sensitive transition to the neighbourhood have not been fully met.

The guidelines say... "In order to balance **sensitive transitions** to evolving neighbourhoods, laneway buildings should convey a smaller, neighbourhood feel."

Dava should be told to go back to the drawing board and scale back their primary building on 26th Ave to be inline with where primary buildings are supposed to be, just like their other building that fronts Cambie Street and should be required to extend the townhouses along the entire rear lane frontage of their site. This would go a long way to addressing the "sensitive transition to the neighbourhood" guideline.

## **Point # 2 - Courtyard requirements.**

From the built form guidelines.... COURTYARDS - 5.1.14 "For projects that include laneway buildings, the space between the **primary fronting buildings** and the lane buildings - **the courtyard** - needs to be large enough to ensure the livability of all units. A **minimum 24 ft depth** is suggested. Different site and massing configurations should be explored to achieve this minimum depth. **Massing** should also strive to **maximize the sunlight** available to the courtyard, such as through variation in height."

The proposed Dava Development at Cambie and 26th Avenue largely ignores this built form guideline. Because their proposal calls for the placement of a "primary building" on 26th Ave (instead of on the major street of Cambie as was intended by the CCP) with the building running all the way to the lane there is no courtyard where it should be for almost half of the width of the site. This orientation also blocks all sunlight to the small courtyard area that is in their plan because the building runs all the way along the south side of the property. If the primary building was cutback and in its place there was a separate 2 storey townhouse on the lane and then the minimum 24 foot courtyard near the rear of the site as is intended in the CCP there would be sunlight for the rest of the development as well as a better transition to the existing neighbourhood.

## **Point # 3 - Orphaning of a single lot without future potential of development within the Cambie Corridor Plan guidelines.**

During the Cambie Corridor Planning we heard plenty about single lots that would not be "orphaned". Now the plan in the written form talks about "avoid precluding future opportunities". So, Dava has drafted a plan for the "orphan" lot to the north of their site to show it has opportunity. But does it really? Dava's plan for the orphan site, that it does not own or control, calls for an FSR of 3.26 which exceeds, by over 30 %, the high end of the FSR range which is 2.0 - 2.5 for this site.

Also, the plan contains a large percentage of small units (19 of the 44 units are under 600 sq ft, whereas in Dava's own development only 2 of 76 units are under 600 sq feet). As well, the plan for the orphan site has no amenity room and very little storage, far less than Dava's own development. Dava's contention that their plan for the orphan site has viability is preposterous, it does not prove that the orphan lot has future opportunities at 6 storeys. An independent economic plan of this should have to accompany their application and also it needs to be assessed against the Cambie Corridor Plan to see if it is consistent...already with the FSR value far exceeding the high end of the intended range for this area of the Cambie Corridor... how can anyone call this viable?

Furthermore, I understand that an application to develop this orphaned lot is being readied, so, why not wait until that application is put forward to see if the lot is indeed viable under the CCP guidelines before approving Dava's development for this site.

## **Point # 4 - Access to underground parking.**

I'd like to make the suggestion that the access to the u/g parking should be off of W 26th. Currently it is set to be at the North West corner of the site. I find this to be a very awkward location for it. There is an extremely steep incline up the lane off of King Edward just before the proposed entrance. The lane is too narrow for 2 way traffic. There is also a T lane intersection just a few feet away. I strongly believe we will see a few accidents in this lane if this placement is used. An u/g entrance off 26th would be much simpler and safer, similar to "The Olive" which has their u/g entrance off of 17th. The COV engineering rep and the city planner claim that having the u/g entrance off the lane is safer for pedestrians because

the vehicles won't be crossing a sidewalk to get into the u/g. However that makes no sense because pedestrians are also crossing the lane as they walk on the sidewalks, both on 26th and King Edward. If the u/g is located off of 26th then the vehicles will go in and out from one point and only cross only one sidewalk. If the u/g is off the lane then vehicles will go in and out of lanes at several points and I expect accidents to occur.

Furthermore, the CCP in section 5.3 speaks of lanes as "unique opportunities for additional and alternate routes for pedestrians"... Not if there are vehicles around blind corners (due to hedges and fences) and blind inclines! I believe there is a better location for the u/g access than in the lane for this rezoning.

- To summarize, u/g parking access off of W 26th would be simpler and safer.

**The above are my 4 main points and on these alone the application should NOT be supported.**

Just using some common sense or best practices when interpreting the principles and guidelines of the CCP should prevail... a side street like West 26th Avenue is not and should not be subject to fronting "Primary buildings" of 6 storeys, even a major arterial street such as King Edward is only allowed 4 storeys in height under the CambieCorridor Plan.

I will continue with other points where the application is also suspect...

## **# 5 - Stepbacks and "streetwall" requirement**

"In general, provide a **noteable** stepback above 4 storeys to reduce the overall building massing (4 storey streetwall)."

My opinion is that Dava's proposed buildings on this site do not achieve the stepback intended, the streetwall impression is at least 5 storeys with only a slight step back on the 6th floor.

## **# 6 - Architecture**

There is no architectural interest to these buildings, nothing different in terms of shape, variation or any other design statement to set them apart from other 4-10 storey mid-rise buildings in Vancouver. This design is just a couple more lame, generic concrete boxes that maximizes square footage and therefore profit.

"Buildings should be limited in size, both real and perceived, to allow for sunlight, views, and a general feeling of **openness**"

There certainly is not a general feeling of openness in this design, and considering the largest building runs the length of the south side of the site, sunlight will be an issue.

As you make your way south along Cambie Street you leave Cambie Village and enter the Queen Elizabeth Park area at King Edward Avenue where the Cambie Heritage Boulevard starts, here a major change in landscape occurs. **This is Vancouver's most significant ceremonial boulevard and deserves better than this proposal offers. This area warrants an equally significant level of architecture to anchor this emerging corridor of mid-rise condo developments as they start flowing through this park-like setting, a statement that should reflect its natural surroundings.** In my opinion, buildings here should have an organic West Coast feel with finishes such as rock and cedar (or other indigenous wood elements). They certainly should not be just more boring, blah, concrete boxes, Vancouver has too many of those already. This assessment of Dava's design is not just my opinion, some architects I have talked to and a pro-development online forum have openly criticized this design. It barely passed UDP (3-2) and 3 panel members had big concerns over aspects of this design. I would venture to say that if the UDP meeting wasn't so poorly attended (only 5 voting members) this application most likely would not have passed.

One question asked at the 1st UPD meeting for this application by a panel member was "what does the CCP say about side streets". The answer from the city planner was "the CCP is silent with respect to side streets". I was very disappointed by his answer as it is clear to me that the panel member was seeking direction. To say "it is silent" gives the impression that anything is possible, but if you follow

all the built form guidelines, primary buildings or wrap-around wings that extend the full length of the property on side streets are not permitted.

## # 7 - Landscaping

The developers should also be required to work a little harder to retain some of the existing significant evergreen trees on the lot including one that is probably close to 100 feet tall. I think it could be possible to save this tree by building an entryway courtyard that would wrap around the tree. This tree is in almost the perfect location between the two buildings at the front of the property to achieve this. In the Cambie Corridor plan there is language that talks about articulating the built form to respond to the site. This should apply to significant trees on the site (if feasible) or on adjacent sites and also to other factors influencing the building site such as slope.

### In conclusion....

- West 26th Avenue is a side street, not a major street or arterial, and should not be subject to fronting "Primary buildings" of 6 storeys... it makes no sense when even a major arterial street such as King Edward is only allowed 4 storeys in height under the Cambie Corridor Plan. The building should only extend from Cambie back to the point that would allow the required laneway building and the minimum 24 ft courtyard to fit.
- the Laneway treatment for lots deeper than 130 feet (this site is 150 feet) requires 2 storey townhouses "In order to balance **sensitive transitions** to evolving neighbourhoods, laneway buildings should convey a smaller, neighbourhood feel." and "should generally consider the design conditions for overlook and privacy found within the City's Laneway Housing policy".
- Because laneway houses are required, a courtyard (minimum 24 feet) is also required. "**Massing** should also strive to **maximize the sunlight** available to the courtyard".
- Dava's design for this site is the worst for transitioning to an existing neighbourhood that I have seen yet in the Cambie Corridor.
- The future development opportunity for the orphaned lot at Cambie and King Edward is NOT viable within the CCP.
- u/g parking access off of W. 26th would be simpler and safer.
- This site is at the beginning of the Cambie Heritage Boulevard and deserves a high level of architectural excellence.

How this Dava Developments application and other applications are being allowed to get to this point and be presented in public open houses is beyond my comprehension. Developers have discussions with city planners leading up to any open house and although city staff don't take a formal position on the application I would have thought that it is the planning department's job to counsel the applicant on the intent of the guidelines. No one can point me to any section of the Cambie Corridor Plan that would allow Dava Developments to build the building that they propose. I hear city staff talk about "grey areas" and "interpretations" of the guidelines but I think I have quite clearly shown where this application is in conflict with the CCP Built Form Guidelines on many issues and in discussions with city planners nobody has been able to dispute my understanding of the guidelines nor show me where there are over-riding guidelines or any language that would prevent them from insisting on the guidelines being followed as they are written. This proposal conflicts with the CCP built form guidelines and this should be noted in any report by city staff to council and this application should NOT be approved as is.

Clive Bottomley

s.22(1) Personal and  
Confidential