

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 4:41 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Rezoning Application for 563-571 West King Edward Avenue

From: Todd Constant s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2014 4:40 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Rezoning Application for 563-571 West King Edward Avenue

I would like to comment on the rezoning application for 563-571 West King Ed

1) The consideration for 6 stories is two lots from Cambie street according to the Cambie corridor plan and the proposed development has 6 stories three lots from Cambie street. The building that is proposed should be stepping down to 4 stories sooner that it is. Even though this development is next to a transit station the Cambie corridor plan of 2011 still maintains that it is within two lots of the Cambie street not the backlane. It will be apparent that the city is not following its own guidelines on this if it is approved.

2) 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 or 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 like daycare spaces and increasing the size of the local community centre as it is at capacity.

These should be addressed before allowing the rezoning to occur.

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 gymastics 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 26th. 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 41st/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 26th 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 26th can have a warning light installed to alert pedestrians on 26th that a car is exiting the underground (like Save on Foods has on 7th). If the entrance is off the lane, then pedestrians will potentially be struck by cars exiting the lanes on King Edward, 26th 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.

From: Carey Murphy s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
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 26th. 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 41st/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 2nd 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 4th 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 26th 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 26th can have a warning light installed to alert pedestrians on 26th that a car is exiting the underground (like Save on Foods has on 7th). If the entrance is off the lane, then pedestrians will potentially be struck by cars exiting the lanes on King Edward, 26th 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