

**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 25, 2014 9:38 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Rezoning of Oakridge Center

---

**From:** Francis Luk s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2014 9:07 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Rezoning of Oakridge Center

I am against the construction of the 11 residential towers that could be as high as 44 storeys each. The close to 3,000 residential units will bring about 12,000 people living in this development (assuming each household has 4 people). Even based on a conservative assumption that only 20% of these people would own cars, you are talking about over 2,000 cars being driving around the neighbourhood. At present, the traffic at Cambie and 41st ave is already very congested especially during rush hours. I cannot imagine what a traffic gridlock would be created due to an addition of another 2,000 cars. It is possible that some of the residents will consider taking the Canada Line but given the small capacity of passengers it can carry (2 cars and possibly expanding to 3 cars), many of the people in these residential towers might still resort to driving to work. You need to reduce the height of these towers by half (no higher than 20 storeys) in order to maintain a living environment for every resident in Oakridge.

Thank you.

Francis Luk

**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2014 3:54 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Oakridge

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

**From:** Will Preston s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2014 3:17 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Oakridge

Dear Sirs:

Object to as much expansion. Am former Board member of Trans Link. The Canada Line is over expanded Expansion not feasible. Try riding it.

Will Preston

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Monday, February 24, 2014 2:06 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Comment on Oakridge redevelopment

---

**From:** Felicity Estrin s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 23, 2014 9:16 AM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Comment on Oakridge redevelopment

Dear Sir and members of the Council,

I voted for Vision in the last two elections, but concern has turned to alarm and now outrage at the rate at which Vision is allowing the city to be developed. The news of the latest Oakridge redevelopment, for me, is beyond the pale, and I'm consequently writing to council today. Vision Vancouver must stop the wanton, rampant destruction of our neighbourhoods; the fabric of our way of life is being destroyed as families are forced out, traffic congestion has reached the worst levels in North America, and we have become the second most expensive city in the world *ahead* of Paris, New York, and London. This must stop and immediately, before any more damage is done to what was once a live-able city.

We have been told repeatedly that densification "will happen" and somehow has to happen, yet where is the data (from studies not funded by interested parties) that supports this? The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods has shown that densification is happening at a far more rapid rate than is necessary based on even the city's own projections (<http://coalitionvan.org/media-releases/whats-the-rush-vancouver-communities-question-rapid-rate-of-development/>). Moreover, according to a study by UBC professor Andrew Yan, the equivalent of more than 35 condo towers are currently standing empty (<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/vancouvers-vacancies-point-to-investors-not-residents/article10044403/>). Finally, reports suggest that the rate of newcomers to the city is dropping off due to unaffordability, so the city's own projections may never come to pass. The rapidity smacks of a cash grab on the part of the developers, who appear to own the Mayor and City Council, to "get while the getting is good."

This Oakridge redevelopment must be stopped, completely scrapped, as there is no way the surrounding neighbourhoods can absorb a sudden population influx of that magnitude without having their quality of life destroyed in the process. Moreover, Vision Vancouver must begin to demonstrate that there is genuine democratic process in this city (as opposed to fake community consultations). How about offering a referendum on your 30 year plan for the city?

Sincerely,

Felicity Estrin  
Vancouver, BC

**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Friday, February 21, 2014 12:06 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Oakridge Rezoning Proposal

---

**From:** Vermette, Simone s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Friday, February 21, 2014 12:01 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Oakridge Rezoning Proposal

Hello,

I can't attend the public meeting on this plan, but have the following comments:

- The proposed density and height of buildings is too much for public transit to take.
- Shadowing on the neighboring properties in the area from the highrises is not acceptable. Forty storey towers are much too high for this area.
- Lack of public park space in the plan is unacceptable for the population proposed for the area.

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Simone Vermette s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

---

This communication, including attachments, is confidential, may be subject to legal privileges, and is intended for the sole use of the addressee. Any use, duplication, disclosure or dissemination of this communication, other than by the addressee, is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete or destroy this communication and all copies.

Cette communication, ainsi que tout fichier y étant rattaché, est confidentielle, peut être protégée par le secret professionnel et est à l'usage exclusif du destinataire. Toute utilisation, copie, divulgation ou diffusion de cette communication par toute autre personne que le destinataire est interdite. Si vous avez reçu cette communication par erreur, veuillez aviser l'expéditeur immédiatement et supprimer ou détruire cette communication ainsi que toutes les copies.

**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Friday, February 21, 2014 12:07 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Public hearing oakridge centre

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

**From:** Vini Edy  
**Sent:** Friday, February 21, 2014 12:01 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Public hearing oakridge centre

As a long time Oakridge area resident, I'm very disappointed that you've chosen a 2pm time to discuss public opinion on the redevelopment of our neighbourhood.

I have many concerns about this massive redevelopment. First, where will parking for sky train users be located? Currently Columbia park has become the area where cars stay parked all day making it difficult to see children who cross the roads on their way to school. If we truly want to make sky train accessible, long term parking must be provided.

Second, where is the proposed elementary school to house all the children that will come with this new neighborhood? We cannot go back to portables at our schools.

Third, park space on a roof does not meet the criteria for accessible park space for all. This is an easy way to get the developer the most money for the land and leaves park users high and dry.

There are many other concerns with regards to the massive redevelopment of the entire Cambie corridor. Without more accessible public consultation for those of us who work mid day you have robbed us of participating in our rightful democratic process.

I would sincerely like more information about my concerns and would like to know why an afternoon start time was chosen for this consultation.

Sincerely,  
Vini Edy

Sent from my iPhone

**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 20, 2014 3:57 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Oakridge Redevelopment - your voice of reason !

---

**From:** MacKenzie, Janice  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 20, 2014 3:44 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** FW: Oakridge Redevelopment - your voice of reason !

Correspondence for the upcoming public hearing. It was forwarded (unread) by Cllr Carr.

---

**Councillor Adriane Carr**  
City of Vancouver  
City Hall: 453 West 12th Ave.  
Office: 604-873-7245  
Cell: 604-653-9053

---

**From:** Stoller-Allmar 5.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 19, 2014 7:11 AM  
**To:** Carr, Adriane  
**Subject:** Oakridge Redevelopment - your voice of reason !

Good morning Ms Carr,  
We have watched you over the years speak out against issues that make no sense and speak for issues that do. First of all Thank you .

We want to applaud what we believe is your stance in relation to the Oakridge redevelopment. We read in the Vancouver Sun this morning that you were very concerned about no " real " park but the supposed "roof top " park was the concession Vancouverites are going to get in exchange for high rise towers aka Metro Town.

We met the head City planner last month one day at the mall. While he was a pleasant young man and he spent a good deal of time discussing the situation with us , we couldn't help but notice that the plan was a fait d'accompli.

There are three issues that we hope you could consider speaking to.

The first , which we have repeatedly complained about is that when there are open houses the DEVELOPERS staff do not wear name tags that identify themselves as working for profit developers. Most citizens ( and many are ESL ) are not aware that the folks teaching them about the plan have a vested interest. I complained to the City Planning Department about this but to no avail. To us this seems duplicitous.

The second issue is that while density around transportation is clearly a good idea the plan to have 45 story towers is beyond comprehensible. While it is clear that Vancouver must increase housing stock . Do we want to be a city where we have a major division between citizens who can afford to live in single family family dwellings that are on their own piece of land and those that live in 500 square feet with access to a "roof top " park ? Medium height density with park land and greenery should be the vision for Vancouver. Metal and glass high rises do not make for quality of life .

The third issue we would like to put forward is that the so called amenities that the citizens will be gaining as a trade off for these monstrous structures are insignificant. The transportation, parks, and all of the infrastructure needed to support this type of density is certainly not part of this plan. The surrounding communities will be destroyed.

If the Vision Council votes in favour of this development at Oakridge our family , our friends and co workers will never again give a single member of their team our vote.

Again thank you , please speak out and ask for our support ..

Catherine Stoller Allman

**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 27, 2014 2:25 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Oakridge Centre Rezoning Comment - Seniors

---

**From:** Lawrence Yuen s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 27, 2014 2:00 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Cc:** Lawrence Yuen  
**Subject:** Oakridge Centre Rezoning Comment - Seniors

Dear Mayor and Council ...

I am home owner in the Oakridge area and would like to speak to the Oakridge Centre Redevelopment proposal.

While I do agree in principle to the area plan and the need for affordable housing, community amenities, effective transportation within the area, and the green initiatives of the roof area, I have serious concerns about the community service aspect of the plan.

First, I do acknowledge and applaud the increase in space given to community services such as childcare, library, etc. I do, however, urge city council, the architects and developers to further increase the size and offerings of the Oakridge Senior's Centre (OSC). The number of seniors is increasing significantly in the Vancouver area. In my circle, know of many who are moving into their senior years and who have purchased or who are presently purchasing properties up and down the Cambie Street corridor. The present allotment of space carved out specifically for the OSC, (2,500 sq. ft.) is far too small even with added fitness and gym facilities, community kitchen ... that are all shared. I would suggest at least a doubling (5000 sq. ft.) for exclusive use of seniors. The baby boom generation is now entering the 65 plus age range; they are more active (play pool, table tennis, board games, etc.) and healthier in general. Therefore more and more amenities that promote their health and well being should be focused upon our senior population.

Many studies have shown that COMMUNITY is far more important to good health and aging than what we first thought regarding the longevity, quality of life, and purposeful engagement for our senior population. It has been



known that Vancouver has a real LONELINESS problem and one of demographic groups that is particularly prone to loneliness/isolation that often leads to depression and a host of other health issues, is the above age 65 population. Thus, it would behoove the City, developer and architects to give greater thought and attention to the needs and the plight of seniors.

I have a 90+ year old father who hangs out at Oakridge because it is a safe environment for he and his friends to gather, chat and have coffee. By the way, the economic benefit of caring for our aging population would I feel, truly benefit the bottom line at Oakridge. They purchase food, gifts for family, many having stable and significant economic resources.

The strength of a society is marked by how it treats it's most vulnerable and most aged. If Vancouver is to be a great city, a benchmark for other cities ... one way is to treat our seniors with respect and care, giving them space and opportunity to engage and live out the remaining years of their lives with fullness in genuine community. We shall be them one day.

Kindly submitted with warmest regards,

Lawrence Yuen

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Ludwig, Nicole

---

**From:** Ivan Chan 5.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 26, 2014 3:11 PM  
**To:** Drobot, Dwayne; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Oakridge Public Hearing

Hi there,

On the card, it says 290 of social housing and 290 units of market rental housing. Can you define what does social housing mean? Does that mean for low income people to live there that is very similar to the social housing apartment at Olympic Village? If so, that is not a good idea. People in this bracket are likely to cause trouble, and will bring drug addicts, etc into the Oakridge west end area.

The social housing situation at Olympic Village shows a clear example of how conditions there deteriorate because of homeless and drug addicts living there.

If such the case I strongly oppose to this idea of having social housing at the high end Oakridge area.

Ivan

## Ludwig, Nicole

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Friday, February 21, 2014 11:58 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Oakridge Centre Rezoning Public Hearing

---

**From:** Ken Poole s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Friday, February 21, 2014 11:26 AM  
**To:** Oakridge Centre Redevelopment; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Re: Oakridge Centre Rezoning Public Hearing

Sorry, don't believe very much of this at all. Yes, someone is spending a lot of money to make it seem that there is public input but I already saw that any negative comments were being ignored at the presentation made at Oakridge a while back. Therefore, I cannot believe that any negative feedback will have any bearing on the project at this point either.

What I really cannot understand, except in the context that there's another election coming up and so the mayor and council are doing their very best to make it appear that they are listening and concerned about the public's opinion, is why you haven't broken ground and gotten the project underway already.

It's already been approved in the back rooms and all this palaver about consulting and taking input from the community isn't going to change things one whit. If it's really so wonderful for everyone, just get that dang thing built.

Frankly, since I no longer see any committed involvement from Target, I can only surmise that when the mall is finished it will be a purely fashion oriented mall with no outlets for plain day to day goods. The real fallacy in that is that the city thinks that people who shop at places like Tiffany's and these other high end stores that are only represented in a few places are going to take the bus to shop there. And the joke is that the people who used to be able to shop at Zeller's will either be taking the bus, or more likely driving, out to Richmond, Burnaby and the North shore to shop at the Targets, Walmarts and Costcos not represented in Vancouver.

No, I see Vancouver becoming a boutique city with high end shops, virtually unaffordable housing and a fair bit of that not even occupied since it will be held as investments and not really for living in. Wander through a few neighbourhoods and look at the houses that are completely closed up with roll shutters for 11 months of the year or the houses where the Christmas decorations never come down because that's the only time they are occupied. I used to wonder at the fact that so many houses never open their drapes or curtains. I know why now. It's so people cannot tell when there is someone living there or not.

Of course, for the city this seems wonderful. They get taxes from the property but since there's no one home, the energy usage is much less than an active house as in the water consumption and the garbage output. God, what a perfect city we could have if all the houses were actually empty, virtually no power use, no traffic on the streets, green house gas emissions and other waste would be negligible, just a mayor and councillors that actually live in some other community sitting back and collecting fat pay checks for administering a ghost town.

Quit wasting our time and taxes and just start building the thing.

Take care.

**To Vancouver Mayor and City Council:**

Regarding the **Oakridge Centre Development project**. Many Vancouverites are very much concerned with the amount of **DENSITY** we are getting too soon already, **LIKE A CROWDED ELEVATOR WITH HARDLY ANY ROOM TO MOVE AROUND COMFORTABLY AND WITH A SMILE ON OUR FACES.**

Please give the local residents a chance to voice their feelings for such a massive development change in their city before proceeding any further. **Please slow down** and lessen the impact so we can keep smiling in our lovely city we once had.

**Preserve more heritage** sites and don't keep letting developers push over all the character homes we so much admire in our neighbourhoods. Where are most of this new population going to park and drive in this lovely city. We don't particularly want to take public transportation all the time. Take a reality check before forcing us all to sell our cars and homes in this case.

We are not all in the teenage group like you were once. Remember the freedom you had at that time living in Vancouver. It was fun to just get in the car and head to Stanley Park or the beach. So that was then and this is now. Well you can still take it easy on attracting more population to our city. Vancouver has enough grid lock in cars and people as it is now. **Slow down and smell the roses.**

**Developers** have enough to do, that we can't even keep up with supply and demand for workers as it is now. Our roadways are certainly taken a beating. More cost for us to pay. Oakridge will lose a lot of business from shoppers who drive there to visit. We will always have developers to please in the future.

**But please, not all at once!**

I'm very concerned by the amount of people in the Oakridge area who may need **hospitalization, home care, or an emergency situation** down the road. I really don't think the hospitals we have now can keep up the pace of the population we have at the moment in Vancouver. Even St. Paul's Hospital is on shaky grounds, so to speak, needs to be upgraded. Do you think Vancouver Hospital and UBC hospital can handle all the visits in the future?

I think City Council should consider this fact before allowing that many people to move in, before a proper plan to handle the hospital visits that may come up. Here again, as other projects in the city become large, **DENSITY** is the big problem. Please, for the sake of all Vancouverites, get the developers to scale down. How about getting some (business) to start a **5 pin or 10-pin bowling alley** for the many bowling alleys we have lost over the years. **A fun game in the community for years.** Please bring a bowling alley to Oakridge! I don't mind progress . . . BUT NOT ALL AT ONCE. Otherwise, I think this is poor planning.

By the way, I see on TV that **Shanghai** has lots of pollution in their city. They have constructed the world's 2nd largest skyscraper. People will be living up to 120 storeys in the sky to escaped the pollution problem.

Ralph Roper

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Ludwig, Nicole

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 05, 2014 9:40 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Oakridge redevelopment

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

**From:** Philip Seth s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 04, 2014 9:15 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Oakridge redevelopment

Dear Sir,

I write to you in support of my friend, Ms. Linda Leong who is deeply troubled by the proposed re-development of Oakridge. I must say that reading her list of concerns, I too have those concerns. I personally am in favour of change. I am in favour of progress. I just wonder if the scale of the proposal is beyond the city's ability to cope. I humbly ask that you put the brakes on this for the time being and have more public consultations.

Thank you for your kind attention, time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Philip Seth.

Philip Seth

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Ludwig, Nicole

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Monday, March 03, 2014 3:51 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: OAKRIDGE DEVELOPMENT

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

**From:** varouj s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Monday, March 03, 2014 3:33 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Re: OAKRIDGE DEVELOPMENT

MY NAME IS  
VAROUJ GUMUCHIAN  
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Your Honour Mayor Robertson and council;

First, let me acknowledge the city, developers and architects charged with the difficult tasks put forward in this proposal. As a member of the Riley Park South Cambie committee I have organized my remarks in four categories: connection and permeability Coherence and comprehensibility Public space Density and massing

CONNECTION, PERMEABLE in the Oakridge area historically and at present it has been pointed out that that there exists a strong community. Modern architecture unfortunately has been unsuccessful in dealing with this essential urban design element. the project tends to undervalue and be unsupportive of the community. In order for such things to happen it is essential that a fully participatory environment needs to be created to include schools in exploring options. as well as being part of the decision making Adults can achieve a sense of self-knowledge and psychological maturity by fully contributing to this process.

COHERENCE AND PERMEABILITY the project has a multitude of needs and programming restraints. that is why it is essential to orient people in the best possible way. this urban design needs to be 'legible', easily read and remembered in its geometric configuration and internal logic. another challenge is the total number of tall buildings present. this actually makes what happens at ground level matter more difficult to solve than having a singular tall building. the black box of the project is the community centre. how is this accessed in the hierarchy and layers of importance remains to be seen.

### PUBLIC PLACE

Conflict and contradiction the great benefit of living in Vancouver is the freedom to exercise our will. a community such as ours has built in and inevitable conflicts and contradictions. encountered in

everyday life this fragile issue can erode with the 'pure' or fantasy sense of identity that can be experienced as consequence of modern-city life. this sense of fragmentation between individuals is encapsulated in this project. is the public really independent in this heavily protocolled environment. at the end we are all responsible for the welfare local community. not to belabor the criticism these unresolved concepts. let us

explore what constitutes civic public space, it should not belong to anybody, unless it is the community, a place for democracy. there are limits how commercialised public space is used and who can use it. as more and more public space migrates into places of commerce and the anchors that give meaning to the urban realm we are no longer in containers of public space but places of spectacle. Parks and open spaces have specific uses and the present design does not promote or encourage unstructured spontaneous gatherings. The public space has to effortlessly absorb people and events and be highly visible magnets for people and activities. by skillfully easing public space out of a shopping mall this can make for a hospitable and welcoming area

.DENSITY, MASSING the environmental impact of the towers acts as an over-scaled device. These shaft features dominate atop the complex in a rather ordinary way. Rather than taking advantage of the hilltop metaphor in a successful and homogenous consequence, it confuses the internal shifts and functions. This could have been designed better by artfully drawing the eye down the odd diagonal to avoid the dreaded 'tower' syndrome. The question is how do we break the monumental scale. How do we effortlessly absorb people in a benign manner. These are questions that not have answers. As JK Galbraith might have put it: 'private wealth and public squalor'. Seem to go hand in hand.

An additional observation are the blank walls in the perimeter along Cambie and 41st . This issue is highly important since the volume of hard surface is problematic where the project meets the street and sidewalk.

Constantly, Seductive virtual images are used to sell high-rise projects. These are really vertical packages of investment serving the interests of an international plutocracy. Without any real sense of responsibility towards local communities and civic space these repetitive projects become banal.

## CONCLUSION

certainly the city is a place of trade and manufacture, residence, recreation, education and welfare. but the quintessential and most elevated purpose of the city is as the crucible in which culture, creativity and consciousness continually evolve.

## Tuerlings, Leslie

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 05, 2014 4:15 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: oakridge underground lot only

---

**From:** Pindar Azad s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 05, 2014 3:08 PM  
**To:** Drobot, Dwayne  
**Cc:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; Save Marpole  
**Subject:** oakridge underground lot only

Hi Dwayne!

I have tried to ring you a few times but no luck. I did go to the underground lot you asked me to view at Whole Foods on 7th.

I really thought from what you were saying it was going to be special and have great access and egress. I went in late afternoon. Still daylight out. The lane in, is so fricking tight. It is not well lit. I crept down the ramp. Coming out was worse— it is not clear what lane to go in as for getting out there are two. You have got to do better than this. The ramps down need to be big— wide. They need to be better lit. They need to be less curved. Seriously, I was dismayed that you were profiling this as excellent works. If the City of Vancouver is doing only underground then they really need to up their game. And as I said, as we age these lots are going to be accident centres! And not all of us are going to be taking the Canada Line and walking home with our groceries. Please design bearing in mind not all of us are 25 years old and happy to walk back from Safeway with our groceries.

This is city is going to be so darn unliveable. Breaks my heart.

Cheers,

Pindar

---

Pindar Azad



**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** Jean Scribner s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 05, 2014 7:43 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Pace of Development in Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to ask you to SLOW DOWN the speed of the planning processes going on in four neighbourhoods at once and to SLOW DOWN the rate at which building permits are being allowed for developers tearing down houses all over this city and building newer, bigger and often then EMPTY houses and condos. What is the RUSH on Cambie--it can't be a sign of the careful, thoughtful planning your planning staff would like to provide.

Our history is disappearing rapidly in many neighbourhoods. Do you want us all to feel we need to move on to make room for more condos? Your pursuit of "density" may have many green benefits--I voted for green. I voted for all of you last time around but I am not going to vote for you next election unless you stop the kind of behaviour that has been exhibited in the planning processes during neighbourhood plans and the bike path through Kits Park project. There are so many other good options for biking along Pt Grey Road that did not get a chance to be discovered. The speed of that particular process (lack of) was shocking. Your green experiment, funded from outside our own country, is out of control. Something has gone very wrong with how you are pursuing density. How much density is needed all at once and for whom? You may get a few extra social housing units from those developers but it is at the cost of public trust.

Why are we building towers at Oakridge when research shows the lowest emissions are gained from 4-6 storey apartment buildings? We will not be lowering emissions at Oakridge, we will be packing thousands more people there--and where are all these people going to come from? Or will those towers be empty as so many of the Coal Harbour condos are. How can this build community? How can these towers reflect our citizen's values of nature and the beautiful geography we sit on? Where are the children in your thinking? I am beginning to realize that the young people influencing your decisions have probably not had kids yet so they have no experience of what families need. Riding in an elevator several minutes each day is not neighbourly and not making it easy for people to connect with nature--so important for health and well-being. Putting a soccer field on top of a highrise, while inventive, is not going to help kids have a relationship with nature. And, who is going to get the ball when it goes over the fence?

Another concern is the sad state of relations with neighbourhood community associations and the struggle over the Joint Operating Agreement. That community associations feel the need to take the City to court is depressing. I personally have spent many years building community in Douglas Park because I believe that community and connecting with people is an important human need. I can hardly believe it when people involved in the struggle over the Joint Operating Agreement describe what sounds to me to be a struggle between recent arrivals to Vancouver and those who grew up here. Why should that dynamic happen? I personally did not grow up in Vancouver but it doesn't mean I want to trounce on the generation before me that went door to door to raise money to build those community centres in the 50s and 60s.

Large parts of the real estate of this city is being sold to foreign investors, many of whom have no intention of living in these houses and condos. Why should Vancouver be a place for foreigners to

park money? While civic politics may not be able to influence the real estate market it can certainly control planning, permits, and land use.

I am asking you to SLOW DOWN and be open to the message that so many are talking about all over this city--you are off course.

Jean Scribner

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** James Lawson s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 05, 2014 5:32 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Oakridge Mall Redevelopment Proposal

Dear Mayor & Council:

I am writing as a long time Vancouver resident that feels compelled to petition you to re-consider the proposed redevelopment of Oakridge Mall.

While I accept vertical densification especially of Vancouver's transportation corridors it needs to be done along the entire length of the corridor and in a more reasonable way that prevents problems incumbent with highly dense populations.

It is a mistake and unnecessary to focus such a concentration into a small area.

A more equitable distribution of residents along the corridor actually provides a better quality of public transportation and can accommodate the same target population number.

In comparison to the proposal at hand (and similar ones that may follow in other locations) a more equitable distribution of residents results in: enhanced quality of life for both employees and residents; reduced focal congestion; better access to community green spaces, reduced living stress; promotion of neighbourliness; a more livable City.

Be it known that many residents, myself included, who don't live in the Oakridge area but who frequently shop at the mall are against this project as currently proposed. Again, I urge you to re-consider.

Sincerely – James Lawson

**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** Har s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 05, 2014 6:10 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Suggestion about oakridge mall redevelopment

Hi,

I am a resident near oakridge mall. The recent develop is way to quickly as we expect. The 6 stories senor apartment building along west 41st ave is already effect the neighbourhood. It has been noise everyday and full of parking in front of our house. It used to be quiet and clean. Within the construction, there are way more dusts than before, and back lane is always dirty. Please stop rezoning in our area. It has so much negative impacts. Thank you!

HAN

## Ludwig, Nicole

---

**From:** Harnek Mann s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 05, 2014 8:14 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office

oakridge langara development

oakridge and cambi area is getting very congested. even now traffic is very high and now you are allowing 45 story towers in oakridge.

this will make this area very very congested, even worse than metro town. we do not want this area look like hongkong, please leave vancouver as vancouver. please do not build that high towers.

## Ludwig, Nicole

---

**From:** Everett Lew s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 05, 2014 8:35 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Oakridge Mall Redevelopment Proposal

I find the proposed residential towers way too high. It would be a blight on the neighbourhood.

Allowing the additional dwelling units would add pressure on the existing infrastructure (such as traffic, services, amenities etc.)

I agree that some re-development is warranted but not at the expense of ruining the idyllic environment that we currently enjoy.

I grew up in the Oakridge area before the Oakridge Mall was even a thought in the dreams of developers. It was all bush back in the late 50's, my friends and I used play there among the wild pheasants. I currently live 4 blocks away from the Mall.

A scaled down version would be more amenable (Max out at 20 stories, this I could live with).

Roof top green space? Give me a break, how many residents would have access to this? Taking an elevator to reach green space? I don't think so.

Everett Lew

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

**Ludwig, Nicole**

---

**From:** marcelle s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 06, 2014 7:03 AM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Redevelopment Plan for Oakridge Center

Dear Mayor and council:

Please be advise I seldom get involved in politics, as I feel that the majority of the time decisions are already made prior to any proposals, public hearings, etc. The redevelopment of Oakridge Center and surrounding areas are greatly affecting many long term residents in numerous ways.

**The negatives:** high density, heights of buildings, lack of a park at grade level, schools at capacity, transit (Canada Line) at capacity, congestion, crime, SAFETY, noise level, utilities (water, sewer), fire prevention....Do I need to say more?!?  
**The positives:** ???? However, \$\$\$ for City of Vancouver, \$\$\$\$\$ for the developers Ivanhoe Cambridge Inc. and 7503059 Canada Inc..

Do I need to say more?!?

**Have you asked yourselves how this proposal is impacting the local people?**

How about the residents who chose to live in this quaint little area called Oakridge to avoid areas such as the West-end, Yaletown, Downtown, areas that are experiencing **ALL** of the negatives as stated above!

I chose to move here in 2002 for the following reasons: quaint established area, long term (until my demise), sense of space, SAFE, convenient, close to work, etc..

**80%** of the residents (ages 45 - 100 years) in my building are here for the long term, not expecting to be dislocated or inconvenienced by City Hall or big developers. Imagine the impact on the residents having to live here in a construction zone/pit for the next 10 - 15 - 20 years!

Note: There are at least 6 sub-areas (Southwest Properties) and the Terraces that will be directly impacted. This equates to **MANY** people!  
Have you asked yourselves?!?

I urge the Mayor and council to reconsider the proposed redevelopment of Oakridge and to put yourselves in our shoes (local residents) for just a few minutes and try to imagine the impact this would have on the local people, the environment and the **upcoming election...**

Thank you for your time.

Marcelle s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential