

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Monday, April 14, 2014 5:35 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Rezoning Heather Place

**From:** Nick Sunderland s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Monday, April 14, 2014 5:04 PM  
**To:** Nick Sunderland  
**Subject:** Rezoning Heather Place

Hello, as tomorrow is the public hearing for the rezoning application for the development of Heather Place, I want to make it clear, among many reasons, why myself and my wife are strongly against this proposal as it has been laid out.

There are many people who feel this is definitely not appropriate for this location, and thus I won't reiterate all of those reasons, but I will tell you the reasons that affect us:

1. We recently bought a condo in the building on the south side of the street, and paid a premium for a fourth floor unit with a view. If any of these buildings are built above the 3rd/4th floor, this will block our view and decrease natural light - significantly devaluing our property.
2. The greenspace across the street, and the general neighbourhood (quiet, school near by, green space) is again a significant factor in why we chose where we live, and the value of our property. Again, by developing the property as has been proposed, this will devalue our property.
3. The parking issue you are hopefully well aware of - increasing the housing density as such will create havoc with finding parking for residents and visitors alike. Trying to drive down some of the streets - with parking on both sides, you can basically only drive one way, which if you live in Vancouver, you have likely encountered and is quite disruptive.

We urge you to reconsider this development and work to create a development that can be in character to the neighbourhood it is in and be respectful to the surrounding residents.

Regards,  
Drs. Nick Sunderland and Sarah Sunderland

I am available at this email address and would greatly appreciate your opinion and reply.

**Nicholas Sunderland**

General Pathology Resident, PGY4  
University of British Columbia

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 9:04 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Heather Place Development

**From:** Kelly Heung s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Monday, April 14, 2014 11:41 PM  
**To:** s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential : Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Heather Place Development

Hi

I live in the VGH neighbourhood and would like to express my objection to the Heather Place Development for the following reasons:

1. The proposal of the high rise buildings are very disruptive to the neighbourhood. The proposed ten storey building is completely obstructive to the condo units directly north of the project. It also does not blend in with the 4 storey building around the area; it will look terrible with two giant 10 storey concrete building along Heather St, which is supposed to be a traffic calmed bike lane. I live in this area because it's a medium density area. I object to changing it into a high density neighbourhood.
2. The increase in population density will also increase the need of parking spaces and traffic. The parking spaces is already under high stress in this area. The VGH parking is one of the most expensive parking in the city and patients are forced to pay a high price to see a doctor. The city did not have any solution to this problem its the current state. The new proposal will only add more stress and create another problem down the road.
3. The proposal is an expensive project that I would not support as a taxpayer. The current townhouses in Heather Place are in livable and fixable conditions. I do not agree with spending a lot on this project while running a deficit in the city. Developing social housing may be an important political statement. However, the city needs a better plan. It is not fair to this neighbourhood because the city tries to pack as many people as she can in this small blocks at the cost of this neighbourhood. This is highly unpopular to the current residents.

If new social housing is unavoidable, I believe the city should keep Heather Place at low to medium density. Please consider developing buildings that are five stories or less and keep the cost as low as possible.

Thank you.

Regards,  
Kelly

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 9:16 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Heather Place shadow  
**Attachments:** WP\_20140413\_002.jpg

---

**From:** Erik Whiteway s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Monday, April 14, 2014 10:00 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Heather Place shadow

The attached photo was taken at 12:30 pm on Sunday.

In it you can see the shadow from the Tapestry building.

You can see the shadow crosses all the way across the wide 12th ave.

The proposed building at heather place will cast a longer shadow as it's a taller building.

We are also well past the March 21st mid point of the sun cycle.

This will shade both the day care and the green space across the street for more than 6 months of the year.

Regards,  
Erik Whiteway

Sent from Windows Mail



## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 11:34 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Heather Place Redevelopment/Rezoning

---

**From:** Mary Anne Throop s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 11:29 AM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Heather Place Redevelopment/Rezoning

City Council:

Re: Heather Place Redevelopment Project - 706 - 774 West 13th Avenue and 755 - 799 West 14th Avenue, Vancouver, BC

I have lived on 14th Avenue across the street from Heather Place since 1999 and I would like to express my opposition to the current rezoning application for 706 West 13th Ave and 755 West 14th Avenue. While I believe Heather Place should be re-developed, and that it is important that the City of Vancouver facilitate rental housing, I firmly oppose the proposed rezoning of this site as it currently sits before the City.

### **Building Height**

The proposed building heights are too high. They do not respect the established neighbourhood character, and will stick out like a sore thumb. As your GM of Planning and Development at the CoV, Brian Jackson, said a while ago: "Instead of getting embroiled in one-off battles over individual projects, planners would develop thoughtful blueprints for four key neighbourhoods. They would listen to the residents. They would provide specific details about height and density so no one would be surprised by anything that came along. Their community plans would provide a model for future planning in other city neighbourhoods as Vancouver strives to accommodate more residents." (Globe and Mail article by Frances Bula, published July 14, 2013. A few other points to the buildings' proposed heights - the shadows cast by the proposed 10-storey tower on the public park and daycare would be ridiculous. The buildings' heights all need to be lowered, and possibly moved further back from the street to limit the length of the shadows cast.

### **Parking**

The proposed parking spaces (0.5 stalls per unit) is not sufficient - this lack of proposed parking is going to exacerbate the existing parking shortage in the neighbourhood. Currently residents, visitors, hospital staff, and hospital visitors compete for parking in our neighbourhood. There should be enough parking for the proposed units that the proposal could at least be considered neutral to the existing parking problem. But, as it stands, the proposal does nothing but make an existing neighbourhood problem worse and shift more of the burden to the City from MVHC. All so that MVHC can save money on excavation/construction costs? This is unacceptable.

### **Traffic, and safety**

Traffic and its effect on the safety of children is also of concern. West 13th (and also Heather) are quiet streets. Heather Street is a designated traffic calmed area and bike route, and borders a school. Further, West 13th houses a large daycare and park across the street from the site, both of which are constantly full of children and pets. The proposed site does nothing to alleviate the increase in traffic it will bring; in fact, it doesn't even address it. This is a huge safety concern.

Overall, the need for rebuilding Heather Place is not the question as it clearly does. What the City must take into account is the existing character of the area. Using the Tapestry building as an example of buildings in our area that are higher, is ridiculous as it has been deemed a heritage building. The density around here is already pretty high, traffic has become an issue and parking, as always, is brutal.

Thank you for your time.

Mary Anne Throop

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

**Hildebrandt, Tina**

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 2:45 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Heather Place Rezoning

---

**From:** Jason Dadswell s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 2:22 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Heather Place Rezoning

Dear Mayor and Council,

Our family lives at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential e and I am NOT in favor of rezoning Heather Place for buildings larger than 4 stories.

Rezoning for 4 story buildings would create a space consistent with the vast majority of the neighbourhood. Furthermore, 4 story buildings would allow for reasonable redevelopment of Heather Place without overwhelming the surrounding structures, creating too much shadow, causing too much traffic and negatively impacting parking.

Sincerely,

Jason Dadswell

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** trevor tomlin s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 4:07 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** opposition to rezoning application for 706 West 13th Ave and 725 West 14th Avenue.

I would like to express my opposition to the rezoning application for 706 West 13th Ave and 725 West 14th Avenue. I live at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential in Vancouver. I oppose the rezoning of this area for the following reasons:

1. You can only compare things that are comparable, and comparing the proposal to the building at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential is like comparing apples to oranges. My building at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential is a heritage building and is the former Nurses Residence which was part of VGH hospital. My building was built in the 1940s and was only kept because of its heritage value. This building is only so tall because it was once part of the hospital. Otherwise, a building of this size would never be here. City planners did not allow for my building to be turned into condos because they envisioned this neighborhood with big buildings. City planners allowed for my building to be turned into condos because it provided an alternative to destroying a beautiful heritage building that has stood here for over half a century. City planners allowed for an existing hospital building to be renovated. City planners would clearly have never allowed for a 10 story building to have been built here if there wasn't an already existing building.
2. I was concerned by the original proposal of a 6 story building. I went to the community meeting and I voiced my concerns verbally and in writing. I spoke to several of the Metro Vancouver staff present with my sister as a witness. I was told by several staff that the rezoning application was only for a 6 story building. I was told that the building would be wood framed. I was told in no uncertain terms that the building would never exceed 6 stories and would never be as tall as the building at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential. The staff of Metro Vancouver have reneged against their word by applying to do exactly what they promised they would never do.
3. It is unprecedented to have such a large building in this neighborhood. Large apartment buildings exist towards Cambie Street, but such large apartment buildings are not in this area. The building at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential is an exception only because it was a heritage building, was part of the hospital, and standing for half a century before it was ever apartments. Putting a large building at 706 West 13th and 725 West 14th would simply be poor city planning. It makes sense to have large buildings on major 4 lane streets such as Cambie or 12th, but it would be poor planning to put one in a quiet neighborhood primarily occupied by houses.
4. The Tapestry building on 12th adjacent to s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential was only allowed to be built to be 6 stories tall. City planners would not allow that building to be over 6 stories for obvious reasons, and it is on a major street. Why would city planners now allow for a 10 story building on a quieter street? The City of Vancouver would never let a private developer build such a big building at 706 West 13th Ave and 725 West 14th Avenue. The City of Vancouver should hold Metro Vancouver to the same standard.
5. The land they want to build on is up hill from 2851 Heather Street. A 10 story building there would stand higher than s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential. It would be the tallest building in the neighborhood.
6. West 13th is a quiet street not designed for such a big development. This is a traffic calmed area. There is a bike lane on 14. I have personally seen an accident at 14th and Laurel where a car struck a bicycle and I called 911. This proposal will make the bike lanes less safe.
7. The Tapestry Apartment building has a driveway entrance only on 12th. 12th is a major 4 lane road with a solid yellow line. The proposal for 706 West 13th Ave and 725 West 14th Avenue will have all traffic entering quiet small streets that are not designed for such large buildings.
8. All Tapestry residents at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential have been told that they are not allowed to purchase a parking permit to park on the street because that would cause too much parking congestion. The proposed buildings at 706

West 13th Ave and 725 West 14th Avenue would not provide adequate parking for the amount of units. Parking in the neighborhood is already hard enough.

9. The proposed development does not provide nearly enough parking spots for the amount of units. The people that live in the current buildings at 706 West 13th Ave and 725 West 14th Avenue drive cars. The people at the redeveloped building will also drive cars and have to park on the street. The City of Vancouver acknowledged long ago when Tapestry was built that street parking is already saturated.

10. Metro Vancouver staff provide no viable solution for the parking problem. It is a fantasy to believe the new residents won't have cars. They have no credible way of proving that they won't have cars and that parking won't be chaos. They offer no solutions to parking problems.

11. When Tapestry was built, there were concerns about the playground being too close to 13th, so the playground was moved closer to the apartment buildings than was planned. It has already been acknowledged that there is potential for an accident. The proposal would cause a substantial increase in traffic on these small side streets, and it would increase the chance of an accident.

I am far from alone in my opposition to this proposal. Allowing this proposal would be simply poor city planning. Please take my concerns seriously. Please deny this proposal because accepting the proposal would be in the worst interest of the community and would be poor city planning.

Sincerely,

Trevor Tomlin



## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 4:37 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Rezoning Heather Place

---

**From:** Ann Cullingham s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 4:17 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Rezoning Heather Place

Hi, I hope to speak at tonight's public meeting and also want to respond on paper. Here are my thoughts:

I oppose the proposed development, as do many other residents of Domego Housing Co-operative, located on Heather Street right across the street from the proposed 10-storey building. Our opposition is not only because of the nuisance and inconvenience of having an extensive construction site taking up essentially an entire city block in our neighbourhood, although this will certainly be very unpleasant for a very long period of time.

More than this though, we seriously object to two really disturbing aspects of the proposed development: first, that 86 low income families are facing the demolition of their homes for no good reason. And second, the proposal is to replace these low rise homes with high buildings that will dwarf and shade neighbours and be grossly out of character with the neighbourhood.

### 1. Pointless destruction of homes

On the first point, we ask that City Hall not condone or permit Metro Vancouver to tear down a whole block of houses in our residential neighbourhood for no good reason. The houses in question are a mere 30 years old: they comprise much needed affordable housing for low income families in a safe and quiet neighbourhood in the heart of Vancouver.

The proponent justifies tearing down such young buildings on the grounds that they are in bad condition. If they are in such bad shape, surely this is due to extreme poor management - and because Metro Housing failed to do its job of monitoring, repairing and maintaining Heather Place. A vote yes to this proposal will be a vote in support of poor management practices and an invitation to Metro Housing to mismanage again again. At Domego we have worked and continue to work hard to maintain our 28 year old building in good condition - this is a struggle but it is worth it to preserve our homes for our members, many of whom are handicapped and/or low income.

I understand that despite poor management, Heather Place is not a hopeless cause and could be renovated. Metro Housing's chosen strategy of tearing down salvageable housing and replacing it with more upscale market housing reflects a very disturbing shift from its original mandate of housing poor and low income families toward a practice of serving more middle to high income families, who already have substantial options.

The first victims of this mismanagement are the tenants of Heather Place, who are losing their homes. A 70% increase in rent is simply not feasible for current residents, as Council must know. Given that housing affordability for all (and not just the middle class) is a “top priority” of this Council (to quote from the Vancouver city website), the preservation of Heather Place and places like it *must be* a priority for this Council. If Metro Housing refuses to voluntarily do what it must do to bring Heather Place back to functionality, then it is up to City Hall to make sure that it does so, by rejecting the rezoning application.

## **2. High rises not appropriate**

Metro Housing says their design is sensitive and adapted to the character of the neighbourhood. This is false. In fact what Metro Housing proposes to do is to introduce high buildings into a low rise neighbourhood, thus fundamentally altering the character of the neighbourhood.

The area between 13th and 16th Avenues is a very pleasant residential area comprising a few houses but mostly low-rise residential buildings and town houses, of a similar style, density and height. There are a lot of trees and gardens and the neighbourhood has a friendly intimate feel to it.

Creating a nest of high rises on Heather, 13th and 14th will forever change this low-key flavour and will dwarf and shade neighbours; it will be at odds with the style and trend of the rest of the neighbourhood; and it will create traffic nightmares in an already traffic glutted neighbourhood; and it will signal Council's willingness to approve construction of similar projects. I strongly oppose this happening. I think this is a neighbourhood worth protecting from mega-projects like this one.

One final point, Metro Housing says that it models its design and height on existing structures - ie Tapestry, an apartment complex that is a heritage hospital building and former nurses' residence on the northwest corner of 13th at the outskirts of the hospital. It is wrong and misleading of Metro Housing to point to this unique pre-existing heritage structure to justify the development of new high rises deeper in the neighbourhood, where none have previously existed.

**We urge Council to reject this proposed development and require Metro Housing to squarely face its responsibility to renovate, maintain and repair Heather Place.**

Alternatively, at the very least, Metro Housing should be required to dramatically alter the proposed design to conform with the neighbourhood.

Thank you,  
Ann Cullingham  
Domego Housing Co-operative