

**Kelly, Melissa**

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 03, 2014 4:00 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Public Hearing June 3/14: CD 1 rezoning 4949-5109 Cambie

---

**From:** Carey Murphy s.22 (1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 03, 2014 4:00 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Cc:** Louie, Raymond; Affleck, George; Ball, Elizabeth; Carr, Adriane; Tang, Tony; Deal, Heather; Jang, Kerry; Meggs, Geoff; Reimer, Andrea; Stevenson, Tim  
**Subject:** Public Hearing June 3/14: CD 1 rezoning 4949-5109 Cambie

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am perplexed by this application. It was originally submitted in 2012, and received very good urban design support (8-2) in 2012. Then, it was quiet until 2014 when a new proposal for the site was introduced. This new proposal increased the height (still 6 storeys, but a taller 6 storeys), increased the FSR from 2.43 to 2.6 (the range in the Cambie Corridor plan for this site is 1.75 - 2.25) and the number of units from 161 to 202. It also removed the laneway townhomes which is the standard "Cambie Corridor" protocol if the depth of the lot permits it, in order to transition to the existing neighbourhood.

So, I am perplexed as to how and why the new proposal in 2014 came about when the original 2012 proposal more closely met the criteria of the Cambie Corridor plan? I would appreciate if council could ask staff so that I can get clarification on how the process works. When I asked at the Open house, the answer seemed to be "because the developer wanted us to look at another proposal for the site".

When something like this comes up and the new proposal is "worse" than the original, I've got to wonder what is going on and are we being worn down? Is the message between the lines "dear residents, resistance is futile"?

I'd like to know the reason for entertaining and apparently now approving the new proposal.

Also, the policy report says the FSR is 2.39 but from everything I read it is 2.6.

Thank you for reading and considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Carey Murphy

Objections to the Rezoning Application for

4949-5109 Cambie Street

Under

The Cambie Street Corridor Plan

Presented at

the June 3, 2014

Public Hearing

by

Monique Choptuik

s.22 (1) Personal and Confidential

Good evening ~~Mayer and~~ Councillors. I strongly oppose this application and believe that **it should not be approved** in its current state. When the CCP was first proposed many people were concerned that the character of their neighbourhoods would change. They were told that it would not and in fact it would be enhanced. I would like to remind Council what was envisioned for our neighbourhood.

- The existing residential character is to be strengthened and enhanced
- Mid-rise "Boutique" style condominiums on 2-3 residential lots are to be built
- The built form response to this unique location should acknowledge the "openness" that results from the current rhythm of existing houses. Larger openings between new buildings, and shorter building frontages (max 120') will help highlight the special features of the area
- Buildings up to 6 storeys in height
- A density ratio of 1.75 - 2.25
- Where feasible and where lot dimensions allow lanes should be edged with smaller scale residential buildings in the form of townhouses to reinforce the intimate scale and character of the lane

This particular development is described as:

- A Grand Promenade style with a family oriented estate like feel, occupying 10 residential lots
- Each of the 3 building frontages is 155' or more

- And an increase in FSR from 2.43 to 2.60
- Changes to the original application include:
- An increase in the maximum building height range by 3.51m - 4.12m
  - An increase in units from 161 to 202
  - A change in the composition of the units (going from 54 1-bedroom units to 114; the elimination of 24 townhouses that lined the lane, decreasing the number of 3 bedroom units from 41 to 18 and increasing the number of 2 bedroom units from 42 to 70)
  - Wings have been added to both sides of all 3 buildings
  - The addition of a 50' site for Road Purposes *thru*

This development is just not appropriate nor does it reflect the "existing family friendly residential nature" of our neighbourhood. It is being classed as a revised rezoning application but it has undergone a significant redesign so it should be viewed as a new application. The applicant states: **"Our objective is to maximize the full potential of the site while respecting the City of Vancouver Cambie Corridor Planning guideline."** It totally disregards what the CCP intended for this neighbourhood and exceeds many of its parameters. For example:

- The Grand Promenade style is completely opposite to the Boutique style envisaged for this area.
- Our neighbourhood is considered the prime family residential area in the CCP, yet 57% of all the units are 1 bedroom or 1 bedroom + den and are not considered suitable for families.

- Although the recommended FSR range for the area is 1.75-2.25 it has been increased to 2.60. The stated FSR is 2.39, I am told that this number is legal according to existing bylaws because the new FSR is calculated on the gross site area including the road dedication.
- All 3 building frontages exceed the 120' max by 35' or 25%
- The increase in all of the buildings heights visually adds another floor
- All the town houses have been removed clearly showing that townhouses were a feasible option for this site
- The massing and design of the buildings have all to do with maximizing the full development potential of the site. The large mass of the 3 buildings does not have an open feel , and reads as one relentless mass. The buildings are neither unique nor architecturally notable.

I just cannot fathom how City Staff can assess this application and find that it meets the intent of the CCP, when it clearly disregarded the guidelines for our neighbourhood exceeding many of its parameters. This renders the CCP meaningless and undermines any trust the public may have in the process. Many of my neighbours and even my husband have told me that the process is a waste of time and pointless. We are powerless to do anything. As one of my neighbours said, " we have been left to the wolves."

The Urban Design Panel stated that it "generally meets the CCP". We should aim for higher than 'generally meets'. They still have continuing concerns and recommendations regarding this application. Specifically, the massing of the buildings, varying the building heights, changing the skyline profile of the building masses especially from one block to another, changing the

exterior colour and materials to reduce not only the visual heaviness of the buildings but also the mass of the uppermost floors.

This rezoning application is also very thin on details and we know that the devil is in the details. Most notably there is no complete landscape Plan package. This is important because it shows both the soft landscape which is the plant material and the hard landscape which is everything else on the site other than the building. It also shows how the site interfaces with the neighbourhood. More information is needed about the children's play area and adventure zone, service orientated spaces, and amenity spaces in order to fully assess this application.

This is not the first large development to be rezoned in our neighbourhood. Currently, the <sup>Empire</sup> ~~QE~~ is being built. At that rezoning hearing Dwyane Drobot acknowledged that it was not what was envisioned for the neighbourhood. It also exceeded many of the guidelines under the CCP for our neighbourhood and was approved by council on the grounds that the site could support such a development. The question should not be whether or not it can support such a development but rather whether or not it fits into and enhances the character of the neighbourhood. Having two developments such as these will change the character of our neighbourhood.

- I am asking Council not to approve this application and ask that it be: Revised
- Reduced in scale
- Redesigned so that it more closely reflects the character of the neighbourhood and the parameters of neighbourhood CCP Guidelines
- Address all of the concerns and recommendations of the Urban Design Panel
- And revisit and review the details of the Road Dedication a major concern to local residents