

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 5:56 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: 408-488 West King Edward Avenue Rezoning

From: Todd s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 5:48 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: 408-488 West King Edward Avenue Rezoning

To Mayor and Council,

I am a speaker registered to speak regarding 408-488 West King Edward Avenue Rezoning application. Below is my speech that I was planning to bring forward tonight. I have been informed that the application will be heard Thursday Feb 26 rather than Feb 24. I may not be able to make Thursday but attach the summary of my speech below. Thank you for your attention to the concerns listed.

To Mayor and Council:

I would like to start by stating that I have no issues with the proposed development concept for the Cambie Seniors Continuum of Care Residences on King Edward at Cambie but I do have some concerns that I would like council to address prior to giving the go ahead.

The Cambie corridor proposal for 2011 stated that FSR would be between 1.25 and 1.75 for King Edward with consideration for up to six stories in close proximity to Cambie Street. (ie. within two lots). Also the Cambie plan assumed that the South sides of King Edward lots are 150 feet when these lots are 124 feet. The sites depth is 124 ft. and not the 150 ft. assumed in the Cambie corridor plan of 2011 that was approved. 6 stories on these lots as they are not deep enough are too much.

The FSR proposed is 1.99 (2.27). I feel that the 1.99 is a little high even taking into account the extra density for the extra stories to the west. I do not count the underground FSR.

There needs to be improved separation between buildings like to 30 - 35 feet (also mentioned in the Urban Design Panel recommendations). The development is already being allowed to be exempt from the 150 ft. building width allowable due to the nature of the care residences.

I ask council to have a review of this at the Development Permit process to see if there are other ways to reach the density required for the development and the separation between buildings.

I ask that the Non Functional overhead elements be eliminated from the top of the building, as it's more of an eyesore that will never blend with the neighborhood. The form of the building is MUCH to large and its like you took a box and tried to fit it into the block covering almost the entire property without widening sidewalks or landscaped setbacks and nothing to compensate for the overall mass of the buildings. The overhead elements that crown all three buildings should be flattened to reduce the apparent looming effect that makes the buildings seem higher.

The fourth floor is not stepped backward enough (as shown in the drawings).

I ask that the set backs be improved off the laneway. The Cambie corridor plan talks about development proposals will include required public realm features like landscaped setbacks, wide sidewalks etc. Except the west building should be zero lot line to the lane with the upper 2 stories set back from the lane to the distance of the setback of the previous building footprint and not provide for any additional space for landscaping.

You need to have a larger walkway in the front on King Edward as it is a heavily used walkway and its not big enough at this time so any development needs to address this and the Cambie Corridor states that development proposals will have landscaped setbacks and wide sidewalks.

The diagrams displayed also had the first floor more like 1 and a half stories as the main level and than went up from there. So that means that the building is 4 and 1/2 to 6 and 1/2 stories high. The east building ground floor to floor height should be similar to the other residential floors at 3 meters. The first floor and other floors should be close to the same height.

The center building has a roof top deck, which makes it 5 stories for the center building. Even with the floor having a set back to the top floor deck, I feel that this is not appropriate as it takes privacy away from the neighbors. There has not been enough to keep the middle building's roof top deck towards the King Ed side and not the back lane overlooking the back yards and houses across the alley. Also the model has allot going on, on the top floor of the middle building with the architectural crown and other structures. This should be minimized as again the building form takes on a massive look and makes the feel that with the higher first floor height that the middle building looks like its 5 and a half stories

Sincerely,

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."