

Castro, Maria

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 10:06 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Blanket Rezoning in Norquay Jan. 19th

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

From: Maureen Charron [s.22(1) Personal and Confidential]
Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 8:14 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Blanket Rezoning in Norquay Jan. 19th

I could not be more opposed to the motion on Jan. 19th that would approve blanket rezoning of an area such that individual projects would not come back to Council for a rezoning decision, be this for Norquay or any other neighbourhood in Vancouver.

It is a fundamental aspect of democracy that this level of decision lies with the elected members of Council and not with the Director of Planning or the Development Permit Board.

These projects need to come to Council to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. The community needs to be involved during all planning phases. The City wants community engagement yet appears to be shutting it down to speed the process up for developers.

At the last election, I recall that Gregor Robertson vowed to listen more to the public. How does eliminating the discussion at the Council table square with this promise?

Maureen Charron

Burke, Teresita

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 12:06 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: blanket rezoning of Norquay Neighbourhood

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

From: Wendy Massing [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 11:50 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: blanket rezoning of Norquay Neighbourhood

I could not be more opposed to the motion on Jan. 19th that would approve blanket rezoning of an area such that individual projects would not come back to Council for a rezoning decision, be this for Norquay or any other neighbourhood in Vancouver.

It is a fundamental aspect of democracy that this level of decision lies with the elected members of Council and not with the Director of Planning or the Development Permit Board.

These projects need to come to Council to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. The community needs to be involved during all planning phases. The City wants community engagement yet appears to be shutting it down to speed the process up for developers.

At the last election, I recall that Gregor Robertson vowed to listen more to the public. How does eliminating the discussion at the Council table square with this promise?

Wendy Massing

2016 January 19

Mayor Robertson and City Council:

My name is Marilyn Hogan and I live "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential". I am grateful to be able to address you today. In fact, the chance to speak to our city officials is the MAIN point I want to discuss. If the RM-9A rezoning takes place, then our guarantee to address council will be gone. NO more open houses. NO more notices in the paper. Not even YOUR approval on building applications. The Director of Planning would have all the power and all the control. This is **not** acceptable!

I am a founding member of Residents for Community Control on City Development (RCCCD). We were shocked when city planners announced their hope that you would rezone large areas of Norquay and fast-track the process for developers, thereby excluding community interests or even input.

The right of citizens to be directly involved in shaping our future is essential in a city that calls itself green and inclusive -- and is a hallmark of the democratic process itself. Historically, Vancouverites have had a voice in city planning. Blanket rezoning would set a terrible precedent and our voices would essentially be silenced.

Fast-tracked approvals would exact a high cost to the community as they would strain resources further: packed pools and even higher demand on transit, in what is already a high-density area.

Applications do not always work even if they meet certain arbitrary guidelines. Decisions about design, esthetics and fit should be ***made collaboratively*** with the residents who will have to live with those decisions.

We are disturbed by the September 23rd 2015 Open House display and the policy report that claims to summarize feedback.

It was hard to tell from the display what Norquay really "feels" like and how narrow some of the streets are near the huge development now underway on Kingsway, just east of Victoria. Large buildings on

. . . /2

those streets would pose a serious density problem, with more traffic, less parking, and so on.

At the Open House -- which itself was inadequately advertised, as I never received a mailout -- we were encouraged to talk with staff.

Much of the dialogue was focused on the RM-9A -- but all our verbal concerns, that is, our “*viva voce*” submissions about how RM-9A takes away our reasonable opportunities for input, were left out of the Appendix G summary in the policy report. THIS IS UNACCEPTABLE!

While part of the summary is true, overall it is not really balanced -- because of what it doesn't say, because of what it leaves out.

A questionnaire was distributed at the Open House but I found the questions misleading, hard to understand, and hard to answer, and so did others. Questions were skewed to encourage responses that appear to support the rezoning application.

Question #2 asked if we agree that “the directions of RM-9A zone meet the intent of the plan policy”. The summary states that people generally said “yes”.

But 32% of respondents said “no”, and 24% said they didn't know. This means that 56% of respondents did NOT agree. Appendix G is not only biased and selective, but the summary I just described is misconstrued and patently not true.

Open houses, questionnaires, and five minute speeches are only token consultation as it is.

Council has already approved an Apartment Transition Zone that allows for diversity in building types. With this added density comes an even greater need for real consultation with residents: as is now the case with development build out's on UBC's South Campus -- through its South Campus Advisory Group comprised of residents,

. . . /3

surrounding neighbours, Pacific Spirit Park users, staff and architects.

In an era when cities are finding ways to encourage input from residents -- some have even created official positions for community-based staff to liaise between city planners and community members -- our city needs MORE, not less, dialogue with residents, including advisory committees, town hall meetings and transparent panel discussions.

Since dialogue within the context of massive densification has only recently started in Norquay and much of the community is barely aware of this rezoning application or its potential destruction to the neighbourhood, how can residents offer fully-informed feedback? We need to table this matter and give everyone more time to study it, and dialogue further and with more transparent community outreach.

Meanwhile, we urge you to stop any blanket rezoning in Norquay and deal with development applications on a case-by-case basis.

Let's save the fundamental democratic principles of transparency and openness -- and let's have real community guidance in initial planning that will shape the future of our city.

Please say NO to RM-9A and RM-9AN rezoning in Norquay.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Hogan, Member of RCCCD

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"