

## Castro, Maria

---

**From:** Lea Johnson s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 21, 2016 5:53 PM  
**To:** s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Cc:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Subject:** Re: Rezoning Application for 1755 West 14th Avenue

Well put!! Thank you! I felt so proud to have s.22(1) Personal and Confidential present a very solid argument and show how unprepared they and the City are.

The capping of population in Vancouver continues to baffle. Reminds me of the Titanic.

The population cap dilemma is a challenge. Council's assumption (Tuesday) that we can keep expanding housing to accommodate people who want to live here is not true and certainly cannot happen.

Population capacity is bounded by limited land, water, food, security (hazards, risk and consequences), transportation, healthcare... The amount of people and supply of housing is naturally capped. So, how big is too big?

The development proposal for 14th has revealed a flaw. The thinking of those currently in the driver's seat is suicidal. There is no plan. There is a cliff face ahead of us and they are assuming it is not there. Lynn and I will have left the bus before the bus hits the cliff face but other generations and some yet to be born will have to deal with it. We have a lot of pretty smart people out there. Can we not begin to help set things up so as to gently stop the bus at the wall?

No population growth at some point is an option and worthwhile thinking about.

Also is rubber stamping the West End template for other parts of the city the way to go? Evidence of this kind of thinking one can find not only in this proposal but down Cambie Street. From the council meeting on Tuesday we see a realistic possibility that our block on 15th south of the 14th will become an apartment building one day. It is a natural location for such a development. With the water system expansion up Burrard to 17th and transit being changed to 16th we also see apartment developments along 16th and into Shaughnessy, which is protected by heritage, but given the City's authority that can be changed.

Over the decades there have been many good ideas that reach outside of Vancouver City. We need to think beyond the range normal vision and imagine together - it is worth the extra time. With the development of the expanded water system up Burrard street this year we have an opportunity to do so. That seems to be hoping for too much?

From Tuesday it seems clear we are letting the city evolve without a vision. The proposed development on 14th is totally out of context and should not be done.

One assumption is true and that is: the conversation will go on.

Lea Johnson  
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Castro, Maria

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 21, 2016 5:08 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Rezoning Application for 1755 West 14th Avenue

---

**From:** Bob Stanley s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 21, 2016 5:07 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Cc:** s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Subject:** Rezoning Application for 1755 West 14th Avenue

The Mayor and City Councillors  
City of Vancouver

Re: rezoning application – 1755 West 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue

My wife and I have lived in our home on West 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue for 23 years.

I had previously written to Council on 18 January regarding our opposition to this rezoning application. We attended the public hearing on 19 January with the intention of speaking. We are unable to attend tonight, but in light of our experience on Tuesday evening I thought it necessary to share further thoughts with the members of Council. We remain strongly opposed, and now with additional reasons.

### THE ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM

1. It seems to me that there was a very large elephant in the room Tuesday evening. Namely, in the total absence of a community development plan for the Fairview neighbourhood any significant change to the character of our neighbourhood will, by definition, be executed on an ad hoc basis. For the benefit of the councillor who objected to use of this terminology, I would direct him to the dictionary definition of ad hoc: "something formed, arranged or done for a particular purpose only." This is exactly what is under consideration under the CD-1 rezoning. comment was not in any manner pejorative. However the councillor's verbal response was, in our view, derogatory and insulting.

2. Why does this area not have a comprehensive development plan? What are the long range or medium range planning objectives in our neighbourhood? What are the specified areas for high rise, single family/duplex or transitional infill housing? Why are high rises banned from major commercial arterial routes (Granville and Arbutus Streets) but proposed for entirely residential areas? How are local residents, city planning staff or Council to consider the merits of any application when there are no criteria or benchmarks developed specifically for this neighbourhood? If there are criteria they remain entirely opaque to this process.

3. We are not opposed to the rezoning of this land for the purpose of providing rental housing. We are opposed to the specific building form. Were lower building types that recognize the scale, character and context of the neighbourhood considered? Garden apartments, stacked townhouses?

4. What is the City's comprehensive plan for the distribution of rental housing in this neighbourhood? In the absence of any plan how are we to evaluate this or any other project on its adherence to City planning policy or directives?

I believe that these are serious issues which must be addressed before the barn door is flung open and our neighbourhood's unique character is trampled into the ground.

I have two other observations on the tone of Tuesday night's proceedings; a tone I and many of my neighbours found very troubling. I recognize that public hearings are often adversarial. Issues are complex and position are by no means unanimous. However, in addition to the unfortunate incident referred to above, <sup>s.22(1)</sup> [redacted] was the target of two more off the cuff remarks by Councillors that were completely uncalled for. In one instance <sup>Personal and Confidential</sup> [redacted] he was rudely reminded that the area under discussion was "private property". Really? He has lived here for forty years. As a matter of procedure, civility and politeness I would have expected more from Councillors and from the Chair.

Robert Stanley

<sup>s.22(1)</sup> Personal and Confidential [redacted]