

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 9:38 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695 to 1775 East 18th Avenue PUBLIC HEARING

From: RD Kandola s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 9:19 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: cc2013@shaw.ca; Robertson, Gregor; Ball, Elizabeth; De Genova, Melissa; Jang, Kerry; Meggs, Geoff; Stevenson, Tim; Reimer, Andrea; Louie, Raymond; Deal, Heather; Carr, Adriane; Affleck, George; Dix.MLA, Adrian; melanie.mark.mla@leg.bc.ca; Don Davies, MP
Subject: FW: 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695 to 1775 East 18th Avenue PUBLIC HEARING

Dear Mayor & Councillors,

I have realized that the closure of public comment in writing was May 18, 2016; however, this was not visible on the City public notices, which provide information on speaking, but not writing. Please consider this email as on time, as I was unable to respond earlier due to injuries I sustained from an accident, and would request your cooperation in including this correspondence as an objective to this project. I have also written earlier correspondence, which I would like to add, as that we sent in on time, and voices similar concerns to object to this development.

The Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours has been working on providing our input to this project for the last several months, and would like to comment that the density component of this project by the Cressey Group go against the use, designs & neighbourhood characteristics of Cedar Cottage. Specifically, the following:

1. The 4 storey apartment building on East 18th should be replaced by ground-oriented building types. Apartment buildings on East 18th don't follow City policies.
2. The 6 story building is too tall as it does not fit the character of this neighbourhood with houses.
3. The density of 6,225 square feet (0.96 FSR) is too much at 1695 E. 18, where the house from 3365 Commercial will be moved to. A laneway infill house would only be 650 square feet here but the backyard housing proposed is 3,222 square feet. This is excessive density.
4. The density of 78,278 square feet (2.71 FSR) is excessive for the 6 and 4 storey apartment buildings to be built on Commercial Dr. and on East 18th Avenue. Normal density is up to 0.75 FSR.
5. 40 trees will be cut from the site
6. 114 units and only 81 parking stalls. This will cause parking problems in the neighbourhood.
7. Parking ramp for 81 cars is on East 18th. This should be off Commercial Drive

Having been longtime residents of this area, as well as speaking with friends, neighbours and others concerned by the highly concerning pace of this development, it is important that the city scale down the project to neighbourhood specifications. There have been significant issues with parking, overuse, and congestion, which will only get worse. As well, the approval of this project, by Cressey, will result in a precedent for future zoning on the primary street (commercial drive) and allow Cressey or others to buy up land. The question we have is – is there a wider strategy that is being implemented from which this project is the start to rezone all of the area to high density? Please be up front with us on this, as council has not allowed this matter to be proceed in a pace that this within resident limits and concerns (it's too fast, too soon, too dense). Would this project also be proceeding at such a rapid pace if the communities concerned were Kerrisdale or Shaughnessy? It seems to the neighbours that the east side is getting 'special treatment' so that all projects are put here so that the people out at Arbutus ridge can enjoy their greenway. When will council similarly invest in our concerns?

Some other cancers I wish to add are that the green space requirements in the report noting there is an abundance of "green space". This is not correct — Clark Park is not accessible due to restrictions from the hill (high road access limits) as well as the retaining wall on commercial drive. Trout Lake is not accessible due to the numerous road crossings required, and the complex labyrinth of routes required to even get to that point. This is a neighbourhood of seniors, people with wheelchairs, and recent immigrants — access to green space and amenities is a prime issues. Instead of using the green space factor as a positive, please consider how it is instead a limit — the Cressey Development should include further green space instead to develop a park.

I also wish to express my concerns about the vision vancouver political donation disclosure list. It is obvious that Cressey himself has funded vision vancouver to a significant sum and it seems to us that he has obtained significant public zoning easements for his developments. He showed up at the "town hall" in the proverbial "plaid shirt" and shorts (re Gordon Campbell) and would not identify himself to the residents there when questions were raised about the development. He was condescending, abusive, and rude to anyone who questioned his development. When pressed, he stated that he was the "owner" of the development and hesitantly said he was Cressey himself. His response — he needed to "feed his kids" and wanted to survive. It is very clear to residents that current party (Vision) has been captured by the developers, and Cressey himself it appears was able to purchase the land at this lot without much public input or real estate signage indicating it was for sale. Why? Why has this company obtained undue benefits, and preferences, in his projects in our area? (he has a significant amount in the area). The residents are interested as we are now in a situation where we provide input on pre-made decisions and not engaged with the process. When the city is pressed, we get non answers. When Cressy was questioned, he became aggressive and belligerent. Even Councillor Reimer, when pressed on this issue, refused to meet to discuss the concerns before hand. Why? Yet she is the "representative" for our area

Something is not right about this whole process and it seems the council is too close to the developers. Information is not being shared, and signage not put up, and decisions being made very quickly without proper input. Why?

I would be interested in your reply.

R Kandola

From: CCAN s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Date: Monday, May 9, 2016 at 10:31 PM
To: <Undisclosed-Recipient:>
Subject: 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695 to 1775 East 18th Avenue PUBLIC HEARING

Hi all CCAN members

PUBLIC HEARING for 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695 to 1775 East 18th Avenue

MAY 24, 2016 at 6:00 pm

City Hall 453 West 12th Avenue

Email, write letters, attend the hearing, speak to City Council

Ask City Council to oppose this rezoning

Here are the reasons:

1. The 4 storey apartment building on East 18th should be replaced by ground-oriented building types. Apartment buildings on East 18th don't follow City policies.
2. The 6 story building is too tall as it does not fit the character of this neighbourhood with houses.
3. The density of 6,225 square feet (0.96 FSR) is too much at 1695 E. 18, where the house from 3365 Commercial will be moved to. A laneway infill house would only be 650 square feet here but the backyard housing proposed is 3,222 square feet. This is excessive density.
4. The density of 78,278 square feet (2.71 FSR) is excessive for the 6 and 4 storey apartment buildings to be built on Commercial Dr. and on East 18th Avenue. Normal density is up to 0.75 FSR.
5. 40 trees will be cut from the site
6. 114 units and only 81 parking stalls. This will cause parking problems in the neighbourhood.
7. Parking ramp for 81 cars is on East 18th. This should be off Commercial Drive

More information below

Signing up to speak

To speak at this Public Hearing contact City Hall from Friday, May 13, 2016 to Tuesday, May 24, 2016. Here is how:

To be added to the speakers list for the agenda item 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695 to 1775 East 18th Avenue email publichearing@vancouver.ca or call 604-829-4238. Ask them to tell you what speaker number you will be on the list.

Just before the meeting, you can also sign up in person, up to 10 minutes before the meeting begins.

After all speakers on the list have spoken, the Mayor will ask if there is anyone else who has not spoken and would like to speak now, if so please come forward.

Once the meeting starts on May 24 at 6:00 pm you can view it online at vancouver.ca/councilvideo so that you can see when your speaker number is coming up.

Be prepared, the hearing could go on for several days depending on the number of speakers and the number of other agenda items.

Don't want to speak, but want your views heard?

If you don't wish to speak to City Council but still want to share your views, send an email or a letter. Deliver your letter to the City Clerk's Office at least three days before the meeting so it can be shared with elected officials on time. It should be sent to mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca by 5pm, on May 18 and cc the City Clerk.

The following are the individual email addresses of the Mayor and City Council. Emails sent directly to each Councillor should be sent a few days before the Public Hearing date in order to give Councillors time to read and review your information.

- City Clerk's Email: ccclerk@vancouver.ca
- Mail: 3rd Floor, City Hall, 453 W 12th Avenue, Vancouver, BC, V5Y 1V4
- Mayor Robertson gregor.robertson@vancouver.ca
- Elizabeth Ball CLRball@vancouver.ca
- Melissa De Genova CLRdegenova@vancouver.ca
- Kerry Jang CLRjang@vancouver.ca
- Geoff Meggs CLRmeggs@vancouver.ca
- Tim Stevenson CLRstevenson@vancouver.ca
- Andrea Reimer CLRreimer@vancouver.ca
- Raymond Louie CLRlouie@vancouver.ca

- Heather Deal CLRdeal@vancouver.ca
- Adriane Carr CLRcarr@vancouver.ca
- George Affleck CLRaffleck@vancouver.ca

Report to Council <http://council.vancouver.ca/20160419/documents/p4.pdf>

The proposal <http://former.vancouver.ca/commsvcs/planning/rezoning/applications/3365commercial/index.htm>

If you can flyer the neighbourhood about this Public Hearing please contact CCAN. There are 97 of us in CCAN, if everyone could speak and bring one more person we can make a difference.

Cheers, Grace

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 12:20 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Public Hearing Zoning 3365 Commercial Drive

From: Nancy Morgan s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 12:08 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Hearing Zoning 3365 Commercial Drive

Hello Mayor and Council,

I am writing today in regard to the rezoning application for 3365 Commercial Drive, 1695 to 1775 East 18th. I do not support the proposed rezoning application.

I have carefully reviewed the developer's application, the council report (April 11, 2016) and the comments of other concerned parties, including the Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours (CCAN). After this review, I find I cannot support the developer's vision for this property and urge the Council to reject the zoning application as proposed.

I agree with the CCNA that the current developer's proposal does not fit the character of and is unpleasantly and excessively large and dense for that location. As a 15-year neighbour of the property in question, I feel that particular location is of enormous value to the surrounding neighbourhood. I am not sure if the Mayor and Council have actually viewed this property, but it is something special: a time capsule into the past of the Commercial Drive/Commercial Street area. It is also special due to the remarkable natural features that remain there, including the running creek and amazing trees. These natural features add to the green space of our community and would be a terrible loss. I feel the existing heritage house and trees have great historical value in their existing context on the property.

I fully support increasing density in the city of Vancouver. This Commercial Drive/Victoria Drive neighbourhood has seen a huge amount of recent densification and I have welcomed it. More affordable housing is an absolute need and additional people can only make our neighbourhoods more vibrant. However, the spaces that have previously given way to increased densification in this Commercial Drive/Victoria Drive neighbourhood were not nice places: they were rundown light industrial buildings. *The property at 3365 Commercial Drive, 1695 to 1775 East 18th is a very nice and very special place.* It should be replaced with something nice and special. What that location does not need is a very large, super dense, poorly constructed, generic development, devoid of character, green space and adding nothing distinctive or valuable to the sense of our neighbourhood.

I support the CCAN's suggestion that a lower density townhouse-style development is more appropriate for the location in question. I also ask the Council to carefully consider the value of the heritage value of the property's natural features and existing buildings and retain these elements if possible.

Thank you very much for your time and your work making Vancouver a great place to live,

Nancy Morgan
s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2016 11:17 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Proposed Development at 18th and Commercial

-----Original Message-----
From: Kenneth Morrison s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 7:00 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Proposed Development at 18th and Commercial

Dear Mr. Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed development at 18th and Commercial. My primary reason for opposing this particular development is that I think it will change, irrevocably, the character of the neighbourhood. There has been much residential development nearby over the past few years. However, the previous development was fundamentally different than this new proposal for the following reasons:

1. This new proposal would remove a green space that contains several old evergreen trees. The other development nearby replaced light industrial facilities that were already devoid of green space.
2. This new proposal would erect a six-story building that is completely out of character of the rest of the neighbourhood.

I am in favour of development and understand well the need for creative ways to create more housing in the city. But, rather than turn this rather charming little corner of East Vancouver into what exists at, say, Kingsway and Knight, please consider saving your approval for the redevelopment of this parcel of land for a more appropriate project. For example, row houses and town houses would be much more in character and would still provide a significant increase in density.

Sincerely,
Kenneth Morrison

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential



Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2016 11:17 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695-1775 E. 18th Ave. (Comments for Public Hearing May 24/16)

From: Mark Oldham s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2016 11:07 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: John Blackmer
Subject: 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695-1775 E. 18th Ave. (Comments for Public Hearing May 24/16)

I live on East 18th (just west of this site) and vehicle traffic and parking is already an issue in the neighbourhood (two churches right on the corner of E. 18th and Fleming as well as another church further west at the corner of E. 18th and Knight). There are also three schools (Tyee, Saint Joseph, and Stratford Hall) in the neighbourhood. East 18th is also used as a quick way to get between Commercial and Knight, so many cars speed up and down the street, and I'm surprised there hasn't been someone killed as vehicles speed up the hill, which is essentially a blindspot.

If this development were to proceed, adding even more congestion to the neighbourhood, something would need to be done to calm the traffic in the area. If parking spaces for the new development are going to be limited, thereby causing residents to park on the street, the City should make much more of the streets on (and near) E. 18th between Commercial and Knight available for residents only. The church-goers (who aren't residents of the neighbourhood, obviously, as they all drive in to attend church) already park illegally and generally cause mayhem, so this new development sounds like it is only going to add to the problem. If there were a fire in the neighbourhood it would be impossible for a fire truck (or even an ambulance) to navigate through some of the streets.

[please remove my company and contact information if this email is going to be public]

Mark Oldham

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

A large rectangular area of the email is redacted with a solid grey box.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This message, including its attachments, is confidential. If you received this email by mistake, do not copy, disclose, or disseminate any information contained in it. If you are not the intended recipient of this email please notify Solus Trust immediately by replying to the sender, and delete it from your system. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2016 1:50 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: May 24, 2016 Public Hearing for 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695 to 1775 East 18th Avenue

From: grnmac s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2016 1:27 PM
To: Robertson, Gregor; Carr, Adriane; Affleck, George; Ball, Elizabeth; De Genova, Melissa; Deal, Heather; Jang, Kerry; Louie, Raymond; Meggs, Geoff; Stevenson, Tim; Reimer, Andrea; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: May 24, 2016 Public Hearing for 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695 to 1775 East 18th Avenue

Dear Mayor Robertson and Council

RE: May 24, 2016 Public Hearing for 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695 to 1775 East 18th Avenue - revised rezoning as of December 3, 2015

I am opposed to the December 3, 2015 revised rezoning application of Cressey Development at 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695 to 1775 East 18th Avenue. I don't see any substantial changes made from their original proposal to their December 3, 2015 revised proposal.

I ask you to oppose this entire application before you at the May 24, 2016 Public Hearing.

Cressey has harassed me three times to underpin my property and to put their large building cranes over my house. I do not want this to happen. This is an unfriendly development.

It is completely beyond me how the City would consider such a large development in a single family area. This project should be much smaller so that the developer would not need huge cranes and underpinning. A smaller project would also leave the land undisturbed so that the trees and shrubs would survive.

Cressey's interest in land seems to be simply to see how much money they can get out of it. They think they can use someone else's property to suit their needs. They don't consider that this is a person's home. A place where they brought the babies home from the hospital and raised them. Where there were graduation and wedding parties. Where the family, five generations of then, lived, played and died. Where they had heart attacks and survived. Where the pets are buried in the back yard. Where the best peaches in the neighborhood grew. This land is where generations of wild animals live; I know they have lived here for at least 75 years. Where trees and plants grow. It is really a shame that this land will be dug up, scrapped clear and covered with concrete for an underground parking lot the length and breadth of the site, destroying all the roots of the trees so they can never come back.

I request that this project be built under current RS-2 zoning. I request that the City require this proponent to build this proposal as recommended by the Mayor's Affordable Housing Task Force: Roundtable on Building Form and Design for an RS zone. That is ground-oriented housing on East 18th with no extra density than currently allowed in the District.

Make the entire project much smaller, 6 storeys on Commercial at 2.71 FSR is too much. This proposal is in an RS-2 zone that restricts developments to the lesser of 35 feet or 2 ½ storeys with a density of no more than 0.75 FSR. The IRP policy does not allow more density in RS zones and it doesn't allow a 4 storey apartment building on East 18th. I ask you to please oppose this application for 3365 Commercial and 1695 to 1775 East 18th Avenue at the Public Hearing for this proposal.

I own the property to the west of this project. I am very upset that the building from 3365 Commercial is to be moved to 1695 East 18th Avenue and that excessive additional housing as infill is proposed to the north on the lot at 1695 East 18th Avenue. The proposed buildings on 1695 East 18th are too much; too tall and dense for a single family area.

If 1695 E. 18th Avenue did have a lane, I believe the density of a laneway house could only be 10% of the property, which would be 700 sq. This proposed infill is 3,222 sq; this is excessive.

If the City allows this height and density it is creating an un-neighbourly project. These buildings will shadow my fruit trees and garden. The outdoor noise which could be created by the residents of four, three bedroom houses next door is unreasonable to expect in a single family RS-2 zone. Also the noise of maintaining four houses on 1695 East 18th is unreasonable for a neighbour to endure. This proposal will create a direct overlooking of my very private backyard and into the windows of my back bedrooms.

There is no back lane on these properties, what is being done so that the Fire Department can access a fire in the infill houses? I do not think this is a safe project.

If the City intends to allow four, three bedroom houses next door to me with very little side yard setbacks this will have a negative effect on any redevelopment I should choose to do. In this proposal the side yard setbacks should be much greater, at least 16 feet because of the proposed high density of 6006 sq. on 1695 East 18th. Currently they show a 6 foot setback, this does not seem enough of a setback for the maintenance of the new buildings at 1695 East 18th Avenue. The current proposed setbacks do not give me enough privacy.

I want to be ensured, by the City, that my wire and picket fences between 1695 East 18th and my property are not destroyed during development of this proposal. I do not want the aggravation of trying to deal with Cressey after they destroy my property. I want the City to be diligent in protecting me from this development.

I want the City to ensure that the natural current grade of our adjoining properties, that being 1695 and 1665 East 18th Avenue, remains the same. I want the City to ensure that the retaining wall between the properties is left and is left in excellent condition so that my property is not eroded away by this new development. I do not approve of any raising of the land at 1695 East 18th Avenue to my level of land. The design of any new development should complement the existing topography; your policies even say to do that.

This entire proposal will take away my quiet enjoyment of my home. It will take away my enjoyment due to:

- the excessive total density of 84,000 sq. and height of 3, 4 and 6 storey buildings the will make it gloomy and oppressive in an RS-2 single family house area,

- the overshadowing and overlooking of my yard and house; and the residential noise that will be created as described above,
- the removal of the tall trees and shrubs that provide refuge for wildlife which I enjoy to watch, and
- the excessive traffic noise that will be created by this project on East 18th Avenue in a single family zone.

I would like you to add my comments and opposition to this proposal to your permanent records.

Yours truly

Norbert MacKenzie

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2016 2:27 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Public Hearing 3365 Commercial Drive, 1695 to 1775 East 18th

From: Pippa Lubensky **s.22(1) Personal and Confidential**
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2016 2:15 PM
Subject: Public Hearing 3365 Commercial Drive, 1695 to 1775 East 18th

Hello,

I have been a resident of the Cedar Cottage neighborhood since 2008, living one block away from the proposed development. I agree with the city's strategy to increase density, the housing situation in Vancouver is desperate!

However, the project in question is too big considering it's surrounding neighborhood. Why not downsize it to the recommendations of the Urban Design Panel? I support their proposal which is

1. turn the four storey building into two sets of two storey townhouses because "this four storey building is the neighbour to the neighbourhood and that you really have to have a good look at that".
2. for the height of the six storey building on Commercial Drive, the City should take its cue for the height from Commercial Drive at 16th, 15th and 14th.
3. this project is in a transition area, a border position with a very committed neighbourhood and that needs to be respected with the architecture
4. that the four and six storey buildings are institutional and out of step with the neighbourhood.
5. the setbacks need to be larger
6. that the heritage house and infill is way too crowded and that it needs more space and breathing room around it.

I am not in favor of preserving the heritage house, it doesn't make the deal sweeter to preserve a house of questionable heritage value. More green space, less crowding is much preferred.

Thanks for considering!

Pippa Lubensky

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Joseph Jones s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2016 3:33 PM
To: Robertson, Gregor; Affleck, George; Ball, Elizabeth; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Deal, Heather; Jang, Kerry; Louie, Raymond; Meggs, Geoff; Reimer, Andrea; Stevenson, Tim
Cc: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: 3. REZONING: 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695-1775 East 18th Avenue

Public Hearing – 24 May 2016

3. REZONING: 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695-1775 East 18th Avenue

I Joseph Jones OPPOSE the Cressey proposal to develop the northwest corner of Commercial Drive at East 18th Avenue for the following reasons:

1. The various appeals to a grab-bag of supposedly applicable policies fail to stand up to scrutiny. One immediate piece of evidence for the shaky policy foundation is how the development site has been carved up into kludgy and dodgy subareas.

When I speak to Council at the public hearing, I will focus on outlining the dubious history of the Interim Rezoning Policy (effective 4 Oct 2012 | amended 2 Dec 2013 and 19 Apr 2016). A mapping of 2012-2016 IRP sites is provided as appendix to this letter.

2. The off-arterial extension of non-ground-oriented housing form, into the area along East 18th Avenue, fails to respect the Interim Rezoning Policy requirement to provide

Ground-oriented forms up to a maximum of 3½ storeys, which is generally sufficient height to include small house/duplexes, traditional row houses, stacked townhouses and courtyard row houses
(p. 2 of Appendix A: Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy
<http://council.vancouver.ca/20160420/documents/cfsc2.pdf>)

A simulacrum end-run that proposes design "to emulate the rhythm and width of town homes" (p. 9) violates the Interim Rezoning Policy and is not acceptable. This aspect would set precedent for the entire City of Vancouver. A "3½-storey rental block" (p. 10) clearly is not a ground-oriented form.

3. There is almost no local area support for the use of heritage bonusing in this proposal. To this significant degree of non-support add the fact that the limited assessment from the Vancouver Heritage Commission has been unusually negative. Planners have tellingly avoided taking the insufficient revision of the unacceptable proposal back to the Commission. This willful misuse of "heritage" provision amounts to scam.

4. Discussion with the project arborist at an open house made it clear that keeping the "significant stand of five mature Lawson Cypress trees at the corner of the site" (p. 8) would be an empty gesture. With proposed development, the remaining trees would experience a serious 30% loss of root structure. The trees need more room, and the adjacent Lawson Cypress trees in the grove need to be retained. Unless the trees are given more space, a major existing green amenity will be eradicated (both immediately and by rapid death) from the

neighborhood by this development proposal.

5. The City of Vancouver proposes to hand over to big Vision-Vancouver-donor Cressey a piece of public land owned since 1939 – "nine percent of the total subject site area" (p. 16). To allow this would amount to extraction of value from the local area with no payback. This has become a depressing and regular pattern for how the City of Vancouver deals with East Vancouver.

Perhaps that money would be applied to the \$55 million purchase price for the Arbutus corridor on the favored side of town? Despite already owning most of the land needed to deliver a Renfrew Ravine linear park (connecting Norquay Park with Renfrew Ravine), the City of Vancouver continues to fail to provide any part whatsoever of the amenity package specified under the 2010 Norquay Plan. A large area of East Vancouver is undergoing massive and rapid redevelopment with none of the promised corresponding improvement to public realm.

6. The lengthy process for the site at Commercial and East 18th Avenue has seemed dominated by back room collusion between developer Cressey and the City of Vancouver. Despite extensive efforts made by local area residents to provide input, the end result has incorporated nothing significant from community feedback.

The City of Vancouver insulted a committed group of people with a stealth posting of 3 December 2015 "revisions to the application" – providing no notification to participants. In light of the foregoing comments, consider how little difference the following minor tweaks have made to address severe policy problems:

Revisions to the Application

December 3, 2015: Revised drawings were submitted on December 3, 2015 to address concerns raised by staff and the community. The overall density was reduced from 2.55 FSR to 2.40 FSR with a corresponding reduction in unit count from 118 residential units to 114 residential units. Increased setback and massing changes are proposed to the rental building, a reduction to the size of the proposed infill building on the heritage site, and the location of the underground parking ramp has been moved closer to Commercial Drive. In addition, the Transportation Study has been updated.

<http://former.vancouver.ca/commsvcs/planning/rezoning/applications/3365commercial/index.htm>

• • • • •

Appendix: Mapping of the Six Proposals under Interim Rezoning Policy 2012-2016

