PH1 - Item 4. CD-1 Text Amendment: 650 West 41st Avenue - OPPOSED

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
02/25/2022	18 31	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Text Amendment: 650 West 41st Avenue	Oppose	This development is already too dense. The buildings do not have enough parking which will affect the neighbourhood. The Canada Line is already unable to handle the volume of people during rush hour. The buildings are unaffordable. The developers should not be given extra density to compensate them for not being able to sell their ultra luxury condos. The present nearby buildings will be subjected to a lot of unwanted shade. There is no consideration for the view corridors that Vancouver is supposed to be preserving. The extreme density that is being imposed on the area all at once instead of more gradually is overwhelming.	Brenda Dalawrak		s: 22(1) Personal and Confidentia	Oakridge	No web attachments.
02/26/2022	12 27	PH1 - 4, CD-1 Text Amendment: 650 West 41st Avenue	Oppose	The increases of 1 m to 30 m to allow up to 9 additional storeys and additional relaxing on mechanical penthouses is significant. It threatens the originally approved integrity and cohesiveness of the Oakridge redevelopment and contradicts key urban design principles. Already the originally proposed height of towers at the periphery of the site is very critical in terms of shadow impact within the site and on the surrounding areas, disturbances of the natural settings and view lines for the existing neighbourhood. Additional height will lutte the promised qualities for the public realm. The combined height relaxations combined with mechanical penthouses will create an ugly assembly of large towers that dwarf the site features at grade and adjacent existing buildings. It will loose its originality and will not stand the test of time as something special for Vancouver. The outcome will be a meaningless and globally interchangeable super-high density that takes no consideration at all on local features such as landscape and existing fabrics.	Lothar Wiwjorra			Oakridge	No web attachments.
02/28/2022	15 29	PH1 - 4, CD-1 Text Amendment: 650 West 41st Avenue	Oppose	This proposal seeks to increase inequality and improve the developers' profit margin at the expense of resident. Currently Queen Elizabeth Park is the highest point in Vancouver. All residents have access to it and take in views both to the North of Burrard Inlet and the Coast Mountains and to the South with views of Richmond, the Strait of Georgia, and the Gulf Islands. Once these towers are built only those wealthy enough to rent or purchase the higher units in the towers will have those views; ordinary residents' views from the Park will be blocked. This is contrary to Section 6.2.1 of the March 15th , 2007 Oakridge Policy Statement which states that 'The form and placement of buildings should demonstrate consideration ofViews to and from public parks and public open space.' This proposal and Staffs referral report have inadequate consideration of the views from the public park on Little Mountain. It is also highly doubtful that these buildings preserve the views to the North Shore Mountains from Tisdall Park as required in the Policy Statement. Furthermore, those residents of the towers may get better views to the North than any Park visitors. There would be then two tiers of the view amenity: those privileged enough to live in the upper floors of these towers would have spectacular 360 degree views while ordinary residents would have lesser views than they currently do in part because their views from the Park are blocked by the towers. For Council to approve this proposal is another way of ensuring the wealthy and privileged have better access to some of Vancouver's outdoor amenities. The developers have already received approval for a major redevelopment of the site that does not meet March 15th , 2007 Oakridge Policy Statement, specifically Section 6.1.1 which states that only one tower per cluster may have a maximum height of 200ft with a possible modest increase to accommodate 24 storeys. If the developers cannot profitably complete the project with 4 towers well beyond this maximum, it is not up t	C Martin			Oakridge	No web attachments.