

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
02/26/2022	11:55	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Text Amendment: 650 West 41st Avenue	Other	Please see the attached pdf's	Allan Buium		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Riley Park	APPENDIX A

From: **Allan/Sherry Buium** § 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: Item 4, Council Agenda, 6PM, March 1, 2022
Date: February 26, 2022 at 11:37 AM
To:

AB

February 26, 2022

Mayor and Council
City of Vancouver

Dear Mayor and Council:

Re: Oakridge Centre (650 West 41st Avenue) — City Council Agenda, March 1st, 2022, 6:00PM, Item 4, CD -1 Text Amendment

For some time, the Riley Park South Cambie Community Visions Steering Committee (RPSC-CVC)** has been in communication with Quad Real and Westbank, the developers of Oakridge Centre. On November 25, 2022, a Zoom meeting was held between presenters for the project [CoV staff (Helen Chan); reps for the project (Rui Nunes, Rhiannon Mabberley, and Zoe Boal) and members of RPSC-CVC.

After the Zoom meeting, RPSC-CVC sent questions and comments to the presenter of the Zoom meeting. We appreciated their responses to our concerns. As background for the discussion below, the following three files are attached:

- 1) December 22, 2020: RPSC-CVC's questions and comments about the rezoning application, sent to the presenters;
- 2) July 16, 2021: reply to RPSC-CVC's concerns by Ms. Mabberley, spokesperson for Quad Real and Westbank;
- 3) July 30, 2021: additional comments from Ms. Mabberley.

We see some positive contributions from the developers, both to the project and for the general community benefits; for example, the use of technology in alternate energy sources and uses and the community amenities are just a couple of notes. However, we still have lingering concerns. For the following comments, the pages referenced are found in Attachment 2.

P. 1 — Ownership

Mayor and Council should be aware of all responses and the details noted.

P. 3 — Towers

Bldg. 5 is still a concern, as is the City's policy to allow for such significant increases in density for rental units.

P. 6 — Shadowing

The response is not satisfactory. The shadowing will affect already built structures as well as those coming on line.

P. 7 — Social housing

Social housing is still being "short changed": it should be the 20%, as outlined in the City's policy for this type of housing within a large project.

P. 8 — Unit sizes

The City Guidelines need a careful review because the sizes for many of the units can create a claustrophobic feeling that makes for a rather uncomfortable living environment. Design guidelines should be reviewed for each project and not use a policy of "one size/site fits all".

P. 11 — Schools

RPSC-CVC can only hope that the nearly \$2M contribution will stimulate the VSB in its future plans for a new school within Oakridge Municipal Town Centre (OMTC).

P. 12 — Traffic

What has the Engineering Dept. done concerning this important issue? The tremendous increase in density resulting from the developments in this area of the city (Oakridge Centre, OMTC, Heather Lands, and Oakridge Transit site) will have a great impact on traffic.

P. 13 — Public transportation

when will the City open a dialogue with Translink? There must be improved surface transit to serve the UMIU in order to achieve the City's goals of encouraging people to get out of their cars.

P. 14 — Security & Safety Issues

Is the Park Board aware of their new acquisition and the future responsibility tied to the new site?

P. 14-15 — Public Safety

When will the City begin a discussion on this topic?

P. 17 — Discussion Points

What are the City's responses to these queries?

P. 17 — Market Place Model

When will the City be ready to respond to these questions?

We will greatly appreciate your response to our concerns.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Allan Buium, Chair
on behalf of the RPSC-CVC

**RPSC -CVC was established in November 2005 by Vancouver City Council as a community group that was part of *City Plan*. As we have evolved over these past 16 years, RPSC-CVC has been recognized as a credible community *watchdog* with a strong *institutional history*.



1) 22 Dec 2020
RPSC-...ve.pdf



2) 16 Jul 2021
Develo...VC.pdf



3) 30 Jul 2021
Mabbe...VC.pdf

RPSC-CVC Review of the Rezoning Application for 650 West 41st Ave

The following comments and questions are based on the following

1. Shape Your City website: <https://shapeyourcity.ca/650-w-41-ave>
2. November 25, 2020 "Zoom" meeting between members of CoV staff (Helen Chan), developer's reps (Rui Nunes, Rhiannon Mabblerley, and Zoe Boel), and members of the Riley Park–South Cambie Community Visions Committee (RPSC-CVC)
3. July 23rd 2019 email from Sadhu Johnston to Mayor and Council, with cc.: to City Manager's Correspondence Group [Subject: Questions from Council regarding the Large Sites MIRHP] (See attached.)

• • • • •

Topics

Ownership

The ownership of the site is not clear.

- Is it a 50:50 partnership for the buildings and the land between Westbank and Quad Real?
- Will the City assume ownership of the community Centre and the two social housing buildings?
- How does Quad Real explain its ownership of the site in relation to the ESG factors (environmental, social and governance disclosures)?

Energy & Environment

• Sustainability

The project notes that 90% of the energy consumed will be zero carbon, but this does not answer the question of sustainability.

- What type of sustainable plans are there for the heating of the buildings?
- Any insulation problems?
- Will such plans comply with the City's new *Climate Emergency Plan*?
- How earthquake resistant will the glass be?

• Environmental Planning

Use of lots of glass is proposed. There needs to be a clearly explained description of the *glass ratio*. The renderings seem to show a "floor to ceiling" set of windows. If this is the case, then the "R-factor" for glazing is rather weak

- What about the environmental impact?

There is no attempt to green the buildings, to use solar panels on roofs or built into walls.

- What about using geothermal?
- Will there be a central heating system for the entire site?

Towers

• **Height** (Height is defined from top of roof slab of uppermost inhabited storey to the geodetic value.) Bldg. 5 at 52 storeys* is too much!! This height will serve as precedent for other developments—all will want the same height. One tower was already removed from the proposal.

- Why not reinsert this tower to give two towers of 25/26 stories?

*On the website, the proposed increased heights listed in the Tables in the Overview section, do not make mention of what is proposed in Appendix 8.1 Policy Comparison Table (p. 204):

7.3 – Allow buildings to exceed the maximum height by 10.35 m for elevator machine rooms and central plant equipment.

N.B. 10.35 m is ~34 ft., which is equivalent to more than three storeys! This means that the building would be ~55 storeys high.

- What elevator housing or machines need 34 ft "headroom"?

This height is not in keeping with surrounding neighbourhoods, not even the MTC towers.

Note: presenting the height in storeys can be deceptive; therefore, give the height in feet or meters.

• ***High towers and children***

- Where do children go to play?

The importance of unorganized play should not be understated. Play not only makes children stronger, but also helps to develop their capacity to work with others. It is an important form of socialization that enables children later in life to cooperate, share, accept responsibility and work our ways through conflict by dealing with little unpleasantries that occur in personal interactions.

• ***Possible Requirement***

Little Mountain, elevation 125 m (410 ft) above sea level (<https://vancouver.ca/parks-recreation-culture/queen-elizabeth-park.aspx>), is the highest point in Vancouver.

As defined in the proposal, building height is taken from the top of the roof slab of the uppermost inhabited storey, with height being presented as the geodetic value. [Geodetic datum: 88.88 m (291.6 ft.)]

A 52-storey building with the requested additional height of 10.35 m (34 ft.) for machine rooms would have the approximate height of a 55-storey building, which would be an estimated value of 550 ft., using a nominal value of 10 ft. per storey. The approximate value "above sea level" for this tower would be
 $550 \text{ ft.} + 291.6 \text{ ft.} = 841.6 \text{ ft.}$

Thus, at 55 storeys, this tower would be not only the tallest proposed building in Oakridge Centre, but also the highest point in Vancouver.

- Would the developer be required to install a flashing light at the very top of this tower as a warning to aircraft?
- If so, what impact would a flashing light have on the livability residents (especially those in the upper floors) of nearby towers on site, on residents of towers in adjacent developments, and on residents in the general area?
- Would there be any possible legal liabilities?

• ***Density***

Too dense. Oakridge Centre itself is comparable to a mini city and will be surrounded by more density (MTC, Oakridge Transit site, the JCC site and the planned projects on the east side of Cambie St.). In contrast to what is on the BOARDS, it does not build on existing characteristics and contexts of the neighbourhoods immediately to the west and south of the Centre.

FSR: 3.71–4.10 FSR. The value 4.10 is the highest yet proposed.

• ***Shadowing***

Shadowing on the buildings situated on the north side of 41st is not acceptable.

The general shadow studies (6.3) show that the buildings on the northside of 41st Ave. (within RPSC boundaries) would be in almost constant shadow most of the day at the equinoxes, and shadowing would of course be even more extensive during the fall and winter months. Almost as soon as the shadow of one building passes to the east, another takes its place. In fact, the sidewalks and lower storeys of buildings on the northside of 41st Ave. would be heavily shadowed almost the entire year. In terms of livability impacts,

this is not acceptable by any meaningful standard! That, by the way, was not the case with the 2007 Oakridge Centre redevelopment context statement, in which the tallest buildings would have topped out at just over 20 storeys.

• **View**

In both the original and revised projects, the view corridor(s) from Queen Elizabeth Park will disappear. City Council, when it approved the original proposal, ignored the residents' comments. This is a serious blow to the tourist sector.

• **Other**

The wind factors generated by the towers could cause problems for pedestrian circulation.

Housing

• **Affordability**

There is a need to clarify Westbank's interpretation of 20% requirement for affordable housing. There is a distinction between social (*i.e.*, subsidized) housing and affordable, moderate income rental (MIR) housing. The City's 20% policy for large sites re: Social Housing is not MIR regardless of CCP3. This is an ambiguity with the CCP3.

The following description of MIR housing and the $\geq 20\%$ requirement in order to obtain increased density are taken from the 2nd paragraph of the Sadhu Johnston email (attached):

The moderate income rental housing concept requires that developers secure a portion of the units (generally at least 20%) at rental rates that are specified by the City, and that are affordable to households with incomes between \$30,000 and \$80,000 per year at approximately 30% of gross household income. In return for this secured affordability, the City offers significant y greater incentives, primarily additional density.

For this project,

Social housing units: $290/3323 = 8.7\%$. Far below 20%.

Affordable housing units: $94/3323 = 2.8\%$. Again, well below 20%.

Non-profit social housing is given very low priority; the BC Step Program for minimum-size units is not adhered to.

• **Unit Sizes**

Not all floor plans are presented. Below are some values.

Design Analysis p. 168–169

A few examples are presented (one floor each for Bldgs. 5, 12, 13, & 14).

	<u>Size Range (~sf)</u>	
Studio:	363–470	(Bldg. 2 has studios at 344 sf)
1 bedroom:	625–781	
2 bedroom:	899–1174	

The smallest studios are very small, as are the smallest 2-bedroom units.

Commercial Spaces

The model for renting commercial space is passe. Hudson's Bay is crumbling and Nordstrom may not be far behind.

- Will the apparent switch to online purchasing continue, thus reducing the need for brick-and-mortar stores?

• **Retail Space**

For decades, Oakridge Mall has served individuals residing in a wide area. As proposed, the new Oakridge Centre will have an enormous increase in residents on site. Added to this are the increase in residents in other surrounding developments (Municipal Town Centre (MTC), Heather Lands and the Oakridge Transit site). Just as diversity is needed in housing to ensure that units are available across income levels, diversity in retail is essential.

The stores cannot all be high-end. Stores should reflect the needs of local consumers in terms of goods and services and pocketbooks. This will reduce travel to other areas and provide local services to those on site and those in the area. This would be in line with the current thinking that places an emphasis on shopping locally.

The Safeway store is going to have to be HUGE, if it is to service the needs not only of residents in the current large catchment area (this part of the city is a food desert), but also the thousands of new residents of Oakridge Centre, MTC, Oakridge Transit site, and Heather Lands.

• **Office Space**

Due to the CoVid-19 pandemic, many people are working from home, and employers are realizing employees can be productive in doing so. The demand from doctors for office space may be diminished, as many doctors now attend to patients electronically, orders tests by computer, and have pharmacists do more. Post pandemic, it is possible that at least some people will continue to work from home. If so, companies may decide to decrease their physical office footprint.

- Is the new amount of office space reasonable?
- Will it be rentable/affordable?
- How "diverse" will the increased workspace be?
- Will this be mainly white-collar positions?

If more office space is needed,

- Why was this not addressed in CCP Phases 1 & 2?
- Did the city drop the ball on this?
- Where are the data that shows this need?

Construction Materials

The use of materials are incongruous and competing.

Lack of use of innovative new materials, *i.e.*, promoting cross-laminated timber CLC as a BC-made product.

• **Cladding**

General cladding not mentioned. Too early in the process?

• **Skin**

The skeleton skin analogy that drapes the buildings is dubious and not convincing.

It is not clear what this "skin" is.

- What material?
- How is the skin constructed?
- Is this less expensive than building outer walls?
- If damaged in an area, how is the damage repaired?
- If composed of panels, what is the possibility of leaks?
- How expensive is the maintenance?
- If composed of plastic, how easily could graffiti be removed?

Aquifer

This seems to be an unsettled issue.

- If there is an aquifer, what are the risks concerning an earthquake?
- Why did city ask developer to do a feasibility study for a well into the aquifer?
- Will there be problems with the construction of the parking stalls? [There was a prior discussion about problems with burrowing too far underground.]

Child Care

The proposed child-care centre is inadequate. If there are, say, 2500 residences and 10% have pre-school children, then there would be a minimum of 250 preschoolers.

- Will the child-care space occupy the ground floor of the Civic/Community Centre?

Schools

Due to the huge amount of redevelopment occurring in the Cambie Corridor (Oakridge Centre, Oakridge Transit Centre, Heather Lands, MTC, Dogwood Pearson, and along the Corridor itself), elementary schools in the area are currently at or above their capacity. Overcrowded schools not only are an inconvenience for students who cannot find places in their own or adjoining catchment, causing children to travel (more burden on public transportation). School overcrowding also has a negative impact on the learning outcomes of students, disproportionately affecting those on either end of the learning spectrum (high achievers and students with learning disabilities).

School space must be addressed. When schools are crowded, parents may choose to opt out of the public system and send their children to private schools, which further weakens the public system. Although the Vancouver School Board (VSB) has the major responsibility, a developer should also bear some accountability, as these children live in the new development. The Planning Dept. cannot approve so much density and neglect providing sufficient school space. The Planning Dept. has an obligation to work with VSB on this problem.

- Are there sufficient area schools, both elementary & secondary, to provide education for the children in the 1223 possible number of family units?
(928 2-bedroom units + 297 3-bedroom units = 1223 possible family units)

Traffic

• Comprehensive study

The traffic study, as required by the City, is very limited in scope and does not give a true picture of the traffic flow that will be generated by the project. The transportation study acknowledges that traffic at the intersection of Cambie and 41st Avenue is already at or near capacity—this intersection is anticipated to operate with an overall LOS E and with unacceptable V/C ratios for several movements; the study notes that nothing is planned to mitigate the increased congestion that this development would create, with the exception of reworking times of signal change. This capacity (or over capacity) is also occurring at other intersections in the area.

RPSC–CVC continues to request that the Engineering Dept. do a comprehensive traffic study for this and neighbouring areas, due to the very large “build-out” that comprises Oakridge Centre, MTC, Oakridge Transit site, and the Heather Lands. A comprehensive traffic survey has to be done on the wider area to include the area bounded by 33rd Ave., Oak St., 49th Ave., and Main St. in order to collect relevant data. Future traffic congestion is a major concern and traffic issues should not be siloed.

• Residential Parking

Having only two access point for residential traffic (Residential Only Ramp (eastern site on 41st) and 45th Avenue/Choy Yuen Crescent), may cause congestion at rush hours—not only at these access points, but also on 41st Ave.

The entrances and exits to the underground parking access to loading area may increase traffic congestion on Cambie and on 41st Ave.

• ***Valet Parking***

Parking for future residents is planned, in large part, to be a valet-operated system. This is costly: \$4.6 M/y.

- Is valet parking made necessary due to "stacking" of cars?
- Will this speed up or slow down access to car?

Public Transportation

• ***Ridership capacity of the Oakridge station***

A large part of the philosophy of this development is increasing mass transit use. Canada line ridership will certainly increase due to the increased densification of Oakridge Centre and the other major development sites in the area, as well as that in Richmond. Because the Canada Line stations are widely separated, with no station between those at 25th and 41st Avenues, the Oakridge station will bear the brunt of the increased ridership.

Major increases in ridership on the already taxed Canada Line will lead to congestion of passengers in the trains, on the platforms, and in the entrance/exit on Cambie at 41st Ave. Although use of public transportation is being encouraged, Canada Line will be swamped and will not be able to contend with such crowding, thereby putting many people back into cars and further exacerbating the acknowledged traffic problems at 41st and Cambie and at other intersection in the area.

One proposed solution is that station platforms can be enlarged to serve longer trains, but at a very high cost (hundreds of millions); TransLink has no money or plans to do this.

To relieve some passenger congestion, an entrance/exit on the north side of 41st Ave. would be useful.

• ***Other Modes***

Since City Hall passed the Green Plan this week, there is a push for electric buses. For accessibility, above-ground transit on Cambie is still required.

Integration Site & Surroundings

The overall urban organization of Oakridge with other big developments in the neighbourhood falls severely short of integration. Street activity at 41st and Cambie is non-existent, non-animated, and lacks connection from the street to the interior.

There is need for retail face on Cambie and on 41st. A large glass building along 41st is alienating. The cold appearance of glass buildings is very impactful—too much glass and not enough human street traffic generated. Too insular. (Two examples of this alienating effect caused by excessive use of cold glass or sheer walls, with no retail outlets on the street level facing major streets, can be found in the Aberdeen Mall in Richmond and Pacific Centre Mall.)

From the drawings, it is difficult to determine whether the façades of buildings facing Cambie overhang the sidewalk.

The arrival area from the Canada Line to the Oakridge Centre is over-crowded, attention-seeking, and over-stimulating; it lacks organization. No proper way-finding is proposed.

Security & Safety Issues

• *On site*

Use of balcony space for agricultural use is questionable as a solution for food security.

The proposal envisions a lot of green space, which is good.

- What kind of security will be needed?
- What entity will provide said security?
- Who will pay for that added feature?

Oakridge buildings will be composed of a lot of glass.

- How earthquake resistant will all this glass be?

Towers, in particular a 52-storey building, could present problems, especially for those living on the upper floors.

- In the event of an emergency, what are the plans for evacuation?
- Is there easy access to elevators, fire escapes?

Each building that has office space should have a separate entrance, lobby, and elevators, all of which are intended specifically for the use of the office workers and of clients. Residents should not have to deal with strangers in their buildings.

• *Public safety*

With the enormous increase in the number of residents in the area (Oakridge Centre, MTC, Oakridge Transit site, Heather lands), not enough emphasis has been placed on the need for a new fire station IN THE AREA of all these major housing developments.

Other Issues

• *Effects of the CoVid-19 Pandemic*

CoVid-19 pandemic has changed public attitudes on several topics including the use of living and office space. Developers must consider whether people want to live in high rises and small condos or rental units, especially in this new era of contagious diseases that could be transmitted through ventilation or perhaps plumbing.

Even after the CoVid-19 problem is resolved, people may not feel comfortable using public transit. It should not be presumed that the public will all return to use of transit.

• *Cambie Flyway*

Sufficient study apparently has not been given to the hazard to birds. In particular, the glass-walled office building seems extremely problematic.

- What treatment will be used on windows to deter bird strikes?
- Would glass impregnated with reflective particles be useful?
- Frosted images on windows?

• *New Street*

There were no results from an internet search of "Chuy Yuen". The closest was "Chuk Yuen", a location in Hong Kong. Information should be provided as to why "Chuy Yuen" would be an appropriate name for the new street.

• ***Living space***

There seems to be no concept of changing to meet a new world. The international press states that what the world wants now are the following:

- More space
- More access to green
- Wide halls
- Windows that open
- Stairs

As very few floor plans were illustrated, it is difficult to ascertain the livability of the units.

• ***Hyperbole***

The following comments, noted in the projects planned achievements, are rather “fluffy” and seem to be a “sales pitch”. There is no guarantee that they will ever come to fruition.

- water management and tapping into the aquifer, etc.
- reducing the retail space and allowing more space for the growing tech sector
- increased work space, leading to more office rental
- an economic stimulus with a \$5B price tag
- upon completion, 6,000 full-time jobs generated
- 30,000 construction jobs generated

"The Woodlands"! Ten trees does not a woodlands make.

Discussion Points

• ***Trade-off: Increased Building Heights to Obtain Increased Rental Units***

Luxury condo sales are not strong at the present time; the developer (like other developers in the area) is converting market condos into rental and office space to offset potential loss.

Because there is a shortage of affordable rental units in the Vancouver, at face value an increase in rental units sounds good. However, the rental units currently being built may not be the right type. During CCP Phases 1 & 2, market condos were built that were not affordable and not what was really needed. This appears to be what is happening in the rental sector.

For the present proposal,

- The building heights were already too high; increasing heights to obtain MIR rental units may be too high a price.
- The majority of these units are market rentals and, therefore, will not be affordable for many people.
- This is a large site and, as such, should have both 20% social housing **and 20% MIR.**
- People's attitude toward home ownership is changing. More are opting to rent rather than to buy.
- A pause in rental rezoning approvals would permit an inventory of rentals built in the last 10 years, as well what is currently in the pipeline. Such an inventory would include overall number, rental type (studio, 1 bed, 2 bed, etc.), affordability level (how many are social housing, how many are MIR), and size (area square footage). This would allow the construction industry to make decisions based on the data, so that the right kind of units can be built.

• ***Market Place Model***

As was noted at the meeting, the entire RPSC area is being used to serve private capital.

- Why should the market place model of development be accepted as the only alternative?
- Could the city not buy land and then lease it back to buyers and renters ala UBC?
- Could the province or federal governments not also do this?

Perhaps, the BCI Corp, through Quad Real, could invest in something other than Oakridge. That is money provided to public employees by the public.

- Should that pension money not be used constructively to provide affordable housing that still earns a reasonable return?

Repeated Comments

• *Real Concerns Not Being Addressed*

RPSC-CVC members were emphatic that two themes were not being seriously addressed:

- overcrowded elementary schools and
- transportation issues
 - traffic congestion
 - ridership capacity of the Canada Line,
 - ability of the Oakridge station to accommodate the increase in passengers.

The traffic and school issues have been glossed over. With Oakridge Centre and the other large developments, these two factors alone could absolutely hamstring the south part of city.

• *Scale of Project*

The scale of Oakridge Centre is mammoth.—a real mini city. Although the developer's boards state that the project builds on existing characteristics and contexts of neighbourhoods. This project has NOTHING to do with surrounding neighbourhoods.

This project is staggering in scope and size and feels like huge overkill. People are moving out of the city, because they realize the disadvantages of small spaces.

The whole development seems overwrought, excessive. Most notably, the heights of the towers are out of place, even in comparison to what is proposed for the MTC. When is enough, ENOUGH?

• *Other Points*

There does not seem to be a strong emphasis on either families or affordability.

The estimated total number of residents for Oakridge Centre is not stated.

- What is the future of *The Terraces* at the 41st & Cambie entrance?

Conclusion

Given that the proposed heights of the towers are excessive, that traffic and school issues have not been addressed, and that the proposal is for too much of the wrong types of rental housing, and given the other reasons discussed above, **RPSC–CVC does not approve this rezoning application.**

As a City-Council-sanctioned group since November 2005, RPSC-CVC continues to be the community *watchdog* with a strong *institutional history*. We look forward to offering developers constructive criticisms that will certainly enhance their respective projects.

Regards,

Allan Buium, Chair
on behalf of the RPSC-CVC



July 16, 2021

Mr. Allan Buium
Chair, Riley Park-South Cambie Community Vision Committee

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Delivered via email

RE: Rezoning Application for 650 West 41st Ave

In response to the letter Riley Park-South Cambie Community Vision Committee shared with us, dated 22 December 2020, we would like to provide some further information and clarification with regard to the Oakridge redevelopment project. For completeness, we have provided direct responses to each component of your letter.

Ownership

The ownership of the site is not clear. Is it a 50:50 partnership for the buildings and the land between Westbank and Quad Real? Will the City assume ownership of the community Centre and the two social housing buildings?, How does Quad Real explain its ownership of the site in relation to the ESG factors (environmental, social and governance disclosures)?

The ownership of Oakridge is a partnership between Westbank and QuadReal. The City of Vancouver will assume ownership of the community centre and the social housing buildings on completion of construction.

Energy & Environment - Sustainability

The project notes that 90% of the energy consumed will be zero carbon, but this does not answer the question of sustainability. What type of sustainable plans are there for the heating of the buildings? Any insulation problems?, Will such plans comply with the City's new Climate Emergency Plan?, How earthquake resistant will the glass be?

In addition to strategies adopted from the Passive Design Toolkit, a high level of sustainable site design will be achieved through the commitment to the Green Building Rezoning policy as was amended May 2, 2018, including total energy use intensity (TEUI), thermal energy demand intensity (TEDI) and greenhouse gas intensity (GHGI) limits for all individual buildings within the Oakridge Redevelopment.

A centralized energy plant will create opportunities for heat exchange between commercial, institutional and residential uses throughout the site and as part of a District Energy strategy. The site will use both existing and expanded geo-exchange infrastructure to further reduce the project's carbon footprint. The intention for the design of the energy plant is to maintain interoperability with the future district energy systems on the Cambie Corridor (south).

1



The District Energy plant will qualify as a Low-Carbon Energy System (LCES) and will rely primarily on water-source heat pump technology, in conjunction with a vertical geo-exchange field installed below the Oakridge site, to provide thermal energy. The Low-Carbon Energy System (LCES) plant will maximize heat recovery and provide low-carbon energy source to offset greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with burning fossil fuel for heating.

The District Energy System at Oakridge will reduce GHG emissions by upwards of 70%, the equivalent to planting 160,000 trees per year or taking 1300 cars off the road annually.

Oakridge will also utilise the most robust water recycling system ever envisioned for a project of this scale. Through the recycling of groundwater and collection of rainwater across the entirety of the site, 72% of Oakridge non-potable water needs will be met by utilizing groundwater and recycled rainwater, the highest ever achieved for a project of this scale in North America. Oakridge will be the first project in Canada to test using treated recycled water in the washing machines of residential units.

We do not foresee any insulation problems and it should be noted that one sustainability feature of the development, is actually the natural insulation provided to the mall below the landscaped roof of the Pocket Park.

The proposed plans will comply with the City's new Climate Emergency Plan. Glass used in this project will comply with any existing seismic requirements in the City of Vancouver.

Environmental Planning

Use of lots of glass is proposed. There needs to be a clearly explained description of the glass ratio. The renderings seem to show a "floor to ceiling" set of windows. If this is the case, then the "R-factor" for glazing is rather weak. What about the environmental impact?

The use of glass in the Oakridge redevelopment will comply with all City requirements as it relates to climate and seismic codes.

There is no attempt to green the buildings, to use solar panels on roofs or built into walls. What about using geothermal? Will there be a central heating system for the entire site?

In addition to strategies adopted from the Passive Design Toolkit, a high level of sustainable site design will be achieved through the commitment to the Green Building Rezoning policy as was amended May 2, 2018, including total energy use intensity (TEUI), thermal energy demand intensity (TEDI) and greenhouse gas intensity (GHGI) limits for all individual buildings within the Oakridge Redevelopment.

Solar panels are proposed on the roof canopies over Buildings 3, 4 6 and 7.



With regard to geothermal, as part of the District Energy strategy on-site, a centralized energy plant will create opportunities for heat exchange between commercial, institutional and residential uses. This process will occur throughout the site. The District Energy plant will qualify as a Low-Carbon Energy System (LCES) and will rely primarily on water-source heat pump technology, in conjunction with a vertical geo-exchange field installed below the Oakridge site, to provide thermal energy.

The Low-Carbon Energy System (LCES) plant will maximize heat recovery and provide low-carbon energy source to offset greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with burning fossil fuel for heating. The intention for the energy plant's design is to maintain interoperability with future District Energy systems on the Cambie Corridor (south).

The District Energy System at Oakridge will reduce GHG emissions by upwards of 70%, the equivalent to planting 160,000 trees per year or taking 1300 cars off the road annually.

The general energy efficiency and improved thermal performance measures which have been incorporated into building design includes the following;

- High Performance Glazing
- Balanced Window/Wall Ratio
- Reduced Thermal Bridging
- Demand Control Ventilation
- Dedicated in-suite energy recovery ventilators
- Low Flow Fixtures
- Energy Star Appliances
- Energy Efficient Lighting and Controls
- Connection to Low Carbon Energy System

Towers

Height (Height is defined from top of roof slab of uppermost inhabited storey to the geodetic value).

Bldg. 5 at 52 storeys is too much!! This height will serve as precedent for other developments—all will want the same height. One tower was already removed from the proposal. Why not reinsert this tower to give two towers of 25/26 stories?

The Cambie Corridor Plan, which was approved in 2018, guides all development along Cambie Street between W 16th Avenue down to the Fraser River. Within this Plan, there is a limitation on height in place for the Oakridge Municipal Town Centre neighbourhood, which restricts heights to no higher than the second tallest tower within the Oakridge Centre Site. At present, the Cambie Corridor Plan envisions the tallest tower outside of the Oakridge Centre site to be at a maximum of 330 ft, with provisions to exceed this height only with the provision of affordable housing or other significant public amenity, and even then, the proposal will be capped at 40-storeys tall (second highest tower at Oakridge Centre).

Building 5 was previously a condominium building, and is now entirely re-imagined as a rental building housing 587 rental homes, which can only be done through the proposed increase in height at this location. As you have mentioned, the proposal had previously removed another tower in order to improve and refine the public realm, accessibility, and light permeation to the



site's 400,000 sf of parks, and as such, Ownership would prefer to not add any additional towers on site at this time to keep more open space.

On the website, the proposed increased heights listed in the Tables in the Overview section, do not make mention of what is proposed in Appendix 8.1 Policy Comparison Table (p. 204): 7.3 – Allow buildings to exceed the maximum height by 10.35 m for elevator machine rooms and central plant equipment. N.B. 10.35 m is ~34 ft., which is equivalent to more than three storeys! This means that the building would be ~55 storeys high.

What elevator housing or machines need 34 ft "headroom"? This height is not in keeping with surrounding neighbourhoods, not even the MTC towers. Note: presenting the height in storeys can be deceptive; therefore, give the height in feet or meters.

The height of the elevator housing is set by elevator codes that require space above the elevator cab to protect technicians that are servicing the cabs from above. The elevator machine rooms are located above this overrun.

High towers and children

Where do children go to play? The importance of unorganized play should not be understated. Play not only makes children stronger, but also helps to develop their capacity to work with others. It is an important form of socialization that enables children later in life to cooperate, share, accept responsibility and work our ways through conflict by dealing with little unpleasantries that occur in personal interactions.

We agree with your comments about the importance of children play spaces. Our proposal for Oakridge incorporates a significant amount of green space throughout the site, providing various spaces for unorganized play. Through our proposal, we prioritize access to nature for residents, workers, and visitors to the Oakridge site by including close to 400,000 sf (9 ac) of parks space throughout the site, and placing buildings around these parks. All in all, Oakridge has 3 acres of open space in addition to the 9 acre park.

The parks plan for the site was adopted by the City's Parks Board in 2018, and were evaluated for consistency with the Greenest City Plan (2010), the Parks Board Strategic Framework (2012), the Local Food Action Plan (2013), the Urban Forest Strategy (2014), the Bird Strategy (2015), the Biodiversity Strategy (2016), the People, Parks, and Dogs Strategy (2017), and the VanPlay: Parks and Recreation Services Master Plan (drafted in 2018, approved in 2020).



Possible Requirement

Little Mountain, elevation 125 m (410 ft) above sea level (<https://vancouver.ca/parks-recreation-culture/queen-elizabeth-park.aspx>), is the highest point in Vancouver. As defined in the proposal, building height is taken from the top of the roof slab of the uppermost inhabited storey, with height being presented as the geodetic value. [Geodetic datum: 88.88 m (291.6 ft.)]

A 52-storey building with the requested additional height of 10.35 m (34 ft.) for machine rooms would have the approximate height of a 55-storey building, which would be an estimated value of 550 ft., using a nominal value of 10 ft. per storey. The approximate value "above sea level" for this tower would be 550 ft. + 291.6 ft. = 841.6 ft.

Thus, at 55 storeys, this tower would be not only the tallest proposed building in Oakridge Centre, but also the highest point in Vancouver. Would the developer be required to install a flashing light at the very top of this tower as a warning to aircraft? If so, what impact would a flashing light have on the livability residents (especially those in the upper floors) of nearby towers on site, on residents of towers in adjacent developments, and on residents in the general area? Would there be any possible legal liabilities?

The height of the 52-storey building is 477 ft. At this height, the City's Planning and Engineering Department have not required us to install a warning light for aircrafts on the building.

Density

Too dense. Oakridge Centre itself is comparable to a mini city and will be surrounded by more density (MTC, Oakridge Transit site, the JCC site and the planned projects on the east side of Cambie St.). In contrast to what is on the BOARDS, it does not build on existing characteristics and contexts of the neighbourhoods immediately to the west and south of the Centre. FSR: 3.71–4.10 FSR. The value 4.10 is the highest yet proposed.

We acknowledge your comment about the existing neighbourhood characteristic and context. While we cannot comment on the specifics of other sites in the community, we can speak to the context of Oakridge.

Oakridge is designated as a Municipal Town Centre in the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS). As you are aware, Municipal Town Centres are intended to be among the regional primary focal points in terms of concentration of residential density, job space, civic, cultural facilities, and transit service. Oakridge is the only Municipal Town Centre identified within the City of Vancouver.

The Cambie Corridor Plan seeks to take advantage of these critical building blocks of sustainable urbanism by integrating them with more dense land uses and additional amenities to build and enhance the existing neighbourhoods along the Corridor. This approach seeks to optimize the advantages and opportunities afforded by a significant infrastructure commitment along this Corridor.



Following the completion and success of the Canada Line and a change in policy to place density at transit stations, an application was made to rezone the property. After two years of public consultation and discussion with the City of Vancouver, the rezoning was approved at a Public Hearing in 2014, resulting in an increase in the density and height.

The current proposal includes revisions to the Oakridge CD-1 (1) Zoning Bylaw. Due to its size and complexity, the project continues to evolve to meet market demand and respond to the current needs of the community. This application outlines increased housing diversity, additional workspace and an improved public amenity offering.

Shadowing

Shadowing on the buildings situated on the north side of 41st is not acceptable. The general shadow studies (6.3) show that the buildings on the northside of 41st Ave. (within RPSC boundaries) would be in almost constant shadow most of the day at the equinoxes, and shadowing would of course be even more extensive during the fall and winter months.

Almost as soon as the shadow of one building passes to the east, another takes its place. In fact, the sidewalks and lower storeys of buildings on the northside of 41st Ave. would be heavily shadowed almost the entire year. In terms of livability impacts, this is not acceptable by any meaningful standard! That, by the way, was not the case with the 2007 Oakridge Centre redevelopment context statement, in which the tallest buildings would have topped out at just over 20 storeys.

We acknowledge your comments about shadow impacts. Prior to submitting the Application for Rezoning Advice, our study revealed that by adding the proposed number of rental units to Building 5, a small portion of Columbia Park to the east would be shadowed on the summer solstice at 6:00 pm. In response, the typical floor to floor height for Building 5 was reduced, to ensure the maximum amount of rental housing could still be provided while minimizing shadow impacts on the surrounding public spaces.

View

In both the original and revised projects, the view corridor(s) from Queen Elizabeth Park will disappear. City Council, when it approved the original proposal, ignored the residents' comments. This is a serious blow to the tourist sector.

We acknowledge your comment about view corridors.

Other

The wind factors generated by the towers could cause problems for pedestrian circulation.

Wind Studies have been done by a third-party engineering firm RWDI to identify any locations in the project site which has the potential to generate high wind speeds and recommend mitigation strategies to be incorporated into building design.



Housing

Affordability

There is a need to clarify Westbank's interpretation of 20% requirement for affordable housing. There is a distinction between social (i.e., subsidized) housing and affordable, moderate income rental (MIR) housing. The City's 20% policy for large sites re: Social Housing is not MIR regardless of CCP3. This is an ambiguity with the CCP3.

The following description of MIR housing and the $\geq 20\%$ requirement in order to obtain increased density are taken from the 2nd paragraph of the Sadhu Johnston email: The moderate income rental housing concept requires that developers secure a portion of the units (generally at least 20%) at rental rates that are specified by the City, and that are affordable to households with incomes between \$30,000 and \$80,000 per year at approximately 30% of gross household income. In return for this secured affordability, the City offers significantly greater incentives, primarily additional density.

For this project: Social housing units: $290/3323 = 8.7\%$. Far below 20%. / Affordable housing units: $94/3323 = 2.8\%$. Again, well below 20%. Non-profit social housing is given very low priority; the BC Step Program for minimum-size units is not adhered to.

The increase in floor area for affordable rental housing meets the requested minimum of 25% of the floor area that is counted in the calculation of the floor space ratio. These spaces will be made available to moderate income households; earning between \$30,000 and \$80,000 per year.

This is consistent with the Council Report dated July 14, 2019 titled: *Issues Report: Direction for the Intensification of Large Sites to Include Moderate Income Rental Housing* which included direction for staff to consider major project sites to determine their capacity to accommodate additional density for moderate income rental housing. This housing will include rental rates and operating requirements in accordance with City's *Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP) (2017)*.

This proposal includes 94 units in Building 10 that will be below-market rental units that will meet the MHIRP guidelines of affordability, which is typically 30% of median income.



Unit Sizes

Not all floor plans are presented. Below are some values.

- *Design Analysis p. 168–169*
- *A few examples are presented (one floor each for Bldgs. 5, 12, 13, & 14).*
- Size Range (~sf)
 - *Studio: 363–470 (Bldg. 2 has studios at 344 sf)*
 - *1 bedroom: 625–781*
 - *2 bedroom: 899–1174*

The smallest studios are very small, as are the smallest 2-bedroom units.

Unit sizes will be determined through the development permit process and will comply to City of Vancouver Housing Guidelines.

Commercial Spaces

The model for renting commercial space is passe. Hudson's Bay is crumbling and Nordstrom may not be far behind. Will the apparent switch to online purchasing continue, thus reducing the need for brick-and-mortar stores?

Based on the current economic forecasting for retail in the future, we do not foresee a significant departure from brick-and-mortar stores and anticipate the need for commercial space in the Oakridge redevelopment. This demand will be supplemented by the new residents of the residential towers. More than ever, we believe that the quality of spaces will be a significant contributor to the success of retail environments and are committed to providing a variety of spaces that support community interaction and connectivity.

Retail Space

For decades, Oakridge Mall has served individuals residing in a wide area. As proposed, the new Oakridge Centre will have an enormous increase in residents on site. Added to this are the increase in residents in other surrounding developments (Municipal Town Centre (MTC), Heather Lands and the Oakridge Transit site). Just as diversity is needed in housing to ensure that units are available across income levels, diversity in retail is essential.

The stores cannot all be high-end. Stores should reflect the needs of local consumers in terms of goods and services and pocketbooks. This will reduce travel to other areas and provide local services to those on site and those in the area. This would be in line with the current thinking that places an emphasis on shopping locally.

The Safeway store is going to have to be HUGE, if it is to service the needs not only of residents in the current large catchment area (this part of the city is a food desert), but also the thousands of new residents of Oakridge Centre, MTC, Oakridge Transit site, and Heather Lands.

We acknowledge your comment about needing a diversity in retailers – we agree! Oakridge is intended to be a complete community, a place that residents and visitors can get all their needs



met (i.e. health care providers, retail needs, grocery etc). For example, on site we are constructing a new grocery store on site to service the neighbourhood that will be around 50,000sf.

Office Space

Due to the CoVid-19 pandemic, many people are working from home, and employers are realizing employees can be productive in doing so. The demand from doctors for office space may be diminished, as many doctors now attend to patients electronically, orders tests by computer, and have pharmacists do more.

Post pandemic, it is possible that at least some people will continue to work from home. If so, companies may decide to decrease their physical office footprint. Is the new amount of office space reasonable? Will it be rentable/affordable? How "diverse" will the increased workspace be? Will this be mainly white-collar positions?

In line with the current forecasting, although working from home has become standard throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, we do foresee a return to offices and do not anticipate a decrease in demand for office space in Vancouver. Currently, Vancouver has the lowest office space vacancy rate in the country, at 5.8%, and continues to experience a high demand. The downtown Vancouver and Metro Vancouver vacancies are also the lowest among large urban centres in North America.

Of course, some companies will continue flexibility for their employees to work from home and this presents an interesting conversation about the importance of residential amenity spaces (i.e. shared workspaces, common amenity rooms etc). As the COVID-19 pandemic continues, and the development Oakridge evolves, these are important conversations that will need to be further explored.

The proposed office space will be made available at market rates. Given the multi- year built out of Oakridge, it is difficult to predict market conditions at the time of the project's completion. We envision a wide range of office tenants taking up space at Oakridge. There will be spaces dedicated to smaller offices, as well as larger headquarters for corporations who are looking to relocate to Oakridge. There will also be a mix of medical, dental, and wellness spaces for varied tenancies and to offer more services to the residents of the Oakridge community. We expect the tenancies to reflect the diversity of Vancouver's commercial landscape.

If more office space is needed: Why was this not addressed in CCP Phases 1 & 2? Did the city drop the ball on this? Where are the data that shows this need?

As mentioned, Vancouver enjoys some of the lowest commercial vacancy rates in North America. This has been a steady trend over the past decade, and something that was considered in the 2014 rezoning. The addition of workspace to the development is an important factor contributing to the health of whole communities.



Construction Materials

The use of materials are incongruous and competing. Lack of use of innovative new materials, i.e., promoting cross-laminated timber CLC as a BC-made product.

We acknowledge your comment about building materials. While CLT is one innovative form of building material, our proposal for Oakridge balances the many considerations when it comes to building materials and performance. While we are taking into account using CLT for parts of Phase 2, the building materials we have used and designed for so far on the project offer the same level of sustainability. We have been procuring our materials locally as well as overseas

The construction team at Oakridge utilizes a wide range of strategies to reduce material consumption. This includes the reuse of left over concrete (which is normally wasted, the use of insulation containing a high degree of recycled content and low emitting VOC's, paints and adhesives.

Cladding

General cladding not mentioned. Too early in the process?

Yes, at this stage in the planning process, finer building materials are still being defined.

Skin

The skeleton skin analogy that drapes the buildings is dubious and not convincing. It is not clear what this "skin" is. What material? How is the skin constructed? Is this less expensive than building outer walls? If damaged in an area, how is the damage repaired? If composed of panels, what is the possibility of leaks? How expensive is the maintenance? If composed of plastic, how easily could graffiti be removed?

The "Skin" refers to the high-performance curtainwall glazing which forms the building envelope. It is proposed to be triple glazed and will have operable windows and doors which will open onto balconies and decks. The 'bones' refer to the sides of the buildings where projecting terrace and balcony slabs are visible on the facades.

The curtainwall chosen for Oakridge will require no more maintenance than any other project. Any damage that may occur over the lifetime of the building will be repaired through regular maintenance work as typically done with any other development.

Aquifer

This seems to be an unsettled issue. If there is an aquifer, what are the risks concerning an earthquake? Why did city ask developer to do a feasibility study for a well into the aquifer? Will there be problems with the construction of the parking stalls? [There was a prior discussion about problems with burrowing too far underground.]

As with any development proposals, seismic regulations from the BC Building Code will have to be adhered to in building design. The presence of the aquifer is known and has been accounted for



within the revised design proposal approved in 2014, and is carried forward to this revision, including the design rationale, location, and technique for the underground parkade.

The groundwater strategy for the development has netted out the most innovative use of groundwater ever achieved in a North American development. The well feasibility study helped city engineering staff understand specifics of groundwater flow and location, as well as helped to determine the appropriate location for City Groundwater hydrants that can be utilised in the unlikely event of major water line disruption in the future.

Child Care

The proposed child-care centre is inadequate. If there are, say, 2500 residences and 10% have pre-school children, then there would be a minimum of 250 preschoolers. Will the child-care space occupy the ground floor of the Civic/Community Centre?

We acknowledge your comments about our proposed childcare facility. The child care program within the community centre has been designed in coordination with the City of Vancouver facilities staff and adheres to Child Care Licensing guidelines. Childcare locations are usually programmed next to sizeable, private and enclosed outdoor spaces.

Schools

Due to the huge amount of redevelopment occurring in the Cambie Corridor (Oakridge Centre, Oakridge Transit Centre, Heather Lands, MTC, Dogwood Pearson, and along the Corridor itself), elementary schools in the area are currently at or above their capacity. Overcrowded schools not only are an inconvenience for students who cannot find places in their own or adjoining catchment, causing children to travel (more burden on public transportation). School overcrowding also has a negative impact on the learning outcomes of students, disproportionately affecting those on either end of the learning spectrum (high achievers and students with learning disabilities).

School space must be addressed. When schools are crowded, parents may choose to opt out of the public system and send their children to private schools, which further weakens the public system. Although the Vancouver School Board (VSB) has the major responsibility, a developer should also bear some accountability, as these children live in the new development.

The Planning Dept. cannot approve so much density and neglect providing sufficient school space. The Planning Dept. has an obligation to work with VSB on this problem. Are there sufficient area schools, both elementary & secondary, to provide education for the children in the 1223 possible number of family units? (928 2-bedroom units + 297 3-bedroom units = 1223 possible family units)

As part of the redevelopment of Oakridge Centre, Westbank will pay \$1,993,800 to the Province in School Sites Acquisition Charges which, when combined with the charges collected from other developments in the area, will help the School Board in updating and expanding existing schools, or acquiring new land for more schools.



Traffic

Comprehensive study

The traffic study, as required by the City, is very limited in scope and does not give a true picture of the traffic flow that will be generated by the project. The transportation study acknowledges that traffic at the intersection of Cambie and 41st Avenue is already at or near capacity—this intersection is anticipated to operate with an overall LOS E and with unacceptable V/C ratios for several movements; the study notes that nothing is planned to mitigate the increased congestion that this development would create, with the exception of reworking times of signal change. This capacity (or over capacity) is also occurring at other intersections in the area.

RPSC–CVC continues to request that the Engineering Dept. do a comprehensive traffic study for this and neighbouring areas, due to the very large “build-out” that comprises Oakridge Centre, MTC, Oakridge Transit site, and the Heather Lands. A comprehensive traffic survey has to be done on the wider area to include the area bounded by 33rd Ave., Oak St., 49th Ave., and Main St. in order to collect relevant data. Future traffic congestion is a major concern and traffic issues should not be siloed.

We acknowledge your comments about our traffic study and your desires to have the City’s Engineering Department complete their own study of the broader area. We note that your comments have also been shared with the City and should they decide a more comprehensive study is required, we will provide input where possible/ appropriate.

Residential Parking

Having only two access points for residential traffic (Residential Only Ramp (eastern site on 41st) and 45th Avenue/Choy Yuen Crescent), may cause congestion at rush hours—not only at these assess points, but also on 41st Ave. The entrances and exits to the underground parking access to loading area may increase traffic congestion on Cambie and on 41st Ave.

We acknowledge your comments about potential congestion at site entrances during the rush hour periods. We have included multiple entrance/exit lanes at each of the parkade entries to allow for smoother vehicle flow and less traffic. The transportation engineer has certified that the amount of lanes designed for will be more than enough to service the number of vehicles on-site.

Valet Parking

Parking for future residents is planned, in large part, to be a valet-operated system. This is costly: \$4.6 M/y. Is valet parking made necessary due to “stacking” of cars? Will this speed up or slow down access to car?

Valet parking is not made necessary due to the stacking of cars, we opted for stacked parking stalls as we knew that valet parking would be offered at Oakridge. This allows for a higher parking capacity. This will speed up access to your car as there will be services to call your car ahead of when you will be leaving so it will be ready for you upon arrival to the valet stations.



Public Transportation

Ridership capacity of the Oakridge station

A large part of the philosophy of this development is increasing mass transit use. Canada line ridership will certainly increase due to the increased densification of Oakridge Centre and the other major development sites in the area, as well as that in Richmond. Because the Canada Line stations are widely separated, with no station between those at 25th and 41st Avenues, the Oakridge station will bear the brunt of the increased ridership.

Major increases in ridership on the already taxed Canada Line will lead to congestion of passengers in the trains, on the platforms, and in the entrance/exit on Cambie at 41st Ave. Although use of public transportation is being encouraged, Canada Line will be swamped and will not be able to contend with such crowding, thereby putting many people back into cars and further exacerbating the acknowledged traffic problems at 41st and Cambie and at other intersection in the area.

One proposed solution is that station platforms can be enlarged to serve longer trains, but at a very high cost (hundreds of millions); TransLink has no money or plans to do this. To relieve some passenger congestion, an entrance/exit on the north side of 41st Ave. would be useful.

We acknowledge your comments about increased ridership on the Canada Line. Canada Line capacity is not within the purview of the developer. Oakridge is committed to enhancing transit facilities wherever possible and encouraging transit use. The expansion of regional transit systems has been a well-documented goal of Municipal and Provincial governments.

Other Modes

Since City Hall passed the Green Plan this week, there is a push for electric buses. For accessibility, above-ground transit on Cambie is still required.

We acknowledge your comments about electric buses and agree that above-ground transit modes are still a critical piece to the City's transportation plan.

Integration Site & Surroundings

The overall urban organization of Oakridge with other big developments in the neighbourhood falls severely short of integration. Street activity at 41st and Cambie is non-existent, non-animated, and lacks connection from the street to the interior.

There is need for retail face on Cambie and on 41st. A large glass building along 41st is alienating. The cold appearance of glass buildings is very impactful—too much glass and not enough human street traffic generated. Too insular. (Two examples of this alienating effect caused by excessive use of cold glass or sheer walls, with no retail outlets on the street level facing major streets, can be found in the Aberdeen Mall in Richmond and Pacific Centre Mall.)



From the drawings, it is difficult to determine whether the façades of buildings facing Cambie overhang the sidewalk. The arrival area from the Canada Line to the Oakridge Centre is over-crowded, attention-seeking, and over-stimulating; it lacks organization. No proper way-finding is proposed.

At street level, Oakridge intends to be a very lively and active centre in the community. At completion, suitable way-finding will be installed within Oakridge to help people move freely and effortlessly throughout the community. Facades of the buildings do not overhang the sidewalk, they are just designed to have canopies at entryways for weather protection.

Security & Safety Issues

On site

Use of balcony space for agricultural use is questionable as a solution for food security. The proposal envisions a lot of green space, which is good. What kind of security will be needed? What entity will provide said security? Who will pay for that added feature?

Oakridge Park will be owned and operated by the Parks Board. There will be lighting throughout the park for security reasons, and there will be security cameras.

Oakridge buildings will be composed of a lot of glass. How earthquake resistant will all this glass be? Towers, in particular a 52-storey building, could present problems, especially for those living on the upper floors. In the event of an emergency, what are the plans for evacuation? Is there easy access to elevators, fire escapes?

As with all redevelopment proposals, safety and security of building residents are considered during the building design stage and all architectural drawings have to abide by the applicable policies under the BC Building Code which dictates minimum requirements to ensure all building occupants are able to evacuate the building safely in the event of an emergency.

Prior to building occupation, City Staff will also conduct inspections to ensure that buildings are built to the applicable codes and that all the building is safe for occupancy. We have also engaged civil engineering consultants HY Engineering as part of our design team to advise and ascertain compliance to the stringent applicable safety and engineering regulations.

Each building that has office space should have a separate entrance, lobby, and elevators, all of which are intended specifically for the use of the office workers and of clients. Residents should not have to deal with strangers in their buildings.

Office and residential uses will have separated entry ways, lobbies and elevators.

Public safety

With the enormous increase in the number of residents in the area (Oakridge Centre, MTC, Oakridge Transit site, Heather lands), not enough emphasis has been placed on the need for a new fire station IN THE AREA of all these major housing developments.



We acknowledge your comments about the need for more fire stations in the community. We note that your comments have also been shared with the City who will be able to provide further insights.

Other Issues

Effects of the CoVid-19 Pandemic

CoVid-19 pandemic has changed public attitudes on several topics including the use of living and office space. Developers must consider whether people want to live in high rises and small condos or rental units, especially in this new era of contagious diseases that could be transmitted through ventilation or perhaps plumbing. Even after the CoVid-19 problem is resolved, people may not feel comfortable using public transit. It should not be presumed that the public will all return to use of transit.

We acknowledge your comments about potential shifts in resident's desires for multi-unit living and take them into consideration.

Cambie Flyway

Sufficient study apparently has not been given to the hazard to birds. In particular, the glass-walled office building seems extremely problematic. What treatment will be used on windows to deter bird strikes? Would glass impregnated with reflective particles be useful? Frosted images on windows?

The development will incorporate appropriate glass treatments to reasonably prevent bird strikes as outlined by the Bird Friendly Design Guidelines. Reflectivity of glass at the highest bird collision probability areas is dampened by large canopies wherever possible. At podium levels across the project, reflectivity is dampened by sloped glazing. Operable blinds will be installed across the project to further dampen reflectivity of the glass.

New Street

There were no results from an internet search of "Chuy Yuen". The closest was "Chuk Yuen", a location in Hong Kong. Information should be provided as to why "Chuy Yuen" would be an appropriate name for the new street.

The new street is named Choy Yuen Crescent. This name was selected by the City of Vancouver Naming Committee and pays tribute to the Chinese market gardens that were known to the area up until the 1940s. Westbank and the project team were not involved in the naming of this new street.

For more information, please see Council Report from September 4, 2019 ([SOURCE](#))

Living space

There seems to be no concept of changing to meet a new world. The international press states that what the world wants now are the following:

- *More space*



- *More access to green*
- *Wide halls*
- *Windows that open*
- *Stairs*

As very few floor plans were illustrated, it is difficult to ascertain the livability of the units.

We acknowledge your comments about potential shifts in resident's desires and take them into consideration. Access to Oakridge Park from each tower will give residents access to green spaces. Hallways are above the required width as per the Vancouver Building By-law. All suites and bedrooms have operable windows.

Hyperbole

The following comments, noted in the projects planned achievements, are rather "fluffy" and seem to be a "sales pitch". There is no guarantee that they will ever come to fruition.

- *water management and tapping into the aquifer, etc.*
- *reducing the retail space and allowing more space for the growing tech sector*
- *increased work space, leading to more office rental*
- *an economic stimulus with a \$5B price tag*
- *upon completion, 6,000 full-time jobs generated*
- *30,000 construction jobs generated*

"The Woodlands"! Ten trees does not a woodlands make.

We acknowledge your comments above. The project's planned achievements have been included in the design of the project to ensure that they will come to fruition. Below we have included some explanations as to how we plan to achieve each of these statements:

- *Water management has been commented on above on page 2 and 3. Oakridge will tap into the Quadra Sands Aquifer to supply over 72% of the sites non potable water needs. This innovation decreases potable water demand by 40%, reduces water sent directly to the sewer by 61% and recycles more water than any other comparable site in the City.*
- *reducing the retail space and allowing more space for the growing tech*
- *reducing the retail space and allowing more space for the growing tech sector – We will be designing spaces fit for tech companies as a growing industry in Vancouver*
- *increased work space, leading to more office rental*
- *an economic stimulus with a \$5B price tag*
- *upon completion, 6,000 full-time jobs generated – These are generated from all the businesses that will be located at Oakridge*
- *30,000 construction jobs generated – through experience, it is known that construction of the entire project and civil works will create these jobs*
- *"The Woodlands"! Ten trees does not a woodlands make. – Our design calls for more trees in this area than stated*



Discussion Points

Trade-off : Increased Building Heights to Obtain Increased Rental Units

Luxury condo sales are not strong at the present time; the developer (like other developers in the area) is converting market condos into rental and office space to offset potential loss.

Because there is a shortage of affordable rental units in the Vancouver, at face value an increase in rental units sounds good. However, the rental units currently being built may not be the right type. During CCP Phases 1 & 2, market condos were built that were not affordable and not what was really needed. This appears to be what is happening in the rental sector.

For the present proposal, the building heights were already too high; increasing heights to obtain MIR rental units may be too high a price.

- *The majority of these units are market rentals and, therefore, will not be affordable for many people.*
- *This is a large site and, as such, should have both 20% social housing and 20% MIR.*
- *People's attitude toward home ownership is changing. More are opting to rent rather than to buy.*
- *A pause in rental rezoning approvals would permit an inventory of rentals built in the last 10 years, as well what is currently in the pipeline. Such an inventory would include overall number, rental type (studio, 1 bed, 2 bed, etc.), affordability level (how many are social housing, how many are MIR), and size (area square footage). This would allow the construction industry to make decisions based on the data, so that the right kind of units can be built.*

We acknowledge your comments and take them into consideration. We note that your comments have also been shared with the City and would defer to them for further comment.

Market Place Model

As was noted at the meeting, the entire RPSC area is being used to serve private capital. Why should the market place model of development be accepted as the only alternative? Could the city not buy land and then lease it back to buyers and renters ala UBC? Could the province or federal governments not also do this?

Perhaps, the BCI Corp, through Quad Real, could invest in something other than Oakridge. That is money provided to public employees by the public. Should that pension money not be used constructively to provide affordable housing that still earns a reasonable return?

We acknowledge your comments and take them into consideration. We note that your comments have also been shared with the City and would defer to them for further comment where appropriate.



Repeated Comments

Real Concerns Not Being Addressed

RPSC-CVC members were emphatic that two themes were not being seriously addressed: overcrowded elementary schools and transportation issues (traffic congestion, ridership capacity of the Canada Line, ability of the Oakridge station to accommodate the increase in passengers.)

The traffic and school issues have been glossed over. With Oakridge Centre and the other large developments, these two factors alone could absolutely hamstring the south part of city.

We acknowledge your comments and refer to our above responses provided where applicable.

Scale of Project

The scale of Oakridge Centre is mammoth—a real mini city. Although the developer's boards state that the project builds on existing characteristics and contexts of neighbourhoods. This project has NOTHING to do with surrounding neighbourhoods.

This project is staggering in scope and size and feels like huge overkill. People are moving out of the city, because they realize the disadvantages of small spaces.

The whole development seems overwrought, excessive. Most notably, the heights of the towers are out of place, even in comparison to what is proposed for the MTC. When is enough, ENOUGH?

We acknowledge your comments and refer to our above responses provided where applicable.

Other Points

There does not seem to be a strong emphasis on either families or affordability. The estimated total number of residents for Oakridge Centre is not stated. What is the future of The Terraces at the 41st & Cambie entrance?

There are also 384 affordable units across the whole project. For family units, we are following City of Vancouver building by-laws for the number of family units required in each building. We have 35% of our market condo units geared towards families.

On behalf of the project team, we appreciate your ongoing interest and consideration of our proposal.

Sincerely,

Rhiannon Maberley
Westbank

From: Rhiannon Mabberley s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: Re: Concerns regarding the Oakridge Centre project
Date: July 30, 2021 at 10:08:34 AM PDT
To: Allan/Sherry Buium s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Cc: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential "
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Hello Allan,

Thank you for forwarding the attachment. I am pleased you got the response and that the information you were seeking was able to be provided to you.

I am the spokesperson on behalf of the QuadReal & Westbank partnership that is developing Oakridge. However our responses are jointly developed and certainly mirror the intentions of both companies. Westbank and QuadReal partnered on the redevelopment of Oakridge in part because of a shared passion for improving the communities we work in. This includes showing leadership on sustainability initiatives and being a positive part of the economic recovery that is so crucial to a post pandemic reality.

The Oakridge redevelopment represents the highest level of social, economic and environmental aspirations for both Westbank and QuadReal.

On the social piece, Oakridge will contribute over \$500M in community benefits including a new state of the art community centre with a daycare and performance space, a 9 acre park, over \$8.5M in public art, 290 units of social housing, 94 MHIRP units and close to 700 rental units.

We believe these are important amenities that contribute to the health of our city for all members.

On the economic side, Oakridge contributes over \$75M in DCL, DCC and permit fees to the City of Vancouver. These funds help to rebuild failing infrastructure in the Cambie Corridor, provide parks space, day care spaces and social housing. In addition, the project will contribute over \$30M in annual property tax revenue and employ over 30,000 local residents. In the context of falling city revenues from pandemic impacts, it has never been more important to invest these much needed dollars in our back yard.

Lastly on sustainability, Oakridge is overachieving even the aggressive targets that QuadReal has set for its portfolio.

Over 95% of the energy required to fuel Oakridge will come from renewable sources and the project itself will achieve close to 80% GHG emissions reductions. Oakridge also utilizes the most robust water management strategy of any development of its scale in North America, saving more than 70% of water that would be typically used. We are hopeful that the water management strategies utilized on Oakridge will create a new gold standard in how water is used and recycles across the city. Looking around our province today at the widespread drought and wild fires, we are incredibly proud to say that Oakridge is a leader in water management.

We hope this addresses your interest.

Thanks Allan,

Rhiannon

From: Allan/Sherry Buiums. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sent: July 26, 2021 10:23 AM

To: Rhiannon Maberley

Cc: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential ; Janice Toker;
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential; Chan, Helen (Planning)

Subject: Re: Concerns regarding the Oakridge Centre project

Good Morning Rhiannon:

It's rather unfortunate that you were unable to receive the RPSC-CVC's registered mail. But it seems that Zoe was able to forward, to you, the content of the envelope and you were able to prepare a response to our comments/concerns regarding the Oakridge Centre project. Thank you for that.

It seems that you are the designated spokesperson for the project. We would appreciate an explanation to our query regarding *Quad Real's* position regarding their website as per the following:

"Your note mentions *Quad Real* as part of the development team but we did not receive a note from them. This is most unfortunate since *Quad Real*, as per its website, prides itself on being a community minded developer that is involved in the community where its projects are present. We also thought that this would have been an opportunity for *Quad Real* to emphasize the importance of *ESG* as a major institutional investor."

Thank you for considering the preceding. RPSC-CVC looks forward to future conversations on the Oakridge Centre project.

Regards,

Allan

p.s. Attached are the pdf's that were printed for the registered mail