

1. CD-1 Rezoning: 4949-5255 Heather Street and 657-707 West 37th Avenue (Heather Lands) - OTHER

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Full Name	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
05/24/2022	01:45	PH3 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 4949-5255 Heather Street and 657-707 West 37th Avenue (Heather Lands)	Other	Please refer to the attached letter.	Peter M. German	s22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	Appendix A
05/24/2022	08:01	PH3 - 1. CD-1 Rezoning: 4949-5255 Heather Street and 657-707 West 37th Avenue (Heather Lands)	Other	RPSC is attaching 3 files for the Mayor and Council to peruse. The material will be useful in understanding this community groups role in the evolution of the project to the rezoning stage. We are #3 on the speakers' list	Allan Buium		Riley Park	Appendix B

APPENDIX A

Peter M. German, QC, PhD
BARRISTER & SOLICITOR
peter.german@shaw.ca
(604) 916-9030

May 23, 2022

VIA E-MAIL
Mayor and Council
City of Vancouver
British Columbia

Your Worship and Members of Council:

Re: Heather Lands Rezoning Application

I am making this submission as an individual and not on behalf of a client or other person.

I proudly served as a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for over 31 years, in provinces, cities, towns, and indigenous communities across this country. I ended my career as Deputy Commissioner, responsible for Western and Northern Canada. For several years, I was stationed in "E" Division Headquarters, at 37th and Heather Streets. I spent many days in the Fairmont Heritage Building, on course and for work.

My concern with the application before Council relates to unsubstantiated comments included in the Referral Report, as well as information which is not contained within the report. These comments and the information pertain specifically to the Fairmont Heritage Building, located at 33rd and Heather Streets.

Let me begin by saying that I detect a palpable fear on the part of many individuals, including RCMP veterans, who share concerns for this rezoning, but are of the opinion that by speaking up they will be mocked or criticized for exercising their freedom of speech. This is very unfortunate. Furthermore, the RCMP has chosen not to engage in the public discussion of this issue, which I consider to be unfortunate.

The RCMP is British Columbia's provincial police force. Its thousands of officers provide services to hundreds of indigenous communities every day of the year, answering calls for service, assisting youth and the elderly, dealing with crime, and performing the many services that we have come to expect of our police. They are partners in these communities with indigenous people and with councils. Many have died in the service of this province.

It must also be noted that the RCMP has provided service to the City of Vancouver for over 100 years, a fact which has not publicly been recognized. In addition to enforcing drug and other federal laws within the city, the RCMP has come to the aid of the Vancouver Police Department

on numerous occasions, ranging from the Depression riots in the 1930s to the Stanley Cup riots in 1994 and 2011. In 1994, the RCMP tactical troop, of which I was a member, received a unit commendation from Vancouver's Chief of Police.

The general tenor of the report to Council makes no mention of the foregoing, but rather paints the RCMP as something of an occupying force that participated in wrongdoing. Allow me to provide some detail.

Report to Council, p. 6 - *In 1920, the northern portion of the lands were transferred to the RCMP for the British Columbia "Division E" headquarters as the Fairmont Barracks. In 1950, the lands became the regional sub-headquarters which operated until the 1970s and then became the Fairmont Training Academy. In 2012, the RCMP relocated to new headquarters in Surrey*

Comment: The RCMP performed federal policing duties in B.C. prior to 1950. In that year, the RCMP became B.C.'s provincial police force. The Fairmont building variously served as "E" Division Headquarters, Vancouver Sub-Division Headquarters, and the "E" Division Training Academy. It also served as a barracks for police officers, including the crew of the St. Roch, arguably Canada's most famous ship, permanently housed at the Vancouver Maritime Museum.

Report to Council, p. 13 - *the approach to heritage and land ownership. The rezoning application proposes a new cultural centre in place of the Fairmont building, which is supported by the Heather Lands Policy Statement in recognition of the emotional burden of required retention of the former RCMP building.*

Comment: It is easy to write that the retention of the former RCMP building creates an "emotional burden", but what is the basis for this statement? Where is the evidence of the RCMP in British Columbia creating an emotional burden that justifies destroying a heritage building and how will its destruction accomplish this purpose? We must be mindful of the fact that the RCMP's federal presence prior to 1950 was almost exclusively in the Lower Mainland, working drug and other federal statute cases. We must also recall that the RCMP is at this very time providing policing services throughout B.C.

Report to Council, p. 29 - *During the process to create a policy statement for the Heather Lands, the MST Nations requested removal of the Fairmont building from the Heather Lands because of its association with the RCMP. The Fairmont building is a constant reminder of the RCMP's role in enforcement of the Indian Act and other discriminatory laws. The required retention of the building is seen by the MST Nations as an imposition of colonial values.*

Comment: Again, we see reference to removing the Fairmont building, this time "because of its association with the RCMP." The RCMP is Canada's national police force. Where is the empirical evidence that it has done anything other than enforce the laws which it was and continues to be required to enforce. What is the documented involvement of the RCMP in B.C., with respect to the Indian Act? Is there a suggestion that the RCMP acted

outside the law? The B.C. Provincial Police was a colonial law enforcement body. The RCMP never was.

Unmarked Grave(s)

Although I am told it was brought to the attention of staff by the RCMP Veterans' Association, I see no reference in the Referral Report to there being one or more unmarked graves of RCMP officers at or near the Fairmont Building.

Officer O.432, Regimental 11871, Superintendent Joseph John Atherton joined the RCMP in 1932 and served his entire career in the Fairmont Heritage Building. He worked the streets of Vancouver, much of it on drug investigations. Prior to his death in 1988, Superintendent Atherton asked to be buried under the flagpole that is found in front of Fairmont Barracks. He continues to reside there. Superintendent Atherton's story is well documented. It is unknown if other members of the Force were buried on the Fairmont grounds and, if so, how many. It is of the utmost importance that Superintendent Atherton's remains and those of any other members of the Force be located and preserved.

The flagpole which serves as the final resting place for Superintendent Atherton was also the location where Canada's maple leaf flag was raised in Vancouver. The event was front page in the newspaper and was memorialized in a postcard, which was so popular that it was adopted by cities and towns, claiming the scene to be their own. Please refer to the attached images.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

s22(1) Personal and Confidential



Peter M. German, QC, PhD
Barrister & Solicitor
604-916-9030



Dear Allan and members of RPSC,

Thank you for your thorough feedback of the proposed Cambie Corridor Plan. As you are aware, we are proceeding to Council on April 17th for consideration of the Plan, with a follow up Council date in the summer to present the Utilities Servicing Plan and Financing Growth Strategy that will provide detailed information on Plan implementation. We have appreciated the opportunity to frequently attend RPSC meetings to provide updates on planning and receive ongoing feedback. As well, neighbourhood walks with your group have been very useful. We have endeavored to respond to your input and feedback throughout the process.

Your committee's involvement over the length of the planning process has provided us insight and guidance on many of the issues and concerns facing the local community. Your feedback along with other stakeholders has initiated a number of additions to address affordability and the creation of more livable, family friendly developments - two issues that RPSC has been passionate about throughout the process. Your feedback has also directly resulted in conducting a post-occupancy survey within the Corridor to better understand the neighbourhood experience and needs of new residents.

The Phase 3 Cambie Corridor Plan is a comprehensive plan covering five neighbourhoods, including the Oakridge Municipal Town Centre. It encompasses all three phases of planning that have been undertaken since 2009, collectively delivering on the original

Cambie Plan planning principles and city-wide objectives. In knitting together phases 1, 2 and 3 of the Plan, the document is substantial (250 pgs) and comprehensive. In reviewing your detailed feedback below, I believe a number of questions and issues are addressed in the Plan.

Phase 3 aims to deliver diverse and affordable housing opportunities throughout the Corridor, with a particular focus on larger unique sites and within the Municipal Town Centre neighbourhood where the opportunity and potential to deliver is greatest. The clear guidance for a mix of market rental, below market rental, social housing and strata housing will support the ongoing development of diverse, mixed-income neighbourhoods throughout the Corridor with many more housing opportunities for families, “missing middle” generations, and for seniors. The focus on providing the “right supply” of housing reflects your comments on affordable housing as a basic community need (community amenity planning tools simply help us to deliver on this objective).

A key part of the Plan is a detailed public benefits strategy which identifies specific amenities (including emergency service facilities), approximate time frame of delivery, and location to the extent possible. We have worked with school boards to coordinate our work with their planning and initiatives to consider and address future growth. There is also a comprehensive transportation policy section and multi-modal network/ system which has been developed based on analysis that includes population projections, land uses, mode share and enhancements to the system. This has been developed through an integrated approach examining the major projects and phase 2 developments in the study area holistically.

We hope to create great streets, local serving shops in each neighbourhood (local commercial added in strategic locations), a

new centre for business, housing for families located off arterial streets, a variety of built form and a network of vibrant, public spaces that will support diverse neighbourhoods. We feel that the Plan will meet the needs of the community moving forward, and that the bold vision for the Corridor will help us collectively tackle our housing affordability challenges.

Staff would be happy to meet and connect further with RPSC to go through specific questions below. There is much work ahead related to implementation to realize successful planning and we hope to continue to work with you in this regard.

Thank you again for your feedback, and ongoing dedication to the community.

Regards,

Susan Haid MCIP, CSLA, RPP

Assistant Director of Planning – Vancouver South Division
Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability

City of Vancouver Ph: 604.871.6431 e: susan.haid@vancouver.ca



From: Allan Buium s22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 7:48 PM

To: Kelley, Gil

Cc: Robertson, Gregor; Affleck, George; Ball, Elizabeth; Bremner, Hector; Carr, Adriane; Deal, Heather; De Genova, Melissa; Jang, Kerry; Louie, Raymond; Reimer, Andrea; Stevenson, Tim; Johnston, Sadhu; Haid, Susan; Ronalds, Lil; Gresley-Jones, Jessie; Chapman, John; McGuire, Michelle; Robinson, Kirsten; Behler, Kirsten; Rougeau, Tiffany; Stanford, Carl; Bennett, Zachary; Jin, Jessica; King, Lisa (PLN);

josh.cairns@vancouver.ca; Deana Grinnell

Subject: RPSC -- CCP3

March 28, 2018

Mr. Gil Kelley, General Manager Planning
Urban Design and Sustainability
City of Vancouver

Dear Mr. Kelley:

The Riley Park South Cambie Community Visions Steering Committee (RPSC-CVC) has had the opportunity to carefully examine the Proposed Plan for the Cambie Corridor, Phase 3 (CCP3). The following concerns and ideas are the results of our discussions based both on our position on the CCP2 Evaluation Framework (please see November 2, 2017) and the Planning Department's proposals for CCP3 as presented at a couple of our meetings, in the on-line material and at the March 2018 open houses.

Housing

The themes of “affordable housing” versus “social housing” versus “non-market housing” versus “work force housing” have been addressed in the latest Plan, but in a rather confusing manner.

- * Excessive density within a limited area has created relentless pressure on the RPSC community.

- * Non-market housing units in high-rise buildings, with no socio-economic mix is a recipe for untoward social issues, such as the “ghettoizing” of a socio-economic group of renters and the creation of “project”-type housing, which was proven to fail decades ago in many large North American cities.

- * No mention of alternative housing models, e.g. co-op housing.

- * There seems to be a “feeding frenzy” by developers, as the proposed rezoning is not prescriptive, thus leaving too much

room for speculation for developers to make the final decision, e.g. constructing four-storey strata versus six-storey rental buildings.

- * There may be some efforts to address the excessive supply of high-end condos within the CCP3. But, with the cost of land being what it is, what are the incentives for developers to construct condos of a more modest nature?

- * Housing should never be considered a community amenity. Housing is a necessity.

- * An emphasis on “family housing” is positive, but again, the question is cost of housing in relation to family income.

- * There is no mention of condo “pre-sales”, yet pre-sales seem to be “the problem” with regard to both speculation and housing costs.

Schools

Where are the plans for a new elementary school within CCP3?

- * Within the area bordered by 41st Ave., Oak St., King Edward Ave. and Ontario St. there are only two elementary schools, Wolfe and Emily Carr. Each already serves an established residential area. Perhaps the Eric Hamber Secondary site should be considered for an elementary school or as a shared site with Rose-Des-Vents on the Heather Lands.

Integrated Services

There is a need for better integration of the various City departments, as the “silo culture” has become an obvious hindrance to good planning.

The theme of “complete streets” and the idea of improved connections within neighbourhoods enhances livability is mentioned, but there is a serious omission in this plan.

- * Why is there no mention of a **comprehensive traffic** study and the implementation of a workable plan? The drastic increase in density as proposed in the CCP3, especially around

41st Ave, and Cambie St., will place a great strain on infrastructure. RPSC-CVC has long stressed the need for such a comprehensive study.

- * There is no mention of the vehicular impact on bicycle routes, especially where access to residential parking crosses a bicycle route.

- * What is the “domino effect” of vehicular traffic on areas immediately abutting the CCP3 area and the blocks beyond?

Public transit receives attention, e.g. the Canada Line and an eventual B-Line along 41st Ave.

- * What about the need to improve service along the following routes: 3, 15, 17, 25, 33 and 41? There is no mention of the passenger line-ups during rush hours on some of these routes. Translink representatives should be expected to attend open houses in order to answer questions.

Retail space has been mentioned, but the economic viability of small retail, e.g., green grocer, coffee shop, bakery or the like, has not been addressed. Rental rates in the area are not necessarily commensurate with the ability of small retailers to make a satisfactory livelihood.

Public safety receives scant attention. Fire, ambulance and police services will need to be increased as the population increases. There is no fire hall within CCP3. Will the four closest fire halls be sufficient to contend with the increased density and building heights as the Corridor is built out? Is the Planning Staff in dialogue with these departments? What input from the various departments has Planning Staff received?

The need to address the demands on community amenities was glossed over. A case in point is the Hillcrest Centre; it is designated as a “destination centre”, whereas more locally oriented centres are needed. Amenities must parallel increased

density. In addition, for the sake of transparency, a concerted effort must be made to show where CAC's are being used and where and when they will be used.

The specific section on the "Public Realm" is a positive ingredient for CCP3.

- * Hopefully this will create a sense of community and a more livable neighbourhood.

- * Listen to the community when decisions are to be made for the selection of public art.

- * How does the "Cambie Heritage Boulevard" serve as a place of refuge from vehicular traffic?

- * What is meant by "creating a breathing space" from 39th Ave. to 41st Ave. when 34-storey buildings are planned for this area?

There are serious shortcomings in the manner in which the proposed plan for CCP3 has been presented. They are:

- * It is unclear as to where the CCP3 begins and ends and where the OMTC begins and ends. This confusion is analogous to an amoeba moving through its territory.

- * Failure to communicate with the many residents residing outside the immediate "boundaries" of the CCP3.

- * Open house consultations in 2017 did not include these residents.

- * When noting the significant numbers of residents who attended open houses, etc. statistics should be presented as to where the attendees reside.

- * To communicate with residents means at least a mail-out to participants within the RPSC community. The simple rationale for the preceding is that many saw some of the consultation sessions were by invitation only; i.e., residing within the "boundaries".

- * On a few boards, it was noted that there are unique sites for future development, yet residents close to those sites were not

aware of the open houses/workshops.

Those sites are: 25th and Oak St. (King Edward Mall), Balfour rental complex and the Little Mt. Housing area. To omit the areas noted is to ignore the impact the CCP3 will have on the surrounding neighbourhoods. Be it from a vehicular traffic perspective or just the increased population and the use of public facilities and certainly the public transit services.

* The actual site for the March 2018 open houses was somewhat disrespectful to the residents as there was very limited space to move around and view the few boards on display as well as not having easy access to the planners in attendance.

The members of RPSC-CVC continue to experience a level of frustration with the proposed plan for CCP3. Are the Planning Dept. and City Council truly listening to the community and RPSC-CVC? It is important to recognize that the RPSC continues not only to be the “eyes and ears” of the community, but also the repository of the continuity and history of the RPSC community as it has evolved. As stated in section 34.2 of the *RPSC Community Visions* (2005), a document still referenced by the City,

Community residents should be involved with the City in the implementation of Vision Directions, and in monitoring and evaluating how well implementation actions work toward achieving Vision Directions.

This idea is restated in Section 14 of the *Guidelines for Redevelopment in Riley Park/South Cambie* (2016)

The RPSC-CVC urges the City and the development community to take a more thoughtful and sensitive approach to further redevelopment...looks forward to an improved consultation process and, as it has in the past, will continue to ...actively participate in, all forms of public consultation.

The RPSC-CVC appreciates the opportunity afforded by the City

to see the proposed plan for CCP3. But, we are concerned that our role as the community “watchdog” has been somewhat ignored, in light of the RPSC-CVC’s evaluation of CCP2, which you received in November, 2017. In addition the CCP3 proposed plan has placed the community under “siege” by the amount of development being proposed. That is, the Oakridge Centre, the Oakridge Municipal Town Centre, the Oakridge Transit Centre, Heather Lands and the unique sites of King Edward Mall, Balfour rental complex and the Little Mt. Housing site.

We look forward to further consultation on the proposed CCP3 plan before it is taken to Council.

Sincerely,

Allan Buium, Chair
on behalf of the RPSC Steering Committee

cc: Mayor and Council
Sadhu Johnston, City Manager
Susan Haid, Assistant Director of Planning, Vancouver
South Division (VSD)
Lil Ronalds, Planner, VSD
Jessie Gresley-Jones, Planner, VSD
John Chapman, Planner, VSD
Michelle McGuire, Planner, VSD
Kirsten Robinson, Planner, VSD
Kirsten Behler, Planner, VSD
Tiffany Rougeau, Planner, VSD
Carl Stanford, Planner, VSD
Zachary Bennett, Planner, VSD
Jessica Jin, Planner
Lisa King, Planner, VSD
Josh Cairns, Planner, VSD
Deana Grinnell, Canada Lands

March 22, 2022

Kirsten Robinson, Planner, Major Projects
Planning Department
City of Vancouver

Dear Kirsten:

Re: Heather Lands and Beyond

At the February 16th meeting of Riley Park South Cambie Community Visions Steering Committee (RPSC-CVC)**, we reviewed the productive February 10th discussion concerning Heather Lands (HL) which we had with you, your City staff colleagues, and the proponents of the project. We think that HL should be viewed as a catalyst for a review of the Cambie Corridor Phase 3 Policy (CCP3). The HL is only one segment of the unfolding of CCP3. It is not too late to carefully examine what has been completed, what is waiting to be constructed, and what is planned for future proposals.

The following comments/concerns are from the RPSC-CVC meetings of February 16th and March 16th. Please note that these items touch on topics directly related to HL and on those concerning the wider community. The items are not necessarily listed in order of importance.

— There continues to be interest in seeing the proposed retail in the NE sector opening in the earlier phase of the HL development and perhaps in the building on 37th Ave. in Phase 1.

— We appreciate the HL plans for using the most recent advances in technology regarding the construction of the building and their impact on climate change.

— We understand that the plans and drawings for the HL Cultural Centre are still well in the future. RPSC-CVC is very interested in the ideas for integration of this Centre with the surrounding community, the

programmes to be offered, etc. We request that we be kept informed of these details.

— The Planning Dept. needs to be more creative in how the CCP3 unfolds, *i.e.*, in the designs of building and in mandating the introduction of building technologies that will meet the future challenges of climate change. How will the City cope with future “heat domes”? Has the City discarded the idea of a *central* District Energy *heating* system that was originally planned for the Cambie Corridor?

— To date, the City’s planning for a walkable community is not evident. Along Cambie St., there is no zoning for retail from King Edward Ave. south to 39th Ave., other than that proposed for the HL (near 33rd Ave. & Heather St.) when that project is in its final phase. It is most unfortunate that the Planning Dept. did not prepare a comprehensive plan regarding the types of businesses coming into the area. Within the RPSC, the only retail locations are along Cambie from 16th to 19th (Cambie Village), and minimal retail from 24th to 25th and from 39th to 41st on Cambie, King Edward Mall at 25th & Oak and on Main St.

— City Council must convince the BC Tax Assessment Authority to re-examine the way in which small businesses are taxed. The tax burden has become prohibitive for many of these businesses. It is imperative that there is more support for local businesses. RPSC-CVC suggest that the City engage in a “support local businesses campaign.”

— Community amenities *i.e.* Hillcrest Centre and Douglas Park CC are already near capacity. Is there a guarantee that the new amenities at Oakridge Centre will be sufficient to accommodate future demands of the increasing number of residents in the RPSC community?

— There is a need for further dialogue between the City and Park Board on the future demands on the parks in the area — Douglas, Hillcrest, Riley, Columbia and Queen Elizabeth. Queen Elizabeth Park is especially burdened as it is both a destination for the City’s residents and the #3 tourist attraction in Vancouver.

— A dialogue between the City and the VSB must take place regarding

a future site for an elementary school. Where will the many new families that will be moving to the many housing developments within the RPSC be sending their children?

— The City's construction policy regarding the glazing of buildings is not clear. Is it a recommendation or a mandatory requirement for all new buildings within CCP3? Have there been any studies on bird protection?

—Walkable areas should be safe from vehicular traffic. This is not the case where condominium/townhouse projects back onto lanes that were to be "pedestrian friendly". These lanes are actually dangerous for pedestrians. This situation has been aggravated as more delivery vehicles are directed off the arterials and into the lanes.

—The preceding concern is best exemplified where street trees have been removed to construct a bicycle path. Although a safe sidewalk exists, there is now the need for courier deliveries to use the back lanes on both Cambie St., south of McGuigan Ave. and along West King Edward Ave, east of Cambie. Both examples are just the initial changes planned for both streets.

— Traffic patterns need to be discussed in a public forum. The creation of a new street, 35th Ave. west of Cambie St. is a case in point, as its impact in the surrounding area is not clear. How will Heather and Manson Streets south of 37th Ave. be affected by new development? Will the buildout of the Oakridge Municipal Town Centre affect traffic patterns both north and south of 41st Ave. from King Edward to 49th Ave., from Oak St. to Main St.?

— RPSC-CVC has had discussions with the Engineering Dept. The latter's reluctance to proceed with our request for a **comprehensive traffic study** is not acceptable. RPSC-CVC will continue to request such a study. (See rpscvisions.ca *Guidelines for Redevelopment in Riley Park/south Cambie, March 2016, Ch. 11*)

— A few years ago, RPSC-CVC organized a "walkabout", composed of members of RPSC-CVC and members of City staff, through parts of the CC in order to view issues in the area. We are willing to organize a similar

event for the immediate future. “Feet on the ground” gives one a better perspective of a situation than “Google Earth”! If a “walkabout” would be agreeable to you and your colleagues, please suggest dates that would be convenient. We suggest 3-5PM and we could suggest areas to view.

Sincerely,

Allan Buium, Chair
on behalf of 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*.

cc: Brennan Cooke, MST
Elisa Campbell, Canada Lands
Cristina Horta, Dialogue Architects
Scott Bell, Planner, Major Projects
Rosemarie Draskovic, Transportation Planning
Tim Barton, Transportation Planning
Theresa O'Donnell, General Manager, Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability
Kirsten Behler, Planner, Cambie Corridor
Mateja Seaton, Planner, Cambie Corridor

Heather Lands Rezoning Application Response to RPSC questions - December 2021

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION

Phasing

The plans for phasing should be adjusted so that Phase 1 will include the following:

- The commercial section at the north end of the site, which should also incorporate the office spaces (retail and medical). There is a strong demand for retail, especially a food market. As this area of the city is a food desert. The developers should note that it is likely that many residents outside HL will want to take advantage of these retail spaces!
- The Cultural Centre, as there is a demand for more community amenity space. This would be a very positive from a public-relations point of view.
- The Child Care facility, as there is a strong demand for more spaces in the community.

A time-line for building completion would be helpful. Sales could start in 2023 and a possible 12-year build-out.

The Developer is proposing to develop the site from South to North in 5 phases. There will be two CD-1s roughly divided by 35th Ave (CD-1 North and CD-1 South). The first phase of CD-1 North includes a social housing building which is supported by the City.

Child Care

More child-care spaces will be needed. The child-care facility is open to residents both within and without the HL development. With the number of family units proposed for HL and the strong demand in the neighbouring community for more spaces, the proposed number of child-care spaces seems inadequate.

The child-care facility should be on the ground floor, not the 4th floor as is being proposed.

The Heather Lands Policy Statement requires a 69-space childcare facility (section 9.2.5). The rezoning application has increased the size to 74-spaces. The childcare centre is proposed to be located on Parcel I (northeast corner of the site), co-located with retail, office, rental and market housing. The childcare is on the 4th level to take advantage of the podium which creates safe outdoor play space that is directly connected to each age group.

Cultural Centre

The Cultural Centre will be operated by the MST Partnership or a delegate and is to be open to all residents in the area, not just to the residents of the site. This would be a very positive aspect, as there is a demand for more community amenity space. As described in the proposal, the Centre should be most welcome, providing the community with educational and cultural opportunities and meeting space for various activities.

How are First Nations practices to be included in the everyday life of HL? The First Nations practices will be determined by the MST Partnership. It is anticipated that Indigenous culture will also be represented through art and building design.

How is the archaeology going to be dealt with during the excavation of the site? The Developer will work with each of the Nations to establish appropriate procedures during excavation. The City has chance find procedures for construction of roads.

Will an Indigenous name be conferred on the site, rather than using 'Heather Lands'? The City expects that the MST will choose to name the site. The MST will need to come together to determine an

appropriate/agreed name. The City through the Street Naming Committee will work with the MST on the naming of new streets. The Park Board will work closely with MST on the naming of the new park.

Type of Housing Units

The number of Social Housing and Secured Market Rentals and 100 MIR units is positive, especially the emphasis on family-oriented units. The housing mix is proposed as 2,612 units, 1652 condos, 300 Market Rentals, 100 MIRPH units, 540 (20%) Social Housing.

The Social Housing will be owned by MST. Is there a target market for the Social Housing? First Nations? Open to all? The Social Housing will be open to all. The City will work with the MST to determine if there is a priority for MST members.

If First Nations will continue to own the land, does that mean that there will be long-term land leases for the condos? The MST has expressed intent to retain ownership of the land long-term. Condos are proposed to be leasehold.

There is no mention of housing for seniors or for First Nations' Elders. The housing tenures (social and rental) proposed for the site are inclusive. There is no dedicated seniors housing proposed currently.

Size of Housing Units

The size of some of the units needs to be re-examined. Greater floor space should be considered. There is quite a reduction in size for the 2- and 3-bedroom social units. Why does the 2-bedroom unit have the greatest % reduction in size?

The City of Vancouver Zoning and Development By-Law Minimum unit size is 398 sq. ft. (note rental units can be relaxed to 320sqft subject to Director of Planning approval and livability). There are no minimum unit sizes by unit type (i.e. 2-bedroom units), however, residential unit size and layout to ensure functionality and livability is reviewed. Further, the High Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines includes an objective to ensure size and layout of units are appropriate to meet the needs of families with children; this includes a criteria that each bedroom should be large enough to accommodate a single bed, a dresser, a desk or table, and in children's bedrooms, some floor space for playing. The detailed staff review of unit functionality and livability will be conducted at the Development Permit stage.

FSR

The proposed FSR has gone up to 2.75 (which is actually 3.4 FSR on the 'net' lands after deducting the 4-acre park). Total area is to be 2.52 M sq. ft.

The Heather Lands Policy Statement (section 4.2.1) enables development of 2,296,000 sq.ft. which equates to 2.50 FSR plus additional floor area for the cultural centre, childcare facility and elementary school.

In 2019, Council approved consideration of additional floor area (~10%) for rental housing to align with the Sustainable Large Sites Policy which was updated in 2018. Consistent with this direction, the application includes additional 10% floor area including rental housing and office.

There was much discussion during the Policy statement about the proposed density/FSR being justified by a Canada Line station at 33rd Ave. With no station being built in the foreseeable future, is this a credible argument to justify such density?

While a station is possible at 33rd where the tracks are straight and flat, it is not anticipated. This was clearly documented at each open house and the Council report supporting the Policy Statement. Please refer to 'Transportation Network & Transit' boards.

Slide 27: <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/heather-lands-open-house-20180309.pdf>

ZB: A ballpark estimate of the number of individuals that would be living in this new neighbourhood is 4,500.

Cladding

Not mentioned. Too early in the process? Interesting exteriors that blend with the proposed green areas would be welcome. Avoid monotonous exteriors.

It is too early to determine materials. Some direction for architecture/materials will be included in the Design Guidelines.

Height

Because this is a “large site” and most especially because it is a joint CLC–MST project, Cambie Corridor Plan 3 constraints on building heights do not apply; therefore, little can be argued against the heights of these towers. Besides, immediately to the south, will be the high-rise buildings of MTC and the excesses of the Oakridge Centre, so that HL towers will not seem all that out-of-place.

The heights have been determined through engagement during development of the Policy Statement supported by urban design analysis. Heights were increased to accommodate additional rental floor area.

Shadowing

Extensive shadowing will occur in the surrounding neighbourhood, particularly in the winter.

Shadow studies were completed at policy statement phase and are included in the rezoning application. The focus is to minimize shadowing on public spaces.

Floor Plans

None given. Too early in the process? RPSC-CVC would be interested to see these when available.

The floor plans will be available for each parcel at the Development Permit phase. Some minimum requirements will be in place. 50% of social housing units will be designed for families with children. At least 35% of market and rental buildings will be designed for families with children, at least 10% will include 3 bedrooms or more.

Rents

As listed in tables (Development Statistics, A0.01), the rents are reasonable for the MIR units.

There will be affordability targets for a percentage of the social housing and the rental housing. These will be secured through the rezoning conditions.

VSB Elementary School

The issue of a VSB elementary school for the area is being addressed by RPSC-CVC. Unfortunately, there are serious challenges to such a site coming to fruition. The Provincial Government must become involved, if a school is to materialize.

A suggestion was made that MST build a public elementary school that teaches children the Coast Salish language. This kind of school is essential to language preservation. Children from the surrounding neighbourhood could be welcomed in the spirit of reconciliation.

The developer foresees a significant number of families residing at HL. It would be beneficial for these families to be in direct communication with the VSB in order to put pressure on the Board to plan for a new school.

To date, there has been no information from the VSB on whether a new elementary school is being planned for the area.

The Heather Lands is providing a site for the CSF elementary school. CoV staff are in regular contact with VSB and we provide information regarding anticipated number of units, % required to be family housing, and tenure % required to be social housing and rental housing. VSB uses this information to determine the anticipated number of school age children for their planning purposes.

Traffic

There continues to be a serious concern with regards to the traffic that will be generated from the site and from the surrounding neighbourhood, especially as the OMTC and other large developments come on stream. RPSC-CVC is continuing its discussion with the CoV's Engineering Department concerning this problem.

With rental units at the HL site, the density was increased by 10%. With some 3,000 new housing units, the traffic load in the area will be very heavy. It is acknowledged that the intersection of Cambie and 33rd Ave. is already at, or near, capacity.

As part of the application, the density was increased by approx. 10% (225,107 sq.ft.). Of that additional density approximately 70,000 sq. ft. is office and approximately 150,000 sq.ft. is rental housing. That would yield approx. 180 additional housing units.

The developer is required to provide a report estimating the number of new vehicle trips and how they will affect existing intersection operations. The City will work with the developer to mitigate these impacts and the development will be responsible for delivering a number of transportation improvements within and around the site. In the case of Heather Lands this includes opening up a new connection between the site and Cambie St on 35th Ave. As per the City's existing policies, the objective is to accommodate most trips to and from Heather Lands by foot, bike or transit. Providing safe and attractive facilities for people using these modes is of paramount importance in terms of encouraging people to use these modes. Ensuring safe access and circulation for people driving vehicles (including goods vehicles) is also important and continues to be a focus for the city and developer.

As noted in the section Phasing (see above), due to lack of retail in the area, the grocery and other stores may receive a high volume of customers, especially residents from outside the HL. This area is a food and commercial desert and these stores would be conveniently located for area residents. This may cause heavy traffic on 33rd Ave. and on the new commercial street located west of Parcel I.

It is the intent of the Heather Lands plan is to encourage walking and cycling while reducing personal vehicle use. The provision of small scale retail will provide for local daily needs thus reducing the need for vehicle trips. The Heather Lands is centrally located and may attract other nearby residents.

The Heather St. diversion is completely new. Should there not be a separate and thorough review?

Where Heather St meets 35th there is a slight diversion in the alignment. This is to create a 'T' intersection that is safer than the angles shown in the policy statement. The review of the rezoning application is looking carefully at the proposed angle and vehicle/cyclist/pedestrian movement.

The Cambie Corridor Plan envisages Heather St between 37th Ave and 41st Ave as a 'car-light street', meaning priority will be given to people walking or biking and vehicle access may be restricted. Between

35th Ave and 37th Ave, Heather St will offer a car free experience for people to walk and cycle away from traffic. This was planned for in the Policy Statement. Combined, this vision for Heather St will make sustainable transportation choices more attractive to residents and visitors.

Major intersections in the area are already at or near capacity, and two main intersections will be operating at overcapacity when the project is built. Minimal mitigation is planned. Increased traffic congestion on 33rd Ave. between Cambie and Oak is inevitable. The closure of parts of Heather St. will be problematic, as Heather St. is used by neighbourhood residents when traffic is heavy on Cambie and West 33rd when going south.

What will be the impact of the construction traffic for the HL and for the new Eric Hamber School (immediately to the west of the HL site) on the traffic flow?

Is it possible that construction vehicles and workers exclusively use the new proposed West 35Ave. to access the site? Is it possible that all construction parking be exclusively on the HL site?

Pre-construction the site is required to meet with and coordinate construction and street use with our Engineering team. Appropriate permits are required to secure street space and any closures must be permitted in advance with proper traffic management plans approved. This may include Temporary Street Occupancy permits which allow temporary suspension of parking regulations for construction activities. Street closures for crew parking are not permitted.

How important is the new street, 35th Ave. west of Cambie, to the project? New street closures are to be included in Phase 1, with closure of the Heather St. right-of-way between 35th and 37th Aves. to take place in Phase 2.

Parking

There will be a <1:1 ratio for parking stalls. How will this comply with the present parking requirements? Plans call for only 2,000 parking stalls and 5,000 bike stalls. Does this include both the resident parking and that for visitors, office staff, clients, etc.? (As there are no plans for a Canada Line station at 33rd Ave., cars will remain a major means of transportation.)

The buildings will comply with Parking Bylaw requirements at the time of Development Permit application. The Parking Bylaw stipulates new development minimum off-street parking requirements for all land use. In addition to parking for residents, residential land uses are required to provide visitor and bike parking, and may also include requirements for loading and pick-up/drop-off. In addition, a mandatory comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan will be required as part of each development application to support lower vehicle trip and parking demand. TDM measures may include, but are not limited to improvements and programs such as: transit subsidies, car sharing, and enhanced cycling facilities on-site.

How will this affect parking in the neighbourhood? A lot of workers from the nearby hospital complex park in this area. Where will they park?

As noted above, parking for new developments on the Heather Lands site will be provided on each parcel according to the Parking Bylaw, by land use. This also includes provision of a mandatory comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan to support reduced vehicle trip and parking demand. In the event of parking spillover concerns, additional or revised street parking restrictions may be explored.

Transit

The transportation report is based on the assumption that more people will be using mass transit. Oakridge station will be at overcapacity when all the new developments in the area are built (in addition to HL, Oakridge Centre, Bus Barns, and MTC lands). These sites will house some 50,000 new residents.

Transit Link are responsible for the transit system and are aware of the proposed density along the corridor. Additional capacity can be provided along Canada Line to accommodate this growth.

TransLink generally attempts to set service levels to meet demand and avoid pass-ups. As part of TransLink's 10-Year Vision for Metro Vancouver Transportation, several improvements have already been funded in Phases 1 and 2, this includes 48% increase in rail service, including 24 additional Canada Line cars.

Who will pay for the upgrades to the Oakridge station? When will it be upgraded?

As a condition of their enactment, the Oakridge Mall redevelopment site is contributing to transit improvements at the Oakridge/41st Canada Line Station.

The 33rd Ave. Canada Line station is not a block away, it is decades away. There is a total lack of transparency on this issue; clarification is needed. Will this developer finance a portion of the building of the 33rd Ave. station? Will it be built through a public-private partnership as was the rest of the Canada Line?

See below.

Public transit must be addressed in a more proactive manner by the CoV and TransLink. At present, the bus routes, #15 & #17, have rather weak service, and the Canada Line must improve the frequency of its trains. In addition, this HL development and the others coming on stream warrant a serious discussion on not only how, but where and when the 33rd Ave. Station will be built.

Information from ZB: Transit discussions are part of the re-zoning process. No plans at present for a 33rd Ave. bus or for a Canada Line station at Cambie and 33rd Ave. (See section, Developer's Contributions, below.)

Why does the City allow developers to mention the 33rd Ave. Canada Line station, when TransLink has provided no details about if and when the station will be built?

Although the significant increase in density within the area warrants such a station, where would the station be located? Several years ago, plans had shown the station as being located on the SE corner of Cambie and 33rd Ave. A new building is constructed there. There was some discussion of the SW corner where the Holy Name of Jesus Roman Catholic church is located. The Archdiocese shut that down. At the NW corner stand residences constructed within the last 15 years. The only open space is at the NE corner where Queen Elizabeth Park is located. Situating an entrance on the NE corner would likely cause an uproar by citizens throughout the city.

As stated throughout the Heather Lands process, a station at 33rd is technically feasible because the track is flat and a station could be added to the line. As there are significant costs and disruption to add a station to an operating line, it is a long term objective. It is not anticipated in the near future. There may be funding allocated through the Heather Lands rezoning (yet to be determined) but given the scale of development and the limited potential for other sites within direct proximity to contribute it will remain a long term objective.

Developer's Contributions

How are the DCL's and CAC's to be calculated?

The DCL rates are calculated per sq.ft. based on land use (residential, commercial, etc). The DCL is calculated at Building Permit (BP). Rates may increase between now and when the BP is applied for. The current rates can be found on the City's website: <https://bylaws.vancouver.ca/bulletin/bulletin-development-cost-levies.pdf> refer to page 4.

CACs on large sites are negotiated based on a proforma valuation associated with the rezoning. <https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/cacbrochure.pdf>

What is the time frame for the clause that is highlighted below?

To advance the construction of the station, the City will seek contributions from nearby redevelopment projects including the HL, while also pursuing discussions with TransLink and other key stakeholders. At rezoning, a contribution is to be secured from the developer as a partial contribution to the future potential station. Should a station not be realized, the contribution would be reallocated to priority public benefits in the Cambie Corridor area.

The timeframe has not yet been determined. This language is from the Pearson Dogwood rezoning report for a Station at 57th Avenue.

Fairmont Building (FB)

MST wants the FB removed; the City favours relocation. If no site is found, then the FB will be demolished. Staff was to report on progress in locating an appropriate site.

Section 4.2.8

- City staff will lead an exploration of options to relocate the Fairmont building off-site, with support from the MST Nations and CLC. The exploration will include identification of potential partners, a feasibility study, determination of a new use and full-cost analysis of relocation and required upgrades.
- If an alternative location cannot be identified within the next 1-2 years and relocated by 2023, the building will be demolished. Prior to demolition, the building will be photographed and documented for the public record, and opportunities to salvage and repurpose architectural elements (e.g., original windows) and building materials (e.g., reclaimed timber) will be provided.

Where does this issue stand? What is the City's position on this issue?

Is the CoV actively searching for a site for relocating the FB?

- If so, which sites are under consideration?
- What is the estimated cost of moving the FB to each of these sites?
- Is the City ready to use some of the CAC's, derived from the Cambie Corridor projects, for moving and renovating the building?

RPSC-CVC has advocated that the FB not be demolished, but rather be moved to another location in which the history of the FB can be recognized both in its historical context as well as in the on-going reconciliation process, while providing needed amenities to the community. Such an amenity is sorely needed by the rapidly increasing population that the local redevelopment projects (Cambie Corridor, Oakridge Centre, Municipal Town Centre, and Oakridge Transit site) generate.

In prior communications with city staff, the city government expressed interest in relocating the FB and in seeking funds to do so. RPSC-CVC suggested four possible sites for the relocation of the FB:

- lot adjacent to Nat Bailey Stadium
- Oakridge Transit site
- directly across Willow St. (three lots would be needed)

- 37th Ave. and Kersland Drive on Queen Elizabeth Park grounds, as this is an under-utilized sector of the park.

If the building is to be demolished, then recycle as much of the FB as possible.

The Planning team, along with staff from other departments (Parks, Finance, Facilities, Social policy), is working on a summary document of the exploration completed to date. We can provide a draft of this document when completed. This would provide a more comprehensive response to these questions.

Public Art

The public art will reflect the MST heritage. Several suggestions were made for MST motifs to be used in street signage, building names, street addresses, and sidewalk mosaics.

Art is important to the MST. Art on the site will be MST led, provided in accordance with the City's public art policy.

Green Space

Quite a few trees (some are scraggly; others, mature) on the HL site will be removed. Offsetting this is the removal of asphalt and concrete from the site and the landscaping that is to be done to make the new development very park-like. What role will the Park Board play in the designing of the future park?

The Park Board will work collaboratively with the MST to design and operate the southern park which is required in the Policy Statement. The northern part of the forest trail will be designed at the same time to allow for continuity of key elements (eg forest trail).

The community gardens will be for both on-site residents, as well as for those in the surrounding neighbourhood. Outdoor space for children was noted, and "age appropriate" facilities should be provided, including the "forested" area.

The design of the Southern Park and Northern Open Space will be coordinated and will include public consultation at the time of detailed design.

What is the status of the large RCMP tree in front of the Fairmont Building?

I am not aware of an "RCMP tree"? The rezoning application includes those that are proposed to be retained (mostly the evergreen trees around the Fairmont Building). The remaining trees will be removed for development, with new trees planted throughout.

Flora and Fauna

A question was raised about the impact of the development on the coyote population and on the birds that travel between Van Deusen Gardens and Queen Elizabeth Park. There is much emphasis on the North-South forest trail, but no mention of an east-west link between Oak Meadows and Queen Elizabeth Park. Concerning the possibility of connecting Queen Elizabeth Park and VanDusen, ZB said that a pollinator corridor was planned and that shrubbery would provide cover for some birds. Is the planned pollinator corridor to be on the 37th Ave. Greenway?

The east-west link between Oak Meadows and Queen Elizabeth Park is along 35th Avenue 'pollinator corridor' which includes a 5 m setback on either side of the street for enhanced planting. 37th Ave is city-wide greenway and along the Heather frontage there is a central treed median and retention of existing mature trees.

Cambie Flyway

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

Building design details, informed by the Bird Friendly Design Guidelines, will be determined at the Development Permit stage.

View Cones

The presentation material concerning view cones was unclear. How many are there and in what direction? (ZB said he knew of only one and that is from the top of Little Mountain looking north.) Why is there not a definitive statement on a view cone from the north side of HL?

Development on the Heather Lands does not impact any of the City of Vancouver's protected view cones. The Heather Lands is south of the Queen Elizabeth view cone (which looks north).

For information on the view cones: <https://vancouver.ca/home-property-development/protecting-vancouvers-views.aspx>

For information on the Queen E view cone: <https://vancouver.ca/home-property-development/queen-elizabeth-park-protected-view.aspx>

Integration with Surrounding Community

This is not "just another large site rezoning application", but part of a reconciliation agreement between Canada and three First Nations—a nation-to-nation agreement. Consideration should be given to how this development will both affect and effect the surrounding neighbourhood. The overall concept continues to stress that this project is an island rather than an integrated part of the neighbourhood.

RPSC–CVC thinks that the developer should ensure that the project not only meets the needs and wishes of MST, but also integrates with, and connects to, the surrounding neighbourhood.

The child-care facility, stores, and office spaces offer opportunities to do this. A new school and other community services should be studied and accommodated, as these would further enhance integration.

Staff believe that the project sits well within the broader community context. The site is designed to welcome all into the community at key entries – including 33rd, 35th and 37th. Heather Street is redesigned to encourage people to access the site by bike. New park land, cultural centre, childcare, office and retail uses are provided. A school site is also provided. These items are all included in the Policy Statement and the Rezoning application has responded with enhanced details (noting more detail follows when each element is designed in detail).

Infrastructure and Services

With the increase in density, infrastructure and services will be strained. Infrastructure should be expanded and updated to meet the needs. Are we to assume that the developer will be responsible for the costs to upgrade these services?

The Developer is required to service the site which includes new services on the lands and upgrades to tie into the surrounding infrastructure network.

Public Safety

With the enormous increase in the number of residents in the area (HL, MTC, Oakridge Centre, Oakridge Transit site, JCC), emphasis should be placed on the need for a new fire station IN THE AREA of all these major housing developments.

The City reviews public safety infrastructure with new community plans/policy statements as well as through needs determined by services groups (ie Fire Department).

Climate Emergency Action Plan

RPSC-CVC is interested in knowing the details of this plan as it pertains to HL.

There are a number of Big Moves and Actions that pertain to Heather Lands including:

- Big Move #1 – HL is planned as a compact community enabling for easy access to daily needs (retail uses, office and commercial uses, parks, childcare, and cultural centre).
- Big Move #2 – HL is designed to encourage most trips to be made on foot, bike or by transit. Measures include high quality pedestrian/cycling/rolling network on site and improved connections to transit off-site. Parking for each building will be designed according to the parking bylaw which may be changed over the course of full build out.
- Big Move #3 – Charging stations for electric vehicles will be provided on HL.
- Big Move #4 and #5 – All buildings will be meet the highest level of sustainable design – as outlined in the Green Buildings Rezoning Policy at the time of Development Permit. This ensures that buildings are meeting the highest standards which are subject to change over the course of build out.

Waste Management Plan

The project's plans assert that "A construction waste management plan will be developed with the goal of diverting over 80% of construction waste from the landfill. The developer, under the guidance of the general contractor, will develop a procedure and process for tracking construction and demolition waste diversion at Heather Lands." RPSC-CVC is interested in knowing the details.

The Waster Management Plan will be a condition of rezoning.

The question of water management for the green space was asked, but no specifics were given in response.

Temporary Modular Housing

The question of the future for the residents of the **Lu'ma Native Housing Society's** temporary modular housing, which presently stands on the site, remains open.

The TMH on site has a 5 year lease (from 2018) with potential for a 5 year extension.