

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2012 10:22 AM
To: Darlene Browman
Subject: RE: 1870 East 1st & 1723 Victoria Drive

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, comments will be posted on the City's website (http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm). Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit vancouver.ca/publichearings.

Thank you.

From: Darlene Browman s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Saturday, April 14, 2012 5:12 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: 1870 East 1st & 1723 Victoria Drive

I wanted to express my concerns regarding the proposed development at 1870 East 1st & 1723 Victoria Drive, I feel the development is too large and too many stories for the area which is residential and I'm worried that the fact that it is housing for recovering addicts will bring an element of people to the area that we do not want, and cause property values to drop. There was a proposed site at Venables and Commercial that seemed a more likely location as the Kettle Friendship Society is next door and is fully staffed to deal with any problems that could arise.

Thank you for hearing my input, Darlene Browman

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office

Sent: Monday, April 16, 2012 10:26 AM

To: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Subject: RE: Regarding proposed zone change and construction at 1870 East 1st and 1723 Victoria drive

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, comments will be posted on the City's website (http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm). Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit vancouver.ca/publichearings.

Thank you.

From: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sent: Saturday, April 14, 2012 9:22 PM

To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office

Subject: Regarding proposed zone change and construction at 1870 East 1st and 1723 Victoria drive

I feel that this proposed development construction will deeply affect the surrounding area and it's residents in a very very negative way. The area is predominantly residential, and the construction of a 4 story 26 unit development on the proposed site will be a huge out of character eyesore, not within "the street scape" policy of the city of Vancouver building guidelines. Changing zoning to make this construction possible is very unfair to the existing residents who purchased in this area understanding that it would remain "residential". This proposal will undo much of the efforts of the residents to gentrify the immediate area and improve property values, and neighbourhood character. That the construction of this size of building will impact heavily, barely addresses the really problematic issue, which is the buildings proposed use!

The idea of a 26 unit building in the middle of a residential area with 20 units designated for recovering (but most likely not) drug addicts and their accompanying seedy entourage of hangers-on, with the related break ins, thefts, and dark elements that generally accompany their lifestyle, is horrifying to say the least.

This is an ill suited location for this housing project. A much better location would be the site at Venables and Commercial, a site that is in close proximity to the existing Kettle Friendship Society.

Please reconsider this disastrous proposal!!

Lawrence Jakerov

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2012 2:25 PM
To: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: FW: On April 16th please consider these facts...

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, comments will be posted on the City's website (http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm). Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit vancouver.ca/publichearings.

Thank you.

From: Merrilee MacGregor s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, April 13, 2012 12:34 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: On April 16th please consider these facts...

...when you decide about the proposed amendment to the current zoning of the lots at the corner of 1st Avenue and Victoria Drive from two-family homes (RT-5) to a multi-unit, multi-storied apartment building for distressed people:

According to information currently on the BC Housing website www.bchousing.org/Subsidized_Housing/Listings the Grandview-Woodlands area already has more subsidized housing than any other neighbourhood in Vancouver outside the downtown core, and the same amount as the downtown east-side. Grandview-Woodlands is already saturated with distressed people. Every day walking in the public parks and on the sidewalks is like negotiating an obstacle course - dodging the beggars, the drunks and drug addicts, the sleeping people and their carts, the physically handicapped people and their supports, the mentally handicapped people and their confusion, the slow and unsteady elderly, and the scary mentally ill people.

I and the two mentally handicapped ladies who live with me have been grabbed by scary drunken or crazy men three times in the last eighteen months. My two charges will never be able to go to the store independently - not because they do not have the ability, but because the neighbourhood is not safe for them.

Please vote "No" on Monday, and develop the potential to house these distressed people in other areas of the city, and in areas that are already zoned for this type of building in order to share the burden a little more equally around the city. There is no point in making the Grandview-Woodlands neighbourhood any more like the troubled downtown eastside than it already is.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,
Merrilee MacGregor

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2012 2:45 PM
To: mamsys@telus.net
Subject: FW: Notice of Public Hearing 1870 East 1st Avenue & 1723 Victoria Drive

Attachments: MAM Submission Apr 16.docx

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, comments will be posted on the City's website (http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm). Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit vancouver.ca/publichearings.

Thank you.

From: MaryAnn Murray 5. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2012 1:15 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Notice of Public Hearing 1870 East 1st Avenue & 1723 Victoria Drive

To Mayor Gregor Robertson and our City Councillors:

I am attending the Public Hearing tonight against the proposed proposal. I have attached a copy of my statement.

These are my following recommendations:

- Height of the building needs to be reduced to 30-35 feet
- The design should fit in with the neighborhood
- Use of the buildings should be restricted to its occupants.

My statement is more emotional and revolves around the fact that the Church refuses to compromise and work with their non-affiliated neighbors.

This is a quote from their proposal Community Housing Project: A proposal by Co:Here and Salsbury Community Society under "Key Partners" the Grandview Calvary Baptist Church describes itself as "***A community of people rooted in the Grandview-Woodlands neighbourhood, who seek to receive and extend the radical welcome of God in Christ for the transformation of the neighbourhood***".

Please take careful consideration to what this quote means. It has created tremendous discord and issues with the immediate community.

Sincerely,

Maryann Murray

My name is Maryann Murray

I live at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential since 1995. I am on the same block as the Church and its two adjacent properties at 1630 and 1636 Salisbury.

While I fully recognize the need for Social Housing and the increased density of property it entails, I have a problem with the height, design and the undisclosed uses of the first floor of the proposed development.

However, my biggest problem is with the GCBC's unwillingness to compromise and work with the immediate community that is not associated with the church. The Neighborhood Advisory committee is only window dressing, so that it appears the GCBC is working with its neighbors. Why is that? I went back to the proposal submitted to the City titled: Community Housing Project: A proposal by Co:Here and Salisbury Community Society and found the answer. Under "Key Partners" the Grandview Calvary Baptist Church describes itself as "A community of people rooted in the Grandview-Woodlands neighbourhood, who seek to receive and extend the radical welcome of God in Christ for the transformation of the neighbourhood".

They want to transfer the neighborhood to their vision.

I understand the City feels a commitment to this project, as it has been working with the church on turning the property into social housing. Now is the time to take a step back and start working with both the Church and their neighbors who are not affiliated with the church.

The GCBC is putting vulnerable people into this building. The GCBC is imposing their vision on the neighborhood. This should be a collaborative process. It is our neighborhood that is changing, and we should have the right to ensure we have input into the change. The church has sown tremendous discord in our neighborhood. It is arrogant, exclusive, and undemocratic to assume you can build a property outside the current zoning without consideration and meaningful dialogue with your neighbors.

This is a neighborhood that embraces helping people. The conditions of any development permit should include reaching a size and design that will be satisfactory to the immediate non-church affiliated neighbors. We need a full disclosure on how this building will be used and reach an understanding that will keep this community healthy and vibrate. This building project should showcase how we can all work together and not continue on its current path of exclusion and disrespect of our beliefs and concerns.

From: mailpost@vancouver.ca
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2012 7:34 PM
To: Hoese, Karen
Subject: Online Feedback - Rezoning Application - 1870 East 1st Avenue
and 1723 Victoria Drive

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Name: Oliver Schneider
Address: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Postal Code: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Phone:

Comments:

I am opposed to the plan as submitted.

I would consider supporting it if it was:

- much lower fsr
- not higher than most buildings on Commercial, never minding the surrounding buildings
- had a design that was even remotely in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood
- more evidence that steps would be taken to avoid housing habitual hard drug users with increased likelihood of property crime or people with severe mental illness, but rather low income or otherwise hard to house people like single mothers, mentally or physically challenged, etc.

A 2.5 storey plus basement/underground parking building, with an fsr of around 1.0 or less, with wood or simulated wood siding, pitched roof with dormers, and a use plan that addressed my concerns about intentionally providing housing drug addicts without proper supervision, would get my support.

From: carolyn shaffer s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2012 8:01 AM
To: Hoese, Karen
Subject: Re-zoning application for 1870 East 1 st Ave and 1723 Victoria Drive

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Red

Dear Ms. Hoese,

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the proposed rezoning at 1870 East 1st ave and 1723 Victoria Drive. I'm mostly concerned about the height of the proposed building. I think it's important to maintain the current height restriction and not allow a taller building in this spot. I live a few blocks away (at Charles St and Victoria Ave).

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Shaffer

s. 22(1) Personal and
Confidential

From: mailpost@vancouver.ca
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2012 12:46 PM
To: Hoese, Karen
Subject: Online Feedback - Rezoning Application - 1870 East 1st Avenue
and 1723 Victoria Drive

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Name: Sheryl Webster

Address: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Postal Code: s. 22(1) Personal
and Confidential

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Phone:

Comments:

I do not approve of the rezoning application. I do not believe that the rezoning fits into the surrounding neighbourhood fabric with regards to height or housing typology. I do not understand the rationale for many of the choices being made at city hall with regards to neighbourhood densification. I agree with ecodensity but density can take many forms.

Kristina Zalite

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1) Personal
and Confidential

Vancouver City Hall
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver, BC
V5Y 1V4

March 26, 2012

Re: Rezoning Application for 1870 East 1st Ave and 1723 Victoria Drive

Dear Council and Mayor and City Staff:

I am writing regarding the rezoning application for 1870 East 1st Avenue and 1723 Victoria Drive. I live at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential, two blocks away from the subject site. I understand that the applicant wishes to rezone from RT-5 to CD-1. I oppose the rezoning application on the following points:

- not meeting height restrictions
- lack of architectural typology fitting into the surrounding context
- lack of substantial information about the procedures in the housing cooperative model.

The applicant is requesting a relaxation of the allowable height (to 15.14m) and stories (4 rather than 3). I oppose any relaxation to the allowable height restrictions and allowable stories. The height restriction of 10.7m is typical along Commercial Drive, zoned for commercial use, and the typical heights in the surrounding residential neighbourhoods are closer to 8m. On Commercial Drive, from Broadway all the way to Hastings, there are few buildings taller than 10.7m and more than 3 stories. In the residential neighbourhood of 1st and Victoria, having a building that is nearly double the height of the neighbouring buildings does not fit into the surrounding context whatsoever. Please do not allow any building with an elevation of more than 10.7m on this site.

Additionally, the building typology does not fit into the surrounding context. The Grandview Woodlands neighbourhood is characterized by heritage houses circa 1900. The proposed rezoning includes an architectural character that by no means fits into the neighbourhood. I am surprised that this building facade would be proposed for an alternative cooperative housing model where one of the

mandates is to integrate residents into the community. Please require that any future building on this site include building materials and styles to create a visual integration into the surrounding neighbourhood.

I attended the open house for this rezoning project and have read the online information provided by the City of Vancouver. I support alternative community housing in a general sense. I have not been able to find a clear outline for monitoring the housing model to see what is working and what is not working. There is a clear outline for who will be living in the proposed building, but what if the housing model is not working, or needs to be changed, or is working well? There is also a clear outline for how the housing model will run, but no methodology for monitoring the new model. For such a novel project, I ask the City to please require a good and proven methodology (that is to the satisfaction of the City) for monitoring the housing model.

Thank you very sincerely,
Kristina Zalite