

March 8, 2016

City of Vancouver  
453 West 12<sup>th</sup> Ave.,  
Vancouver B.C.  
V5Y 1V4

Attention Mayor Gregor Robertson and Council

Your Worship and Members of Council,

**Re: 22 East 5<sup>th</sup> Ave – Heritage designation and Heritage Revitalization Agreement**

As a property owner and resident at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential I am of two minds. While I support the retaining of the façade at 22 East 5<sup>th</sup>, I cannot support the massive increase in height and bulk of the proposed building that is being requested by the developer to retain two exterior walls.

Having dealt with James Boldt, Heritage Planner, over the rehabilitation of my property, I find it somewhat amazing that the plan he is recommending to you this evening could even be construed as heritage retention.

The proposal is for multiple entrances and windows to be added on 5<sup>th</sup> Ave and on Ontario. I find these to be inappropriate alterations that are contrary to the HRA and Heritage Designation. Mr. Boldt was very insistent that on my rehabilitation project, that all the original openings be retained and in fact there could be no changes to the front of my building. I was not even asking for a HRA or Heritage Designation.

The Planning Department has also relaxed the requirement for on-site parking. Not only is the FSR calculation excluded from the second floor parking area; it also has not followed the bylaws that state that parking should be at or below grade. When I asked the question about the parking, Ms. Marie Linehan, Development Planner, replied

*“To clarify the comment regarding underground parking.*

*The lane at this site is higher than the street elevation at E 5<sup>th</sup> Ave, and also slopes up to the east from the entry at Ontario St.*

*Parking access has to be from the high side at the lane, versus from the street at E 5<sup>th</sup> or Ontario, as both are bike routes. Providing a ramp from the lane level to underground parking would impact the size of the ground floor units – i.e. would cut into the floor*

*level to provide clearance for ramping down to underground parking. We would not support ramping down only one level from the lane and providing parking uses at the ground floor street elevation as this is not a desirable in terms of the public realm interface.”*

I somewhat understand what she is trying to convey as far as “public realm interface” goes for the 1<sup>st</sup> floor but if the developer was told to put the parking underground, the ramp issue that she speaks of would be the same going down as it would be going up to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. Same number of parking stalls going up and well as going down. I can only take inference from this exemption of below grade parking as the City is somehow helping the developer avoid the cost of excavation. The notion that the North and East walls would be in peril if the proponent were told to excavate is a red herring, as façade retention and excavation is done successfully on other projects in the City. Is there a new policy where as the City of Vancouver helps developers avoid costs they don’t particularly like?

In my emails to the Planning Department, where I asked some pointed questions as to the rationale behind this project’s review, I was taken aback by a comment by the Project Coordinator -Development Review Branch, that he felt that the Mount Pleasant Community Plan for lower Main Street was migrating into the I1 zone. I quote,

*“ Moreover, please refer to the Mount Pleasant Community Plan for Lower- Main Street (<http://vancouver.ca/files/cov/mount-pleasant-community-plan-implemetation-package-3-lower-main.pdf>) While it does not specifically apply to this site (it a[pl]ies to Main Street between Eat 2<sup>nd</sup> and East 7<sup>th</sup> Ave), it is fair to assume that as the city densifies, these policies and design guidelines will migrate out from Main Street into the surrounding residential and industrial areas”*

When did planning by migration become the way that the City of Vancouver Planning Department works? If the City is planning to change the zoning and intent of I1 zone, is it not part of proper planning to inform property owners and residents as to the City’s intention and also involve the citizens of Vancouver in proposed changes?

As to the bulk of this building and it shadow casting, – there are three full time residences that are affected by the shadow casting and/or by the blocking of sun and views. While the existing zoning would allow a building to reach the height of 18.3 m (60 ft.) this building is actually going to measure close to 40 m. (131 ft.) to the top of the building’s parapet, measured from the middle of the rear lane at the south east corner (as per the proponent ‘s drawings).

While this proposal adds something new to the area, it is out of context as presented and should be rejected and the proponent be instructed to come back with a

building that is built within the zoning bylaw parameters and reflective of the area scale.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Angus

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

