

Tuerlings, Leslie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 10:01 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Some comments related to the rezoning of Mount Pleasant Area and the Public Hearing process last Thursday

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Ray Zhang [5.22(1) Personal and Confidential]
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2017 10:37 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Some comments related to the rezoning of Mount Pleasant Area and the Public Hearing process last Thursday

To the Mayor and the Councils of the City,

After attending the public hearing on last Thursday Jan 26, I am deeply disappointed about the political process of the rezoning for the following reasons:

1. I am not sure why the City is not willing to let the tenants of the rezoning site (e.g. The Church of God and Light and Love Home) to voice out their concerns regarding the potential impact of the rezoning proposal (i.e. their representatives were interrupted by various City Councils in the hearing process). Does tenant have a say in the rezoning process? Since the rezoning is directly about the site that they are currently occupying, they should be given an opportunity to speak.
2. I read the City's evaluation report. The Heritage Vancouver issued a report about the current building (the Simon Fraser Annex) located at 123 East 6th Ave. Specially, Heritage Vancouver has provided a letter supporting retention of the Simon Fraser Annex because of its heritage value. I am not sure why the heritage value of the building was not mentioned in the staff's presentation of the rezoning proposal in the hearing.
3. The City's staff claimed that the rezoning will not impact the current operation of charities such as The Church of God and Light and Love Home because there are existing lease agreements. However, it only takes simple economics theory to predict that increased density of the site will lead to rent increases which will eventually forced out current tenants. Again, I am not sure why the City staffs did not mention this point in the presentation.
4. I felt that the staffs and the Council members are only focusing on the real estate development and do not pay enough attention to the existing social services in the Mount Pleasant area. For example, Councillor Tim Stevenson mentioned that he was not aware of any charities and NGO in the area. I personally volunteered in two of the charities in the area for the past ten years and witnessed thousands of low income families being helped during the time. I believe it is the City's responsibility to investigate the potential impact on existing social services, especially the services to the lower income and ethnic minority groups.
5. In general, I am upset about the City's different attitude towards different social groups. For example, I observed that during the process, the Councils were more inclined to listen to the opinions from groups

like realtors, property owners and business associations, but had limited appetite for the voices from the NGOs. In particular, I am disappointed about Councillor Tim Stevenson's attitude towards TuHien Trieu. I found Councillor Tim Stevenson being impatient and rude - He not only interrupted Ms. Trieu's speech but also the conversation between Ms. Trieu and Councillor Melissa De Genova! I think Councillor Tim Stevenson owes an apology to Ms. Trieu.

In sum, due to the five reasons mentioned above, I believe that the City should postpone the decision on the rezoning and gather more information before making a decision.

Regards,

Ray

Phd Student of the Sauder School of Business

Tuerlings, Leslie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 9:26 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Some comments regarding the Public Hearing from last Thursday Item #4

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Amy Deng [s.22(1) Personal and Confidential]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 9:13 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Some comments regarding the Public Hearing from last Thursday Item #4

To the Mayor and Council Members of Vancouver,

I regret to inform you that I will not be attending this Tuesday's Public Hearing as Speaker No. 34 for Item 4 - FACILITATING GROWTH IN VANCOUVER'S INNOVATION ECONOMY – MOUNT PLEASANT INDUSTRIAL AREA – AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT BY-LAW, as I do not want to fall victim to what some of the other speakers experienced last Thursday. I perceived some prejudice in some members of the council towards the Church of God members, and felt some questions or comments from the council directed towards those speakers were offensive, patronizing, and unnecessary.

Even though I was not a speaker that night, I felt offended to hear many reminders about members of the public not being allowed to speak about "the lease" or "anything else other than the specifics about the rezoning". In my mind, I had not thought to speak about the lease, but rather to give logical reasoning of why I believed the rezoning would cause negative impact to the Mount Pleasant community by threatening the existence of the organizations such as Light and Love Home. And to let you know what those negative impacts would be, it only made sense to describe to you what Light and Love Home, Love Your Neighbour, or the Church of God are, and how many people would be affected. However, such descriptions, no matter how brief, were reminded by more than one councillor that they were unnecessary, and a waste of their time at that hour of night. As a tax payer who was volunteering my time to be there, I found those comments to be appalling coming from those who were meant to be representing our city, who supposedly had the interest of the people in mind, who were paid to be listening to the public's opinion at that hour of the night.

Also, there were exasperated comments from members of the council challenging the reason why we felt that the rezoning would affect our stay on I1-B, 123 E 6th Ave, when the city staff had already mentioned that we would not be affected. I would like to ask city staff to please explain how we would not be affected. If the city has no short-term intentions of developing I1-B after rezoning, why isolate the rezoning specifically to that building alone? If the city did have plans to develop it, the question of how a community group could afford to rent/purchase a part of the space there (among the booming tech industry) without government support, arises. If the city had no intentions of developing I1-B in the long term, then why bother rezoning at all? Hence the logical fear from me, and my friends, of our existing services at 123 E 6th Ave being affected/interrupted/ended soon due to being displaced.

As a well-educated professional who lands in the highest tax bracket, who owns several properties here in Vancouver and overseas, I felt that I would be respected and welcomed by the city council to give my opinion, if I do not identify myself as a member of the Church of God - this feeling originates from observing pleasant interactions of council members with other members of the public who were representing either their businesses or their clients - I believe none were challenged with the type of questions that members of the Church of God received. I would like to ask whether the difference in treatment from certain council members originate from the fact that members of the Church of God were from a minority group, a faith group, or purely because they deserve no respect due to being tenants to the city, who, as a councillor clearly commented, "could be asked to leave even if the rezoning did not occur"? I sincerely ask the council to review what happened last Thursday evening and to give speakers a chance to voice their suggestions and opinions that are representative of the public, who you presumably are trying to serve. They cannot give you the specifics about the rezoning, such as how tall or how wide the building ought to be for good reason – they do not want anything to change!

After this experience, I am beginning to lose faith in parts of our local government in representing the public and working towards filling the true needs of the community. It seems that the economy is of foremost importance to some, and business stakeholders are those that need to be pleased above all others, such as minority groups, low income families, women and children. Wouldn't prevention of problems such as drug-addiction, family violence, teenage pregnancies and illiteracy through social programs be more effective and beneficial for those concerned, than large sums of money being used to repair those problems after they have occurred? Community groups and non-profits such as Light and Love Home, Love Your Neighbour Club and the Church of God are doing these to help. Please do not overlook their needs when you do your city planning and development. To create a happy and healthy community that thrives in all aspects, including economy, the true needs of the people need to be considered.

Thank you all for your time.
Yours truly,
Amy Deng
January 30, 2017

Tuerlings, Leslie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 9:26 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Feedback on public hearing on Jan 26th regarding inappropriate attitude of Tim Stevenson

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Toby Chan s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 10:33 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Feedback on public hearing on Jan 26th regarding inappropriate attitude of Tim Stevenson

Dear Mayor and Council of Vancouver,

I want to have complaint about the attitude of Tim Stevenson in the public hearing on Jan 26th. I am quite shock to hear his inappropriate comments against Tuhien on item no. 4 regarding rezoning of Mount Pleasant Area. How could a councillor feeling frustrated to hear our voice? Tuhien tried to let councillors understand how people in the community would be affected by the rezoning but Tim Stevenson was so rude and impatient during the public hearing. Also, Tuhien spoke and presented in a very nice and polite way. I did not understand how come Tim Stevenson had to reply her in such bad attitude. Tim Stevenson said he did not want to hear how much good work of an organization contributed to the community. He as a councillor should feel shameful to speak such words. I hope that Tim Stevenson will apologize for what he said.

Your sincerely,

Toby Chan