

Isfeld, Lori

From: Jonathan Woodward s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 8:50 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 105 Keefer Comment

Hi

I've been living in Vancouver for 17 years. In that time I have seen the changes in the city, including really great developments downtown that allow families to live in condominiums downtown, people walk to work, and the development of a really great waterfront.

However as Andy Yan says in this thoughtful piece in the Sun, we had the luxury of building on old industrial land to create this space. (<http://vancouver.sun.com/opinion/op-ed/opinion-where-goes-chinatown-goes-the-city-of-vancouver>) That is mostly gone. Now Vancouver is faced with the choice of what to destroy in order to grow.

(Are we destroying? I think the developments that happened in Chinatown on Main and Keefer clearly show that we are. They are the same as everywhere else. There is nothing remarkable about them, from the Royal Bank branch on one to the Starbucks in the other to the boring exteriors all the way up. For all the talk about integrating into Chinatown, those efforts have clearly failed. Nothing about this development makes me think 105 Keefer would be any different.)

I agree we must grow. So the question is: what to destroy? To me the answer to this question is obvious. The single family homes in this city are not affordable to the average person any longer. Some have heritage value, but many are large, empty, tacky palaces. Their high cost has made the neighbourhoods devoid of children, and they take up a huge amount of city land. For the city to preserve them, by law, while allowing national treasures like Vancouver's Chinatown to vanish, is an outrage.

Please cease the process on 105 Keefer until the city allows significant growth in single family home neighbourhoods.

Sincerely,

Jon

s.22(1) Personal and
Confidential

Isfeld, Lori

From: Vivi Ana s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 5:46 PM
To: Public Hearing; Robertson, Gregor; Louie, Raymond; Jang, Kerry; Affleck, George; Ball, Elizabeth; Carr, Adriane; Meggs, Geoff; Reimer, Andrea; Deal, Heather; Stevenson, Tim; De Genova, Melissa; Kelley, Gil; Hoese, Karen; Mayor and Council Correspondence; Zeng, Yan; Cheng, Paul
Subject: RE: 105 Keefer St rezoning application

Vancouver City Council,

I'm writing because I don't support the Rezoning application at 105 Keefer and 544 Columbia St. In the past, I lived in Chinatown. Chinatown is near where I live. Currently, I work in Chinatown. Chinatown was a large part of my childhood. I care about the historic area.

I am strongly opposed to the rezoning proposal for the reasons below.

- It is not right that taxpayers are paying for the social housing so that Beedie can profit from the rezoning's height and density increases. They are also paying reduced DCL and no CACs. This is not fair.
- The ground floor retail businesses will unlikely be affordable to seniors.
- It will displace affordable Chinatown businesses that residents depend on.
- The Keefer Triangle is a culturally significant site that should not be used for condos.
- The proposed project does not meet "a significantly higher standard of architectural and urban design excellence" required to warrant the additional height.
- The density proposed in this project is not reflective of Chinatown.
- Members of the Chinatown Historic Planning Committee voted against this project.
- Seniors housing offered does not justify the additional height requested.
- Approving this rezoning will set poor precedent to other rezonings in Chinatown.
- The Chinese Veterans Memorial should not be a private front yard for condo owners.
- The significant decrease in family units is not appropriate for Chinatown.

Here are some of my ideas of what could be on the 105 Keefer site instead of condos:

- Community centre
- A plaza
- A place for everyone from all ages and groups
- A community park

The 105 Keefer rezoning application is not suitable for Chinatown. Staff should not recommend City Council to approve it.

Sincerely yours,
Viviana Vo

Sent from my iPhone

Isfeld, Lori

From: Teresa Vandertuin
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 4:11 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 105 Keefer Rezoning

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

There are many reasons why I object to the rezoning proposal at 105 Keefer but I'll keep my objections in this message to fiscal ones; this is bad dealing making 101.

City Council has a responsibility to use our tax dollars wisely. The City has many needs and urgencies to spend our dollars.

If approving 105 Keefer is seen as a financial benefit to the City's treasury, it makes more sense to approve - BUT - I do not see any financial benefit for the City from this development project.

The developer says it needs 3 more stories in order to include 25 social housing units but the Province is going to pay \$7.3 million in construction costs for those units! How can the developer then claim they need more height? It doesn't make sense.

And the City has waived any Community Benefit cash because the developer is including 25 social housing units. But the province is paying for those units! The developer wins both ways; the province pays for the 25 social housing units and the City waives cash benefits for their inclusion!

Who is responsible for this bad deal making? The City and our citizens lose all around with this deal.

And don't get me started on "25 social housing units" - there will only be 8 units that are affordable to seniors on fixed income! The others are subject to unregulated market forces.

I have to ask those who support the project because more affordable housing is needed: how can 8 units solve the affordable housing crisis? We need an entire development of housing for fixed income. Work with the province - spend \$7.3 million on true "social housing".

Bad deal-making! Take this back to the drawing board AFTER the renewed rezoning plan for Chinatown has been approved. STOP trying to slip this project through before the renewed plans are finalized.

Thanks for reading!
Teresa Vandertuin

Isfeld, Lori

From: Trevor Wideman s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 4:05 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 105 Keefer

To Mayor and Council,

I am writing you today to oppose the proposed Beedie development at 105 Keefer St. in Chinatown. I am a PhD student in Geography at Simon Fraser University, and up until last January, a resident of Chinatown. In my two short years living in the community, I saw it transform immensely - buildings were knocked down, affordable dry goods shops and small grocers disappeared, and low income housing was replaced by shiny new towers. When I moved out of the community I wished that I could guarantee that my unit would go to someone who needed it more desperately than I, but I know in my heart that was not the case.

As an observer now living in Grandview-Woodland, I continue to see Chinatown transform. While some might frame this transformation as inevitable or unavoidable, the rapid redevelopment is not coincidental - it has occurred since the city's Historic Area Heights Review in 2010, which has allowed for developments like 105 Keefer to proceed. Furthermore, council has approved developments like 105 Keefer with very little modification, even though they have the power to force developers to make important changes to projects that would improve the lives and housing situations of the city's most vulnerable. Developments like this offer little to no benefits to the low-income Chinese Canadian seniors living in the area, as evidenced by the fact that Beedie Living has now removed all mention of Community Amenity Contributions from their website (<http://105keefer.com/community-benefits/>). Furthermore they have cast cascading and gentrifying effects on the wider Downtown Eastside in the form of commercial upscaling and rising property values, which in turn affect rents in this predominantly poor community.

I have been to two open houses on this development, written numerous letters, and signed several petitions opposing this development, and I continue to do so. I am a member of a vocal majority, not minority, who is interested in seeing Chinatown exist for future generations. 105 Keefer might seem like a drop in the bucket in the larger context of Vancouver, but in the context of Chinatown, it is huge. The Mayor and Council here have a chance to stop this development and imagine something more equitable for the community - and in the process, they would be taking a stand against the ongoing colonization of the Downtown Eastside by profit-seeking developers, while rejecting the politics of displacement (deployed against First Nations, Japanese Canadians, Afro-Canadians, and many, many others) that has been embedded in this city since its founding in 1886.

Thank you for your time,
Trevor Wideman

Trevor James Wideman, BA Hons. (Manitoba), MA (Queen's)

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential



Mayor and Council Feedback

Case number: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Case created: 2017-05-25, 09:40:00 PM

Incident Location

Address: 2161 W 12TH AV, Vancouver, V6K 4S7

Address2:

Location name:

Contact Details

Name: Leo Shin (ps)

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Email:

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Request Details

1. Describe details (who, what, where, when, why):

Dear Council,

I write to add my voice to those who oppose the rezoning application for 105 Keefer.

Your vote has tremendous implications for a community which has contributed so much to our city, our province, and our country. Please cast it not with a sense of power but with that of humility.

Leo K. Shin

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Mark Shieh

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

May 26, 2017

VIA EMAIL publichearing@cityofvancouver.ca

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

Dear Mayor Robertson and City Councillors:

Re: Oppose 105 Keefer Street and 544 Columbia Street Rezoning Application

I am writing to oppose the rezoning application for 105 Keefer Street and 544 Columbia Street as submitted on December 12, 2016.

Like many Asian immigrants in Vancouver, I grew up with Chinatown – weekend breakfast at The Boss Bakery followed by grocery shopping with my parents. Today, I live in Strathcona and work in Chinatown.

Regarding this application, I commend the effort of the proponent team and on how the design has evolved, especially the series of interior passage ways and rear lane access that encourage people to engage with the ground floor activities across a large 150' x 122' site. However, I do not believe the proposed public benefits and contextual design merit rezoning approval. In this letter, I focus the concern on authentic fine grain.

CHINATOWN ARTICULATED FINE-GRAIN BUILDINGS, NOT BULKY BUILDINGS

Chinatown Neighbourhood Plan (2012) articulates the importance of fine-grain character: "The urban fabric in Chinatown consists of narrow lots, human-scaled buildings, ornate facades, and shop fronts on the ground floor that animate the sidewalk... These features express a Chinatown identity and a sense of place that makes Chinatown unique from other neighbourhoods. This distinctive character is part of Chinatown's economic advantage, which can attract businesses, investors, residents and visitors." The proponent has made considerable effort, over multiple revisions, to sculpt a bulky building so that it *looks* more fine grain, through articulation, colour, and material. But Chinatown's fine-grain character is not about superficial qualities; it's about authenticity – truly small human-scaled buildings, not big buildings dressed to look like small buildings. This distinction is not an aesthetic preference, but one with tangible and intangible consequences. Building form doesn't

cause behavior, but it offers the possibility of certain uses and activities. For example, a smaller building is more feasible for small business owners to buy, and it's easier to reuse and adapt over time. Evidence from emerging research — by organizations like National Trust for Historic Preservation — suggests that “established neighborhoods with a mix of older, smaller buildings perform better than districts with larger, newer structures when tested against a range of economic, social, and environmental outcome measures.”

HOW MIGHT WE MOVE FORWARD? SOME IDEAS:

- Give non-support to this proposal and encourage the proponent to re-engage with community stakeholders.
- Consider alternative building forms that are authentically fine grain, including a network of smaller buildings.
- Be more intentional with creating homes for mixed-income and intergenerational families.
- Do more work to resolve the ground floor uses; not simply relying on smaller floor areas of the commercial retail units to attract “mom-and-pop” shops; but actively work with stakeholders to articulate a clearer vision for the ground floor activities, especially operators and organizations who might help with programming.

Thank you for reading and inviting citizens' comments.

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

A rectangular grey box redacting the content of the comment.

Mark Shieh

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

A large rectangular grey box redacting the content of the comment.

Isfeld, Lori

From: Sylvia Gung s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2017 4:41 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: My message
Attachments: Chnatown.docx

Hello

This is Sylvia Gung s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Attached is my message to the public hearing.

I'll be at the hearing tonight but later.

Thank you.

Sylvia Gung
Burnaby

So far, gentrification hasn't done any good to the society. It's just created more housing problems, eviction, one of the most despicable culture in this proud country Canada, displacement of people, becoming poorer, more homeless, adding to addiction, gambling and other miseries, my opposition starts from these facts.

My name is Sylvia Gung.

I am also from Korean-Canadian community, and come over to add one more head.

We live in a multicultural society, and when one community suffers, we bring efforts together to work it out.

If the Chinatown side loses, it is because the Chinese people are ignorant and weak. If the government side with its business agenda wins, in as it has been other cases as well, it is because our elected officials are ignorant and end in bullying the trusting citizens, without adequate provision that is necessary to live on. And here, there, the weight of history is added.

So, if the gentrification continues, it blatantly spells out that we all are ignorant bunch, after having such the high education, earning many degrees, after 13+ years of the public education.

The main reason for the existence of government is to keep the order in society, by serving the Poor and weak, providing a good education, and listening to the Poor. Instead, it just functions as a public trough to deliver more to the wealthy.

While all the problems we humans have created are extremely complicated fostering corruption, crisis, destruction, the solution is rather simple for the government.

Three steps:

1. Returning the cash or bribe for access to people where it originally belongs
2. Getting down to the earth to listen to people
3. Delivering a well-balanced education

Vancouver highly holds multiculturalism and green ways of living. I can hardly think that a forceful gentrification is the way to live green.

Please, take great care to revitalize the Chinatown by listening to these hard working, hurt many ways, yet still loving and caring people who love to live where they belong. And make the Chinatown the Historic Pride of Vancouver.

Please, listen to the people, we need, as many speakers have insisted, to have culturally appropriate and affordable intercultural housing facility with well-designed senior center. And it is the time for the government and developers not to deny more affordable housing. We don't need more luxury condo. Offering 25 units, at best, is immoral projection. Most of all, please, don't disappoint these diligent, passionate young people trying so much to work it out. Break their heart and spirit is not the way to live green for the government, either.