

**Hildebrandt, Tina**

---

**From:** Devón Loerchner  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 13, 2018 4:27 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 95 West Hastings

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

To whom it may concern,

Please accept this as a request to not go forward with the proposed new rental building on 95 West Hastings, which from description, does not increase accessible housing or consider the vulnerable community at large. We are in desperate need for social income housing and subsidization in that area. I am in support of counsel reviewing the proposal keeping our downtown's marginalized in mind.

Regards,

Devon Loerchner

TBI Community Support Facilitator

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** Dani Moretto  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 13, 2018 4:05 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Opposition to 61-95 West Hastings

I would like to thank City Council for the time to address the proposed development at 61-95 West Hastings. I am against this rezoning application and development.

In January 2017, I attended the open house for this development and was able to speak with the developer, as well as City of Vancouver staff to get answers to some of the questions I had concerning the rezoning request and development. Unfortunately none of the answers alleviated my concerns and I had hoped that before the proposal moved forward, some of the items that were the cause of these would be changed. Based on the presented application today, I can see that nothing has been altered and the proposal remains the same.

I have lived, worked and volunteered in the DTES since 2005 and signed a contract to purchase at [redacted] in 2010, where I have lived since the building opened in the Spring of 2012. Currently I am a social worker with a health authority and prior to this I managed supportive housing sites for a large non-profit, one of which is in the same alley as [redacted] and the proposed development at 95 West Hastings. The dream of owning a home in Vancouver is very hard to achieve and I am incredibly fortunate to be able to do so. However, the only reason I was able to do so is because [redacted] was a property that allows minimal rentals and strives to be owner-occupied, was sold below market value to people who lived or worked in the DTES, and included a floor of subsidized housing that is managed by Habitat for Humanity and the Portland Hotel Society. With rents in Vancouver being above \$2000 for a one-bedroom, I would not be able to afford to live within the city if I did not own at [redacted] even though my husband and I are professionals with healthy incomes.

I can see that other residents of [redacted] have submitted responses in favour of this development and would like to point out that at least one of the two is an owner who has not lived in the building since 2013, immediately after the year restriction on rentals passed, and instead rents their unit out for a profit. I live directly above one of their units – also facing 95 West Hastings and looking over the alley it backs onto - and can attest that their lack of concern over shadowing and sunlight are serious concerns for me, though perhaps this owner's occupation as a real estate developer and non-resident influences his opinion. However, the blocking of sunlight is not the greatest concern to me nor is losing a view because my unit (and his) do not have views due to the floors our units are on. Something will be built at 95 West Hastings; my biggest concern is that whatever is built is right for the size of the space, the neighbourhood and its community, as well as adheres to the zoning of its address.

The basis of my opposition to this development is as follows:

1. 95 West Hastings has zero inclusion of subsidized or social housing units, which does nothing to house and support the low income residents of the DTES. Nearly every large development in the DTES in the last several years has included subsidized or social housing – such as Woodward's, [redacted] Sequel 138 – and could not accommodate all who applied, with [redacted] having a lottery to choose from those who fit the restrictions. Thousands of people in the DTES live on government income assistance with housing allowances of \$375 with a large number sleeping in shelters, on the street, or in inadequate housing like the Regent and until recently, the Balmoral. Until there is no longer need for more shelter spaces and hundreds of people are not absolutely homeless on the street, the City of Vancouver should not approve housing



developments in the DTES that do not support the most vulnerable of the neighbourhood's residents. It is ethically and morally wrong to do so.

2. Allowing the variances and rezoning requests by the developer of 95 West Hastings while not demanding that the development better the existing community will set a precedent in the DTES and have a dramatic negative impact on the future of the neighbourhood. Future development proposals will look to the results of 95 West Hastings' application and feel no need to work to support and improve the DTES community. It is hard to understand why the Stanley Hotel redevelopment on West Cordova one street behind 95 West Hastings has had to meet so many demands by the City and Gastown zoning requirements and is still not approved, but 95 West Hastings has been asked to change nothing despite requesting such significant variances and rezoning approvals. The Stanley has a large amount of social housing units and directly gives back to the DTES community, which 95 West Hastings does not.
3. The alley against which 95 West Hastings will be built simply cannot support the addition of 77 parking spaces – almost double what the current parking lot on this corner holds – and commercial spaces, deliver vehicles, and a loading bay that 95 West Hastings would add. As it currently exists, this alley is a congestion and size nightmare. I, and other residents of s.22(1) Personal and Confidential have to often wait for up to an hour to access the 14 stall parking garage at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential due to alley traffic. Once you enter the alley you cannot turn around and with the side at Carrall being blocked due to construction and garbage bins for over the last year, you must sit in your vehicle and wait. If a fire truck or ambulance needed to reach an address or person in this alley, it too would be forced to wait or attendants walk on foot to the emergency. How closing in this alley even further with the proposed FSR variance of 95 West Hastings, which would fill the lot to the furthest edges possible makes sense is beyond comprehension. It is clear that the developer and those who support this proposal have not actually experienced the issues with this alley firsthand and have not designed the building to reflect the realities of what is possible in this space.

Again, I thank City Council for hearing my opposition of the proposed development at 61-95 West Hastings. As I stated earlier, something will be built at 61-95 West Hastings and my opposition does not come from losing my view or sunlight, though access to sunlight is something the City must consider when approving projects. 61-95 West Hastings would completely block sunlight and negatively impact the quality of life of the residents above the Metropole, all of whom live in SRO units where the rents are steadily rising beyond the reach low income individuals and for whom access to sunlight is perhaps most important. 61-95 West Hastings should not be approved at it is currently presented because 1) it does not support the already existing community of the DTES and instead alienates the most vulnerable; 2) will set a precedent for other developers to alienate the community with City approval; 3) it is simply too large in FSR and a height of 112+ feet when the rooftop is included for the area to support. Please, City Council, do the right thing and do not approve this project as it currently exists.

Best,  
Daniella Moretto  
DTES Resident and Worker



**Hildebrandt, Tina**

---

**From:** Anne-Marie A s 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 13, 2018 3:32 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Re: 95 west Hastings  
**Attachments:** image1.PNG; ATT00001.txt

When there are thousands of homeless DTES residents and those in shelters it is absolutely unacceptable that this rental building will not have any subsidized units for low income people. Whomever the developer is: Your greed is disgusting.

Anne





2 hrs · Vancouver ·

PLEASE READ THIS - There is a development proposal up for a public hearing today for the corner of Hastings/Abbott at 95 West Hastings that will be a massive rental building where rents will be "whatever the market can support" - City of Van worker (meaning \$2150+ for a 1 bdrm), will have ZERO subsidized units for low income people, ZERO social housing, ZERO space for including the DTES community, and only bring 132 units of people who have likely little to no connection to the DTES into the neighbourhood RIGHT ACROSS FROM THE GRAND UNION! Almost every single large new development in the DTES in the last several years has included a social/subsidized housing aspect - Woodward's, Stanley redevelopment, 66 West Cordova, even horrible Sequel 138, etc. The developer of 95 West Hastings is somehow above including the residents of the DTES - perhaps because he built the Trump Hotel in Vancouver - and the City seems likely to allow the rezoning request. Please, if you're like me and do not want DTES residents to be pushed out of housing before it's even built, send in a comment in opposition to [publichearing@vancouver.ca](mailto:publichearing@vancouver.ca) and reference "95 West Hastings". When there are thousands of people sleeping in shelters and on the street, or are inadequately housed in buildings like the Regent and Brandiz, developments like 95 West Hastings should NOT be approved by the City and any moral person should not want to build them. Comments sent in before 5pm TODAY will be distributed to City Council and posted on the website. Two sentences is enough. Help, please.