

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Michael Taylor  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 13, 2018 1:54 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Opposition to 95 West Hastings

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

I oppose the approval of the rezoning application before City Council for 95 West Hastings for several reasons. I have lived in the Downtown Eastside and worked in the neighbourhood for over 10 years, which has provided me with a great deal of knowledge regarding the strengths and challenges of the community and its people. The reasons I oppose this development are as follows:

1. The proposed development does not have ANY social or subsidized housing units included in its plans. This is unacceptable in a neighbourhood where such a large number of residents are absolutely homeless and sleeping on the street or in shelter. It does not make moral or fiscal sense for the City to approve developments in the heart of the DTES that will push DTES residents out of housing before it is even built. Every person sleeping in shelters and on the street costs the medical/judicial/social services sectors a tremendous amount of money each year, an amount that drops dramatically once people have adequate housing. I cannot support a development that will ultimately cost taxpayers money while it also keeps people living in misery.
2. "Market rentals" means that the rents will not be affordable for nearly all of the residents living in the DTES. "Market rental" means whatever the market can support, which based on recent published numbers is upwards of \$2090 for a one-bedroom in Vancouver. In a neighbourhood where the average income is under \$27,000, who could possibly afford to pay \$25,000+ in rent for a year? My partner and I are professionals with decent incomes and even we could not afford these rents.
3. The proposed development is simply too large for the area that it would be built on. The developer is asking for approval of a much larger building footprint than what the zoning of its address allows and what is realistically completely beyond the ability of the physical area to support. The alley this proposed development is slated to back onto is also the alley where the building I work in is. Every day I see the alley blocked by delivery trucks, garbage trucks, resident vehicles, and construction and garbage bins. If someone from City Council simply drove down this alley between 6am-8pm it would be obvious that this building would add too much traffic to a situation that is already out of control while also squeezing the space nearly shut by its size.
  1. I have called ambulances for people I have found overdosed in this alley and have had to run 60+ft down the alley to meet the ambulance and bring the paramedics on foot to where the person in need of saving is because the alley has been blocked and the ambulance could not get through. How does adding more traffic, squeezing in the space by a massive building, and blocking it even further allow emergency vehicles to reach people or buildings?

I hope that City Council will take a hard, objective look at the facts regarding this development and its request for approval. The facts show that the development as it currently stands is not appropriate for the space it would be built on, the community it would exist in, and for improving the quality of life of people who already live in the area. Please do not approve this rezoning and proposal request. Not requiring social housing in a new development or that it meets the needs of the area while also keeping in line with the look and size of other buildings surrounding it as required by its current zoning will set a precedent that shows the City does not care about the DTES, and instead favours developers.

Sincerely,  
Michael Taylor  
Resident of the DTES and social services worker

**Hildebrandt, Tina**

---

**From:** Jean Swanson s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 13, 2018 11:28 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** written comment on rezoning proposal for 95 W. Hastings

Dear Council. Please reject this proposal. It has absolutely no redeeming qualities for the low income community. Jean Swanson

--

Jean Swanson

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential