

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Sandra C [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 25, 2018 9:02 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Fw: Grandview Woodland Community Plan-Commercial and 12th Densification

To the City of Vancouver,

Apparently the site on the information we received in the mail is no longer monitored. This is very frustrating.

This email account is no longer monitored

M
Mayor and Council Correspondence <mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca>

Reply |
Today, 8:51 PM
You
To contact Mayor and Council, please submit your comments through the [online form](#).

To submit comments regarding a public hearing, follow the process [here](#).

To invite Mayor and Council to an event, use the [online invitation form](#).

Thank you,
City of Vancouver

Please see the email below.

Sandra C.

From: Sandra C [REDACTED]
Sent: June 25, 2018 8:51 PM
To: mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca
Subject: Grandview Woodland Community Plan-Commercial and 12th Densification

Hello,

I am writing in response to the information we received regarding the Grandview Woodland Community Plan.

We all understand the need for housing options and densification of some areas of the city.

I have reviewed the 272 page plan. Many of the proposals are very good.....

Regarding the proposal of the multi-storied buildings on 12th Ave. between Commercial and Woodland, many of the homes on the south side of 12th between Commercial and Woodland are new and already multiple

family properties. At least seven are new. The older heritage homes are well maintained. If these homes are torn down, all the materials will end up in a landfill. It is neither environmentally friendly nor sustainable. As well, it is a stretch of homes that are in keeping with the character and history of Vancouver.

Parking is already difficult in the neighbourhood. We have permit parking on our street. Despite this, it is always difficult to find a spot close to our home. It is especially frustrating coming home with a carload of groceries and not being able to park less than half a block from our home. The city has been contacted numerous times about this issue. There has been no action and no change. With increased density, there will undoubtedly be a need for more parking. Where will that be?

We realize that a great deal of time and energy has already gone into these proposals. We doubt that our concerns will have a significant impact on the proposals but felt the need to express them.

Regards,

Sandra C.

Ludwig, Nicole

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Karen Sawatzky
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 2:20 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: June 26 Public Hearing: Item 2 - REZONING: Increasing Housing Choice in Grandview-Woodland – Proposed Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law

Dear Mayor and Council,

I write to express my support for the recommendations in the staff policy report on increasing housing choice in Grandview-Woodland - but with some reservations that I will explain.

I am a renter in Grandview-Woodland. Overall, I support the staff recommendations because I believe they will enable a greater range of housing choices in Grandview-Woodland and will allow more people who can't afford to buy (or rent) million-dollar (at least) detached houses to find homes in my neighbourhood. I have lived in this area for a long time, but off and on. When I moved back here in 2012, it was extremely difficult to find a place to rent that wasn't an overpriced, damp or cramped and insecure basement suite. Expanding the housing choices and places where purpose-built rental can be built will help people like me who want to stay or come back to this neighbourhood if they've had to move away for any reason, whether by choice or not.

I also support the general direction of this report because I think it's important for the sake of the neighbourhood's health, vitality and character that it accommodate a higher population. I also think it's important for the sake of equity that GW absorb its fair share of the city's growing population, which for many years it hasn't. I note from info in the city's open data files (the area profiles) that the 2016 census population of GW was about 29,200. I also note that in the GW plan document that this figure is basically the same as the area's population in 1996 and 2001 (page 14), and that GW's population actually decreased from 1996 to 2011 by about 2,000 people - and this was in a time when the city overall was experiencing substantial and regular population growth. I'd be willing to bet that most of the people the neighbourhood lost over that time were renters who were displaced from insecure housing such as basement and other types of secondary suites, as those searching for affordable homeownership options shifted west. As I understand it, this plan would allow for more secure and purpose-built rental apartments to be built in areas where they're not allowed under current zoning, so I support it for that reason. Also, when policies prevent neighbourhoods like GW that have good access to amenities and transit from increasing the amount and types of available housing, this puts additional pressures on other parts of the city - and in some cases those will be poorer areas such as the Downtown Eastside, which will in turn result in more displacement and loss of lower-income residents.

My reservations about the plan are that, as I understand it, the expansion of housing choices is mainly proposed for arterials such as 1st Avenue, 12th Avenue and Nanaimo St. I don't think that new residents, those seeking more affordable ownership choices and renters in search of secure rental housing should all be forced onto arterial streets that are noisier, dirtier and more polluted than residential streets in the interior of neighbourhoods. This is inequitable and sends the wrong message about the status of renters in the city - that they are second-class citizens. Renters are generally lower-income than homeowners and so often can't afford the best housing options, but that doesn't mean that city policy should mandate that all new secure new rental or multi-family (strata) housing be built only on arterials. I realize the city is moving away from this approach in other areas and through its housing strategy, but the expansion of housing choices in this particular proposal seem to be focused on arterials, which concerns me. Also, while I see townhouses as a necessary and welcome addition to the menu of housing options, I also realize that they are going to be more

expensive than many current renters can afford to buy or rent, so I hope they are not emphasized to the detriment of expanding more affordable and compact multi-unit housing options such as apartment buildings.

Finally, I believe council took an important step forward with the approval of the Making Room recommendations last week - a step I hope will help expand the areas where new purpose-built rental can be built in all parts of the city. I hope that the recommendations in this staff report are in keeping with that vote and those very welcome decisions, rather than undershooting them.

best,
Karen Sawatzky

s.22(1) Personal and
Confidential