

Swanston, Denise

From: Roger Wong-Moon s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2019 6:14 PM
To: Public Hearing
Cc: Ailbhe Smyth
Subject: Opposed to REZONING: 2542-2570 Garden Drive and 2309-2369 East 10th Avenue

We would like to submit why we are opposed to the rezoning proposal for 2542-2570 Garden Drive and 2309-2369 East 10th Avenue.

We live at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential We are in favour of increased density in our neighbourhood to combat housing shortages in Vancouver. However, we believe Council should reduce the maximum building height for this development to four storeys from six storeys (with a FSR that reflects this) for the following three reasons:

1. This site is at the intersection of two side streets (Garden Drive and 10th Avenue), not at the corner of Nanaimo and Broadway, nor even on a major arterial route. How is it that six storeys are equally appropriate at 10th and Garden as along Broadway itself between Victoria and Nanaimo? And nearby, the west side of 2600-block Nanaimo Street is zoned for four storey buildings. It seems like six storeys was an arbitrary height proposed without considering the impact of this change.
2. The surrounding neighbourhood cannot support the transportation infrastructure upgrades required to manage this amount of additional density. There are geographic limitations such as the Grandview Cut rail line that inherently restrict normal traffic flows. There are already traffic restrictions on both Broadway and Nanaimo nearby. The proposed density increases are more than the surrounding lanes and side streets can absorb without being overwhelmed by traffic congestion.
3. The proposed building would completely dwarf other residences in this neighbourhood which are still only single family dwellings, duplexes and triplexes. Is Council aware that the immediate area of the proposed site currently contains a shelter house for vulnerable young people, chosen because it is a quiet residential neighbourhood, not a busy urban location?

In summary, we think Council has a responsibility to local residents to ensure the sustainability of neighbourhoods affected by proposals like this one. To be clear, we are in favour of change, we are in favour of increased density and we are willing to support a three storey with an additional set back storey building on this site, even though it would have a massive impact on current residents. We see wonderful developments of that size at locations all over Vancouver and we believe it would provide the best balance of growth and livability for our neighbourhood.

Sincerely,
Roger Wong-Moon and
Ailbhe Smyth (cc'ed to this email)

Swanston, Denise

From: devorah kahn s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, January 14, 2019 9:28 PM
To: Stewart, Kennedy; Carr, Adriane; Fry, Pete; Wiebe, Michael; Boyle, Christine; De Genova, Melissa; Bligh, Rebecca; Hardwick, Colleen; Swanson, Jean; Dominato, Lisa; sara.kirby-yung@vancouver.ca; Public Hearing
Subject: Public hearing re: Development of 2542-2570 Garden Drive

RE: Development of 2542-2570 Garden Drive & 2309-2369 East 10th Avenue

Dear Mayor & Council,

My name is Devorah Kahn and I live s.22(1) Personal and Confidential Like most others in my neighbourhood I am opposed to the size and design of this development. Firstly, our neighbourhood isn't officially a part of Grandview/Woodlands yet our triangle was included with no proper notification regarding the community meetings. It wasn't until November 2016 that we, as a neighbourhood received proper notification of an Open House to review the future direction of the plan. This was 3-4 months AFTER the plan was approved by City Council. No information had been sent to our neighbourhood as a whole during the previous 4 years of the Grandview/Woodlands Community Plan.

Having said that, some of us - a paltry few, were on the GWCP mailing list due to hearing rumours about the Safeway site at Broadway/Commercial and wanted to find out what the impact of that development would be on our neighbourhood. If it wasn't for that, we would never have known about the Citizen's Assembly, nor that our triangle was destined to be significantly changed.

Once I learned about these changes, I contacted Andrew Pask, Community Planner, requesting an explanation of the process and why our neighbourhood had not been included in the community consultations. The response I received contained information aimed to cover up the incompetencies on the City's end, with no recognition nor explanation of our being left out of the process. I sent my concerns to Councilor Andrea Reimer, who followed up with Mr. Pask and relayed the same information to me. I continued my correspondence to Gil Kelley, who passed me on to Sr. Planner Kent Munroe, who again, repeated the same information provided by Andrew Pask, clearly not doing any research of his own. I met with Sr. Planner Karis

Hiebert who finally apologized for the oversight, and agreed that it should have been done differently, yet there was nothing that could be done at that point, since the recommendations had been approved by Council. I hand delivered a letter to Gil Kelley's office for him, and never received a response.

In the spring of 2016, when the proposals identified in the report were made public, our neighbourhood stood astonished at what was being proposed. We hadn't had any opportunity to stand up at the community meetings and make our voices heard. We only had an opportunity to go to the council meeting where the recommendations were approved. For these reasons, many of us are incredibly angry at the City for this enormous oversight. I hope this will provide the necessary context to my and my neighbours' anger and resistance to this proposed development.

I, personally, am not opposed to increasing density in the City - nor change. In fact, those who know me will say that I embrace change. Though I strongly believe that shoving a 6-storey condo with 68 units and even more parking spaces - including guest spaces, in the heart of a single family neighbourhood is NOT the way to do it. This sort of change is a shock to our lives, our neighbourhood and its vitality, our livability, and the future of the city. Having all those additional cars in our neighbourhood, plus more in future developments will do little to address the City's "Greenest City by 2020" agenda.

And the car issue doesn't stop there. Our neighbourhood is already congested with cars that attempt shortcuts at Garden & Broadway to get onto Grandview Highway to bypass the eastbound light at Nanaimo. It's congested at 9 am and 3 pm by parents driving their kids to/from Laura Secord, a French immersion school drawing kids from all over the Vancouver area. The Central Valley Parkway (bikeway) cuts through our neighbourhood aligning with the triangle within which we live. There are sections along the CVP that do not permit cars. This makes getting into and out of the neighbourhood very challenging. When all of these factors are combined, we get a massing of cars, many of which do not know how to exit the maze, and end up driving around in circles, becoming increasingly enraged.

Gil Kelley speaks about "gentle densification" but I don't see that here. These seven lots of single family homes can be turned into 15-20 townhouses with apartments above, on that same site. Having paid an enormous, inflated price to the owners of those houses makes this

suggestion a less profitable venture, for sure, but at what cost to our neighbourhood that will bear the brunt of these changes.

For Bucci Developments to state that this development will “enhance” our neighbourhood is an insult to me and my neighbours. We happen to live in a very vibrant neighbourhood. We get together as a neighbourhood annually, we use our community amenities. We know our neighbours, we know their kids’ names, we even know their dogs and cats names. We look out for each other. We shovel our neighbours’ walkways. We have an active community network, a list-serve with notices of things for sale or free, events/parties, and things to keep our eyes open for - like car break-ins or other suspicious activities. Our neighbourhood is one of Vancouver’s special places, a place that City Hall should be proud of, should be SHOUTING about, not damaging.

And speaking of amenities, I am aware that the City requires a community amenity contribution (CAC). Yet, there is no commitment from the City that it will be used in our triangle neighbourhood. It will go into a general pool of CAC’s whose use will be decided based on needs in the city at large, or the GW neighbourhood that we, again, are not officially a part of. The new Trout Lake Community Centre and Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood House are already used at full capacity. Will this CAC contribute to a new or expanded community centre, Neighbourhood House, library, or child care centres - in OUR community - that install technically (on the City’s website) considered Kensington/Cedar Cottage?

We suggested that the Bucci staff meet with us with open ears, to learn from us, not to tell us what they intended to do. To show us the respect we deserve and offered to respond as such in return. Yet they only offered a written explanation.

We are not resistant to change. We want to be a part of it. We live here. We want to welcome new folk to our community, our doors are not closed.

Thank you,

Devorah Kahn

Swanston, Denise

From: Jane Henry s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 9:36 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Rezoning 2542-2570 Garden Dr.

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to oppose this development.

I urge you to reject this Zoning Application. This case is precedent-setting and carries impacts beyond our small area of "The Triangle" bordered by Broadway, Nanaimo and The Central Valley Greenway. There has been a mistake made in the lack of step-down from the Nanaimo/Broadway Node arterials to interior residential streets. This happened when the final draft of the GWCP came out. By this time the Planners minds were fully set in stone. They refused to listen to any reason regarding the step-down issue. The Urban Design Panel in their recommendations says *"The GWCP allows a six-storey building form on this block and requires the building to be designed to appropriately transition from higher density developments along arterial streets (Nanaimo Street and East Broadway) to adjacent lower-density neighbourhoods."* A 6 storey building is not a transition from a 6 storey building, regardless of any reduced massing on the top two storeys. This needs to be a transitioned height building. If this application cannot be approved with height restrictions to 4 storeys, or better yet, 3 storeys then it should be refused and allow for the GWCP to be amended to create a proper step-down from the 6 storey nodes at Nanaimo and along Broadway into our traditional neighbourhood and any other sites similar, like the mirror image of this north of Broadway.

The vast majority of our neighbourhood inhabitants, which are currently ~700 people, are deeply upset by what has happened to us here. I think it valuable for you to know that our 10 block Triangle is 2.9% of the entire 340 block GWCP but the development slated for our small area comprises an additional near 2600 people, 27% of the projected population growth of 9500 people as per the Community Plan. If we include the north side of Broadway and the east side of Nanaimo (which will have a huge impact on us) that percentage jumps to a whopping 80%, another 4800+ inhabitants, a mere 7400 more people overall. That is 10 times our population now. I see no point in including the projections of Broadway/Commercial's inclusion—they would probably be around 400%. It is obvious to me that the planners were very wrong about the numbers. I am at quite a loss as to how they came up with only 9500 more people in this vast area.

The traffic problems we are experiencing are complicated by us being a Triangle with one through street north/south. This building will be accessed from a north/south lane only, a half block from the busy intersection of Broadway and Nanaimo or off the side street of East 10th. You only need to spend one afternoon rush hour to see how this will affect traffic on this crucial arterial. There should be a requirement that a lane be put in running east/west between Garden and the north/south lane matching the lane to the west between Broadway and 10th Ave. This will relieve some of the congestion from the south turning lane at least. The businesses will suffer here with all the comings and goings of the residents, not only for this development but for all the future ones adjacent. This will further reduce the extra long massing that, and I quote from the UDP again: *"The inclusion of the northernmost parcel of the subject site results in a longer development site than what the GWCP envisions. Correspondingly, the proposed building has a greater length than what the GWCP anticipated."* Adding a lane would further mitigate this overage in length and create some space from the future 6 storey on Broadway adjacent to it.

Laura Secord School is a nightmare mornings and afternoons. Teachers have no on site parking, so use our streets. Commuters park all day on Semlin, 10th Ave, Lakewood and further east. Transit is overloaded and buses are too full to stop. There is no near future improvements for transit on either arterial. We have intersecting bikeways on Lakewood and Central Valley, pedestrian controlled lights on the only street that cuts across our entire triangle, blockages on Broadway and 12th as school pedestrians clog the intersections so anyone turning on the two arterials cannot get across. I see this every day out my windows. During these busy times emergency vehicles would be hard pressed to move. And even though construction is considered a short term inconvenience, the massive change to our neighbourhood ensures we will likely see no let up over the next decade or two. I have attached a letter from the Vancouver Police Liaison Officer for Laura Secord School demonstrating the depth of our problems here. These issues have been going on for as long as I have lived here, 12 years, and will only intensify as the developments begin surrounding our island from all sides. We will become a walled neighbourhood with little ingress and egress.

All our current amenities are full and/or have wait lists, like our community centres, daycares, seniors centres and Laura Secord and Van Tech schools are at capacity.

My final point is about housing type. It has been rammed down our throats that the goal of the GWCP in our area is to promote transit, so why is none of the zoning here for seniors, students, subsidized or co-op housing? There is no rental even. I have heard the rationale that this issue is taken care of in other areas. Why is planning so resistant to rentals etc. in these blocks?

There are so many things wrong with what happened to our Triangle but I am willing to accept 4 storeys max. It is one building in a vast area. It's impact to the larger plan is almost nothing, yet paramount to our Triangle. If you allow this to be rezoned you will have no choice but to allow the 6 storeys under the new bylaw. Please stop this development and tip the scales back to something equitable.

Sincerely,
Jane Henry

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Vancouver BC

From: "Pazdzior, Susan"

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Date: October 27, 2017 at 1:52:02 PM PDT

To: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Subject: Secord: Message from our VPD Liaison Officer

Reply-To: "Pazdzior, Susan" s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

PLEASE DO NOT RESPOND TO THIS UNMONITORED EMAIL ADDRESS. YOU WILL NOT GET A REPLY.

This morning our Vancouver Police School Liaison Officer stopped by during morning drop off and was concerned enough to come into the school to discuss her findings, and follow up with this email request. Please take a moment to read Constable Leggett's message below. The safety of your children depend on it.

Reminder to parents: regarding the standing/stopping regulations around Laura Secord School. Adherence to the parking/stopping signs will increase the safety of the students and other pedestrians around the school and it will also keep traffic flowing.

In front of the school, on Lakewood, there is a section of roadway that prohibits stopping and is indicated by 2 no stopping signs at each end of the section. Vehicles are permitted to stop on either side of the signs for up to 3 minutes.

Similar signs are in place on E. 10th Avenue, on the south side of the school.

Vehicles are **not** permitted to stop in the middle of the roadway and let passengers out. This is against the City Bylaw as well as Motor Vehicle Act. More importantly, it increases the risk to the passenger.

Today, I noticed a great deal of congestion at the intersection of 10th and Lakewood as drivers are trying to turn eastbound but cannot do so because vehicles are stopped blocking the road while young passengers exit.

I also noticed a vehicle parked facing the wrong way on E 10th while a small child got out and was almost struck by a cyclist travelling west on E 10th Avenue.

In addition to my own patrols in the area I will be asking our traffic section to assist in enforcement.

If the parents have any questions about this please have them contact me

at

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sincerely,

Cst. Cheryl Leggett

School Liaison Officer

s.22(1) Personal and
Confidential



To Mayor Stewart and City Council re 2542 – 2570 Garden Drive

I live at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential and wish to register my disagreement with the scale of the proposed development and the various claims made by the developer that it will "enhance" our neighbourhood.

- 1. A 6 storey building on a residential street is not appropriate, its much too massive a structure against the remaining low rise buildings near it**
- 2. A 6 storey building in not a proper transition from 6 storey bldgs on main streets - 3-4 storey preferred and townhouses rather than appt block to better blend with existing streetscape**
- 3. Same transition issue applies in the next block south of 10th on Garden – slated for 4 storey should be 3 storey townhouses max**
- 4. Lack of appropriate transition here an "oversight" by Planning that needs to be corrected at all similar sites within GWCP**
- 5. Approval of this project as proposed will be a precedent for future proposals at similar sites – all the more reason for our opposition to this project as currently proposed**
- 6. Highest density buildings should be reserved for main roads - Broadway, Nanaimo**
- 7. Increased density not the problem - too much density at once and at one site is the problem**
- 8. Our Triangle community is already vibrant and does not need new projects like this one to "enhance" it**

First and foremost, the developer and the city refer to our neighbourhood as part of Grandview-Woodlands, which is not correct. And the reason for our part of Kensington-Cedar Cottage having been lumped into the Grandview-Woodlands Community Plan is highly questionable, especially when there was little notice or consultation with me and my neighbours. So right from the start this proposal on Garden Dr got off on the wrong foot with me and my neighbours.

The increases in density sanctioned in the Community Plan that this proposal exploits may be seen as unreasonable by many, but is not entirely unwelcome. Although the design has improved from the unsightly block first proposed, it remains too large a massing on what is still a residential neighbourhood street, not a main thoroughfare. Moving from a 2 storey single family streetscape to a six storey multi-residential building on the other side of the street is too drastic a step and should not be approved. The revised design does not complement nor is sensitive to the neighbourhood, as claimed. Townhouses rather than an apartment block would fit the existing streetscape more appropriately. If the objective of the Community Plan was to encourage the acceptance of density within our neighbourhood, then the process in approving the plan and the scale of this proposed project and its design do nothing but encourage the opposite.

I find it difficult to comprehend how the Design Panel approved this as a transition building and their finding that it blends into the neighbourhood. Certainly not the existing neighbourhood where my neighbours and I live now, but perhaps the "enhanced" neighbourhood to be realized by the new community plan in 20 years, once all of us have gone.

The issue of transition on the residential streets is not unique to the Garden Dr site. It is something that needs to be corrected at all similar sites throughout the community plan area.

It is facile to accuse me and my neighbours of being resistant to change. No one invites change easily, but can be convinced to accept it if reason on all sides prevails. My neighbourhood will not be "enhanced" by this development, it will be inundated. 68 new residential units, potentially 150+ new residents, where there were at most 5 or 6 families before, will do nothing but impose hardship, both during construction and long after. The local businesses are not likely to benefit significantly since parking in the building will discourage pedestrian engagement in the community and the anticipated shopping nodes. In fact, access to the underground parking will negatively impact the use of the laneway and impede deliveries to the businesses along Nanaimo. That's all bad enough without the anticipated added competition for street parking in the surrounding area during and after construction, together with the already acute problem of traffic related to Laura Secord school. And if approved, this is but the first of many such developments along Garden Drive, and the rest of the community, multiplying the negative impacts many times over.

Our Triangle neighbourhood has been very responsive to density incentives. New construction of duplexes replacing existing single family homes has been extensive, with even higher density housing on a number of redeveloped properties, along with basement suites and laneway houses. Those changes over the past 10 years have already provided a steady increase in the population of the Triangle already.

The idea of increased density has been touted as a way to improve housing affordability. However, the immediate effect of the Community Plan approval was real estate agents offering land assemblies, a doubling or tripling of the value of the properties affected, of course a welcome windfall for the lucky owners. Since land is a major cost of any development, higher valuations trigger a corresponding drive to maximize the number of units for the project to be financially viable, all without delivering a residential unit at an "affordable" price for any but the already well off. My acceptance of more density in my community will do nothing for affordability, merely encourage the relentless drive to higher and higher valuations. The proposed development does not include any rental units or a social housing component. What about day care spaces for the young families that will supposedly occupy this new development and other ones to come? What is there in this proposal that brings value to my community, or for that matter the greater good, other than lining a few pockets? I do not fault Bucci for trying to maximize profits on this project, but I do not accept my

municipal government's abdication of responsibility in imposing reasonable limits that protect the quality and liveability of my neighbourhood.

I watched with interest the saga of the Beatty project at 105 Keefer, and the decision of the design panel to reject the most recent proposal. I quote Stephen Quinn in an article in the Globe & Mail about that decision: "Is it possible that the voices of a neighbourhood may actually have been heard? Is there a slim chance that the development permit process might be something more than a rubber stamp weighted heavily - almost without exception - in favour of developers?" This summarizes the experience and impression of many residents involved in consultations and the development of Community Plans, especially the recent experience of Grandview-Woodlands & Cedar Cottage. And the quote from Gil Kelly regarding that decision: "We really need a remarkable building there that is both context-sensitive and excels in its design response" I would agree, and our neighbourhood deserves the same consideration in that respect as Chinatown.

The Bucci development, as currently proposed, shows some willingness on the part of developer to listen to the neighbourhood and make changes, but that listening must be complete and cannot ignore the things they do not want to hear. The proposed changes do not go far enough to encourage acceptance. And no amount of amenity contribution will make the difference, especially when there is no guarantee from the city that any of it is actually spent on enhancements directly affecting our neighbourhood. \$160,000 on traffic and pedestrian improvement should have been spent long ago by Engineering because of the Laura Secord school congestion. The problem has been there for decades and should not have had to wait for additional development.

As someone who has been involved in social and affordable housing development in the city, I am acutely aware of the pressing need and the delicate work needed to gain acceptance and support for such housing and special needs facilities with the communities they will be located in. Community engagement does not merely constitute open houses that advertise a virtual fait accompli, the result of negotiations between planning and the developer, then encouraging feedback that appears to be mostly ignored by government and developers alike as merely knee-jerk resistance to change. That approach encourages even more resistance. Where is the process that encourages the maximum benefit to the majority of residents, not merely the imposition of what planning feels is good for them, what the developer is allowed to get away with, and relies on community members with either little time or energy to put up a fight and let it happen? The bulldozer should be reserved for the construction site, not the planning process. My vote is for maximum benefit to the majority of residents. Let's figure out a way we can make that happen so I can welcome new residents to my already vibrant neighbourhood.

Regards,

Franco Ferrari, resident of Kensington-Cedar Cottage community

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Public Hearing Jan 15th, 2019

To Mayor and Council

I am writing to you in regards to the "Bucci" development on Garden Drive and 10th Ave East. This 6-Storey Building appears to be a too massive a complex for a residential street neighborhood like ours where you will find mainly 1 to 2.5 storey houses.

We call this area between Broadway in the North, Nanaimo Street in the East and the Greenway in the South the "Triangle". This describes the shape of this area perfectly. When the various Community Planning Projects started the Triangle was part of the Kensington Cedar Cottage Plan. Without being aware, we became part of the Grandview Woodland Community Plan (GWCP). This change was not officially communicated to me or my neighbors. Only by visiting "Open Houses" did we realize that we are part of the GWCP.

I attended the Public Hearing in Sept 2018 regarding the rezoning applications for the Grandview Woodland Community Plan (GWCP) as outlined in the latest proposal. We listened to a number of speakers from within the Grandview Woodland Area. I fully agree with the points made. Most speakers opposed the rezoning applications, often due to the size of buildings and the massive increase in density. This brings up the question do all these proposed building types i.e. like the massive 6-storey -development on Garden Drive and East 10th Avenue become an example for similar developments in small residential area? Will it set a precedent? It concerns us greatly, that this might be a precedence for similar developments.

The footprint is too large for a small side street in an area already limited in space by its shape. This possible development will add to our traffic problems due to the school and the building we already experiencing.

The point was made that these new proposals do not consider let alone achieve the objectives as outlined in the GWCP: "the history, communities, businesses and the multiple cultures and areas that exist in the community". I feel that this cannot be achieved by the kind of building types as planned for the Garden Drive/ 10th Ave East.

From the GWCP (Grandview Woodland Community Plan) "This community strives to be a place where people of all socio-economic levels can live, work, play, and visit." The proposed buildings will only suit those at the high-end income levels, who can afford to purchase. This plan does not provide any rental units nor any social housing units.

We realize change is inevitable and we have seen it already in our "Triangle". A number of laneway homes, basement suites, duplexes and triplexes have been added and the general zoning for this area is now for Duplexes. But for multiple unit structures as planned on Garden Drive/East 10th Ave a 6-storey building with 68 units to me is not "a mindful approach to the pace and type of change as outlined in the GWCP" and further "Change must be integrated, gradual, and sustainable and be responsive to the needs of local and city residents." It is peculiar when Parts of Nanaimo, which is an arterial, between Broadway and 12th Ave are zoned for less- they are no further away from transit or the shopping nodes. It is therefore hard for us to except that Garden Drive, which is a side street, would be zoned for 6-storeys. It must also be noted that First Avenue is zoned for 4-storeys and this is an arterial through fare. Compared to these the development on Garden Drive should certainly be no more than 4-storeys. 3-or 4-storeys would create the buffer zone as described in the GWCP between Nanaimo street and the houses on the west side of Garden Drive. Even south of 10th Ave the houses planned on Nanaimo Street are 4-storeys. It is simply ludicrous to plonk a 6-storey building on this street.

Since this planned building does not provide the step-down as outlined in the GWCP I could see a greater acceptance if the building is reduced in height, a maximum of 4-storeys. This will provide the step up for the homes around this rather massive building and prepare for a transition for the higher building (6-storeys) planned along the South side on Broadway from Victoria to Nanaimo Street and at the so called "Node" in our case on Broadway and Nanaimo Street which supposedly will be 6-storeys building.

I also question the location. Why Garden Drive? This is not a major artery like i.e. Cambie Street, even for part on Nanaimo Street the proposal is for only 4-storey buildings.

The City Planning Department talks about "increase and diversify the housing stock by providing a range of housing forms and types and sizes for low-income households." The proposed building on Garden Drive and 10th Ave has 68 Units, all condominiums, however, of various sizes. But there is no option for rental housing in this development.

There are many more points to be made where the new proposal does not meet the aim of the GWCP as the paragraph below states: i.e.

"Recognize the value of existing affordable and low-income housing that meets the needs of low- and moderate-income households, with a particular focus on the retention and managed renewal of secure market rental housing." We see these disappear to make room for Condominiums, (which mainly serve the "Developers", partly the City and the high-income population), but they are out of range for the low-income population that has been living in the Grandview-Woodland Area.

Also, from the GWCP "Increase options and enhance stability for the vulnerable populations, including seniors, individuals and families experiencing homelessness, Aboriginal adults, youth and families (who are over-represented amongst the city's most vulnerable populations), those with mental illness and addictions by ensuring access to shelters, as well as encouraging more supportive housing, social housing, and housing that is adaptable and accessible." This in my view is an ideal location for low impact senior housing or supported rental family housing.

This is not the first time we making our concerns known. In 2017/2018 we attended "Open Houses", gave feedback with hardly any acknowledgement from the City. We wrote letters to the past Mayor and Council and the Planning Department. I personally organized a petition in January 2018. This petition was in support of Mr. Franco Ferrari's letter from December 2018, which very clearly stated our concerns. We had 68 signatures. We did not canvass Nanaimo Street and Broadway because at the time it was already known, that there would be a Land Assembly on Broadway. Naturally I feel most impacted by the proposed changes on Broadway, Garden Drive, 10th Avenue East and what might become of the intersection as a "Node" at Broadway and Nanaimo.

I am asking, the Mayor and all Councilors consider some of the feedback you and the council will receive at this Public Hearing (January 15th, 2019) and what has already been provided to the Planning Department over the past two years.

Sincerely,

Gisela Beckmann

Swanston, Denise

From: Linda Fox s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 4:09 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 2542-2570 GARDEN DRIVE and 2309-2360 EAST 10th AVE

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am a resident of 44 years in the Broadway Triangle, so I know this neighbourhood very well. Today I want to express my concerns re this Rezoning application in this format plus in a small speech this evening.

* These 7 properties (the close equivalent of 5 lots) were considered and purchased under the GRANDVIEW WOODLAND COMMUNITY PLAN that allowed for a density limit of up to 6 storeys.

As CCL's Carr and DeGenova are the only ones familiar with the volumes that are in the GWCP, and you have only been in office for about three months, I will give you a background as to how it affects the BROADWAY TRIANGLE since 2013 to the present and in the future. I will use time lines for hopefully more ease of reading.

****THE GWCP- EMERGING DIRECTIONS** came out in JUNE 2013 and was viewed at open houses in JULY.

It was shocking to most everyone in its grand land use directions for the massive span of Grandview Woodland.

The most controversial area was not actually in GW, but in Cedar Cottage and particularly centred around the Skytrain area.

However in viewing the map, I realized that Broadway, the north side of E.10th, Nanaimo corner and 2500 block of Garden Drive were being treated as if it was a part of Grandview. It indicated 4-6 storeys apartments or stacked townhouses.

The battle for neighbourhood preservation was on.

Over the next two years the City held open houses, workshops, etc. I attended several.

****FEBRUARY 2/2015-** the BROADWAY/ COMMERCIAL Sub-Area Workshop and Focus Group" was held at the CCC, with 11 tables, composed of city stall and interested residents. Three of us attended from the Triangle.

FYI- DOROTHY BARKLEY, who I will mention later, was at my table.

The Discussion theme was to see where there was 'Convergence' and 'Divergence of ideas for the whole Sub-Area.

Focus of discussion was 90% around Commercial/ Skytrain area . Getting to discuss the area between Victoria Drive and Nanaimo in any great detail was not possible. It is no wonder as the hullabaloo still was about the Safeway site predominantly.

**** MARCH 2015-** The DRAFT SYNOPSIS of the Workshop is released and those who attended received a copy.

The most "Divergent" opinions as far as the Triangle were:

Broadway, east of the Cut("No change, medium, not sure"); south of the Grandview Cut, east of Victoria ("No change, medium, lowest") # Area identified for "lowest- scale" buildings or "no change" - E. 10th, E.8th

IMPORTANT NOTE. : a document attached to the synopsis- page 17 indicates in Appendix B- A Hierarchy of Scale (July 2013). *The general pattern was one of the starting points for the February 2015 Workshop) **SIGNIFICANT** are the documents/ maps that clearly show that the balance of the BROADWAY TRIANGLE shows TO BE DETERMINED.

**** MAY2015-** the Draft SynOPSIS was then to be turned over to the Citizen's Assembly.

Many of us in the community then wrote letters to the M&C and to the CA to state our opposition and give wise suggestions of alternative building types that are more suitable to this geographic area and its challenges.

****June 25/ 2015** VANCOUVER SUN articles and quotes re the GWCP which is about to be released.

****DOROTHY BARKLEY-** on the CA; head of GWAC, now opposing.

Her initial reaction in a Sun article last month (May) was that the Draft Plan reflected the CA's recommendation. But having spent more time with it, she recently said "she discovered that it overrode a number of assembly suggestions, including those around height.

The GWAC has also begun to fear that the pace of change in the neighbourhood would be too swift and the redevelopment of rental buildings could push out lower income renters who could not afford to live in a new apartment".

**** ANDREA REIMER** in the same article indicated further delay of area plan is not palatable.

"We are at a point where we either need to say YES or NO to the Plan. I don't see now more time on this Plan is going to get us to anything more than is on paper right now".

She refers to: If councillors say NO it would not mean STATUS QUO for the community. Stats indicate decrease of kids or teens.

"About 2/3 of residents in the area are renters and most new residents would be as well.

It may be that 'Contingent' that will hold the most sway as the Plan heads to hearing this week. If renters join homeowners in a push back against density, CCL's may find it difficult to okay the Plan. If they don't it will make it easier for CCL's and staff DISMISS concerns as having come from a non- representative demographic that yelled loudest".

**** JULY 25/2015** comments of the COALITION OF VANCOUVER NEIGHBOURHOODS written to the M&C by DOROTHY BARKLEY and another person.

" Among the top concerns of residents is having only one summer to read, digest, and respond to a 250 page document. Both the planners and the CA had almost a year to think about the Plan for the neighbourhood. Residents need at least two months.

GWAC is calling on the city to delay the decision on the Draft Plan to at least November 2016 and to provide a clear mechanism by which resident feedback WILL be incorporated in the Plan.

NOTE: the proposed Plan was changed from DRAFT to a revisited final document with only 5 business days before the council meeting, and that no change side bars were included to assist residents in digesting the material and any change."

**** June 27/2016** - The awaited FINAL DRAFT Plan is released.

SHOCKING is an understated word as what was in the Plan now involved our BROADWAY TRIANGLE in it's totality.

Where it was ' TO BE DETERMINED' up until MAY 2015, before being turned over to the Citizens Assembly for their input... we now see various colours that indicate 4- storey apartments, rowhouses or townhouses and duplexes.

##For these potential rezonings, this Triangle community NEVER received the opportunity for consultation and discussion as was afforded to everyone anywhere throughout the whole GWCP process.

Because I kept all documents related to the GWCP since 2013' I knew something went wrong somewhere.

Any communications to the Planning Department, as in Andrew Pask and even CL Reimer could not give us residents an answer as to how this happened. They just said it was 'always there' or 'some resident asked to be included'.. No name/s available for us to talk to whomever may have thought was speaking on behalf of residents.

****JULY 5/ 2015** Open House held to show all the details.

From that time on, an exhausting effort of many residents in our Triangle, wrote letters to the M&C; gathered a door to door petition of opposing signatures; several prepared speeches to be addressed at the City Public Hearing to be held on JULY 26/2016.

At the hearing, the main two focuses by speakers were still the Safeway site and the Kettle / Boffo area (with its NO TOWER campaign).

All that expenditure on our part was for nothing. Our main speaker requested that the entire Triangle (including Broadway/ 10th/ jut into Garden from the 2013 plan) be excluded from being adopted in the whole, until we could have some consultation or explanations as to this exploitation.

****JULY 28/ 2016 - The GWCP was approved in its totality.**

**** JULY 28/ 2016. - QUOTE in the VANCOUVER SUN post approval, by the ONE dissenting vote: ADRIANE CARR.**

" A little more time might have been enough to win the backing of those who have been the most active and engaged on the issue. To feel they were sidelined and hadn't the chance in the end to really get on board. I really regret that". Carr said, her voice crackling.

"You DON'T need to build the kind of height and the kind of density on certain spots that we have been pushing and that are in this Plan. You can incorporate more people, you can incorporate more growth, we can develop as a city in a scale that is more amenable to the human scale", she said.

I'm really worried about the character of the community and around the Drive. What's going to happen? It's going to change.and the people are not all on board with that".

****SEPTEMBER 2016**

****The Realtor/ Developer gold rush is on with Land Assembly signs lining Broadway on both sides.. All announcing 6 storey strata condos.**

Then realtor NIKO puts his signs on 4 house in the 2700 block of Nanaimo.

****OCTOBER 2016**

Realtor Michelle Yu has her large Land Assembly signs planted around the Garden/ E 10th location.

NOTE: Resident in 2532 Garden Drive did not want to move or be involved in this assembly. Residents of 2542 and 2560 were aging and though having lived there many years, they wanted to downsize. The properties were sold privately previously to individuals Some time in 2017, the LA signs indicated "SOLD".

**** SEPTEMBER 8/ 2017**

Cards are received in the mail announcing BUCCI's Public Engagement Session to be held SEPTEMBER 25th at Trout Lake.

I start my email communications with Mike BUCCI on the same day to introduce him to the quirks of the Broadway Triangle and how this proposed building is not a fit.

We communicated several times.

*My email communications should be included in submissions to the Rezoning planner at the time- Michelle Yip.

Many residents from the Triangle submitted comments via email, comment sheets at the open house, or on the BUCCI website. Reaction to the design and height and massing was negative. We were told they were really not ready to have had this open house..

They were also going to find another architect.

FYINOVEMBER 2017 Another surprise for the Triangle.**

Realtor Sonia Khari has a huge billboard sign up, plus individuals signs for houses 2246, 2254, 2260, 2268 on East Broadway. They all say SOLD. We had no idea of this as never any signs up such as Michelle Yu's.

****NOVEMBER 21/2017**

BUCCI held another Public Engagement. Much better artistic renderings by a professional architect. Resident commentary and ideas from the last session, we could see were incorporated in the new design.

HOWEVER- The consensus of the majority remained in the community 'STILL TOO HIGH' at 6 storeys and too mammoth to project into this area with homes of 2-3 storeys.

Again...more resident letters, etc. sent to BUCCI and Michelle Yip. This went on into December.

** DECEMBER 15/2017 (unbeknownst to us) BUCCI applies for a REZONING APPLICATION. All correspondence of residents to BUCCI is forwarded to Mateja Seaton in the Rezoning Department., Some of us continue in dialogue with Mateja over the next while.

** FEBRUARY 25/ 2018

I see the billboards announcing the Rezoning Application posted at the site.

**Late FEBRUARY/ MARCH 2018

BUCCI sends cards, on his own accord, to announce the City held open house for the project will be MARCH 20th. Many did not receive the cards on time.

Also, the City was to hold open houses (over Spring Break) on MARCH 13th and 15th for the implementation of the final stage of the Plan which were the 4 storey Apartments/ townhouse / row houses. That date had to be changed to the 14th and 17th. Talk about a screw up.

**MARCH 20/2018 - QUOTE

JAK KING - a GWAC member and well known historian must have received the BUCCI card for the open house, as he quoted on his blog and suggested these points be asked by those attending.

1) As was so eloquently stated in the recent Throne Speech in Victoria..." when people can't find an affordable home..safety and security is taken away..and Businesses cannot grow when skilled workers the need, are shut out by the high cost of housing."

* How many of the 68 condos will be affordable (by CHMC definition) to Vancouver families earning a median income (as defined by Stats Canada) using government regulated minimum down payments?"

2) *How will you guarantee that all purchases of the 68 condos are tax paying Canadian residents?

**APRIL 4/ 2018

The UDP files its Minutes on line re this project.

** APRIL 12/2018

City sponsored Open House at the CCC for the Rezoning Application.

My observations of attendants:

many City planners, some BUCCI representatives; many Developers, speculators or realtors and those that just follow Rezoning applications out of curiosity.

Not really a lot of other people and not many residents of the Triangle attended.

BECAUSE: Since SEPTEMBER 2017 till then, we have expressed our voices over and over. IT IS STILL TOO HIGH and is too massive being one building on 5 lots.

There has been no activity or action since this time, until being made aware via the Courier notice and then the City Notice received in the mail, announcing JANUARY 15th.

I hope I have given you all a picture of how overwhelming, beleaguering, besieging this Journey since 2013 has been on the residents of the Broadway Triangle, and I also hope you seriously consider this project in it current form as NOT suitable.

The KCC Plan of 1998 had the right concept of how to build a visionary community plan for the next 10-20 years, as it really did involve the residents and if they did not support ideas that were not approved. What they suggested for this Triangle area back then is exactly what we are accepting of today. A good read if you have time.

Our community can sustain duplexes, triplexes, row-houses or non stacked townhouses, but NOT apartment style buildings.

Thank you kindly for your attention.
Linda Fox