



Comments From Hastings
Entertainment Inc. (Joint
Applicant)

November 13, 2003

Mr. Dave Thomsett
Senior Planner
City of Vancouver
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver, British Columbia
V5Y 1V4

Dear Mr. Thomsett,

I have read the "Policy Report Development and Building" dated November 13, 2003, the subject of which is "CD-1 Text Amendment – 2901 East Hastings Street (Hastings Park)" and generally agree that it is accurate.

I do have some comments on the information contained in the report. They are:

Throughout the report, the completion of the concept plan is scheduled for July 2004; my question would be what happens if it is not completed by then? Can the wording be amended to say that "the proponent may submit a development application for the proposed use once the entire concept plan or the portion related to the Hastings Racecourse site has been approved by council"? Otherwise, the opponents who will have access to the visioning process for the entire site will try to slow the process and it may not get to council for a very long time. If not, then I believe we should be able to proceed after the July date.

The report refers to a capital expenditure for upgrading the racetrack of \$30 to \$45 Million and that is accurate if the proposal was for 900 machines. With the restriction placed on the process to only 600 machines the proponents would invest \$10 to \$25 Million to start and, if and when, additional machines were added the additional capital investment would be made.

As the City of Vancouver is the owner and landlord of the entire site (starting in January 2004) the proponent would look to the owner to be involved financially in the improvements to the lighting, paving, lining and landscaping of the parking areas and the overall infrastructure of the site services.

The proponent is also concerned with the number of public processes which may be involved before final approval is granted. Does there need to be a third public

processes during the development permit stage when there has been one for the referral report and a second during the visioning of the entire site?

Within the "Proposed Conditions of Approval" section (b) (iii) speaks to the costs of any mitigation of community impacts and identifies some of the possibilities. Does the proponent have any input into these costs and the necessity for it? And under (iv) in the same section, who is the judge of a "high standard"? It would be desirable for the proponent to engage in discussions with the city that would lead to a mutually satisfactory outcome based on an established set of criteria.

Give me a call once you have received this if you have any questions or comments. We look forward to being at the council meeting of December 2 when this item is on the agenda.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Phil Heard", with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

Phil Heard
President/CEO