

## Re: Real Estate Matters 27 10 12 : A Response

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in response to Bob Ransford's article concerning The Exchange Rezoning Proposal / Jameson House conflict which was published in Saturday's edition of The Vancouver Sun, and in anticipation of the Public Hearing to be held at City hall on Tuesday the 30th. Unfortunately It appears that Bob has only informed himself about the developer's point of view, and has not bothered to contact the immediate residents and neighbours who are immediately affected.

1. While there are many admirable qualities of the Rezoning proposal in question - downtown density infill, office use, rehab and re-use of the Stock Exchange building - I find it absolutely appalling that the architect / developer has applied to place over 20 floors of office uses directly across the lane *just over 30 feet* away from existing apartment living areas which are located at the south side of Jameson House. Notwithstanding Item 2. below, this is either a) design incompetence or b) design arrogance.

2. I find it incredible that the City's urban planners have allowed the development team to proceed to the point where it now has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in time, design costs and submissions to get to this point and only *now* have the consequences of a ghastly massing / use conflict have become come obvious. Jameson House has been built and occupied for some time; it is an 'existing condition'. It is shocking that the proponents of the Exchange Building did not talk to the residents of Jameson House before finalizing the total building design and submitting their Rezoning Application.

3. This conflict could, and certainly should, have been red-flagged by the City's planners as soon as soon as the first development sketches were submitted for discussion, many months ago. At that stage it would have been easily possible to design the location and mass of the Exchange Tower to avoid the current conflict. Only now, contained within the report to be submitted at Tuesday's Public hearing, is the City responding, in last-second desperation, by proposing to 'lop off' an offending corner of the Exchange Tower. This of course is a naïve, totally inadequate, response to a question that should never have been posed in the first place. This will definitively *not* remedy the significant loss of sunlight, daylight and privacy that this extremely large office building would create.

4 The Exchange Tower can, and should, now be reworked in a sufficient manner to take into account the extremely serious matter of existing urban uses and conditions. The residents of Jameson House are fully cognizant and supportive of a high-density downtown core, and have chosen to live there. Any new development is required to be fully respectful of its existing neighbours. By any account this one fails miserably.

5. I do agree with Bob Ransford is right on one fundamental point; the design of livable cities does require attention to detail, especially when the livability of the city is at stake.

It is of immense sadness to myself, and others, that the required degree of design sensibility has not been applied in this case.

Sincerely,

David Ellis - retired Architect

Good evening and thank you for your time. My name is Fran Strike and I am an owner at s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
s.22(1) Personal

I am here because I am concerned that there is a conflict between the proposed office tower and livability at Jameson House that has been disregarded by city planners. I am fully supportive of redevelopment in the central business district however I believe that the City has not listened to our concerns regarding privacy, loss of sunlight and daylight.

I work in the TD Tower and look across the street to the next building which is separated by two large sidewalks and six lanes of traffic. I was in early this morning while it was still dark and all the lights were on in the towers. I could see clearly into the offices across the street and cannot imagine how much more detail I would see if the tower was only 30 ft away.

To give you perspective, my living room is approximately 30 feet long. If I stand at one end and my husband stands at the other I can clearly see what he is wearing and doing.

I have prepared for this hearing by searching for information on building separation in other cities. I found a City of Toronto report dated 2006 - Design Criteria for Review of Tall Building Proposals.

In this study it was noted that minimum separation between buildings is necessary to achieve light, view and privacy.

The study noted that the minimum will be no less than 80 feet. It also noted that 'the taller the building, the greater the facing distance between buildings should be.

The report also features the City of Vancouver for its progressive and world class standards ...

"The City has been successful in regulating tall building development, and the strategies employed there have been mirrored by cities across North America. The desired form for tall buildings in Vancouver is compact and slim towers atop podiums that interface positively with the public realm. Widely spaced towers with small floor plates minimize shadowing, maximize separation and views between buildings, and reduce privacy and overlook impacts."

Why are we compromising our leading standards by rushing to approve this development without consideration for livability and privacy?

The report also noted guidelines for minimum tower separation as follows:

Boston – 124ft  
Calgary – 78 ft  
New York – 60 ft  
San Francisco – 114 ft

It is a fact that the city allowed development of Jameson House in the CBD. At the time the development was proposed the potential impact JH would have was a primary concern for city planners (I am referring to a Policy Report dd April 25, 2004 by Phil Mondor) The report noted that the proposal for Jameson House exceeded the typical privacy/livability separation distance criteria of 80 ft from the neighboring TCC. In other words, respect for livability of neighbors was crucial to the process by the city.

It also noted that JH would rely significantly on adjacent properties for livability/privacy separation and would thus limit their development potential in terms of building height, siting and size of tower elements.

We are not asking council to reject the proposal in total but are asking for your help in deferring the rezoning proposal to allow time to consider alternative design that will respect our concerns regarding livability and privacy.

It is fair to say that the residents of JH are also an important part of the CBD. We bring life to Hastings West during the day and after hours and make a positive contribution to the community in which we live.

Thank you