

**From:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**To:** [Tom Shiffman](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Amendments to I-1- Mount Pleasant Industrial Area  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 22, 2013 9:48:18 AM

---

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website ([http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting\\_schedule.cfm](http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm)).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit [vancouver.ca/publichearings](http://vancouver.ca/publichearings).

Thank you.

---

**From:** Tom Shiffman s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 19, 2013 12:49 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Cc:** Ben Rappaport; Henry R.  
**Subject:** Amendments to I-1- Mount Pleasant Industrial Area

City Clerk's Office  
City of Vancouver

Dear Sirs;

I read with interest the Policy Report on implementing changes in the I-1 Zoning of the Mount Pleasant Industrial District. The changes are a step in the right direction in updating the potential uses for light industrial property in the area.

As a long term property owner in the area, I have been awaiting some changes in the zoning to allow a more flexible mix of uses in my buildings and my neighbors buildings thereby enhancing the ability to be able to more easily lease vacant space and attract new businesses to the area.

In the report dated December 20, 2012 prepared by Kevin McNaney, many of the changes I had hoped to see were recommended. The goal of creating more jobs in the area by allowing more flexibility in the types of businesses allowed in the I-1 area is laudable and hopefully these changes, once hopefully passed will have that effect.

If I am reading this correctly, one amendment that gives me concern is simply a language issue. Most of the buildings in the area are single or two stories. This would typically allow a more "industrial" use on the main floor and an "office" use on the 2nd floor. I am guessing that is what the planners were thinking when they drafted the proposals for changes. When

they considered the changes for General Office Use, in combination with Industrial Use in the same property, they were thinking a main floor would be used for Industrial and the space above would be used for general offices. This is stated on Page 2 of Appendix B which was attached to the report. Under #7, it says;

"B) the maximum floor space ratio shall be 1.0 for the following Office uses: General Office, which may be increased to another 1.0 FSR if an equal amount of floor area from section 4.7.1 (a) is provided on the ground floor." **Presumably, if the main floor is occupied by the industrial, the balance of a building of equal sized floor plates, would be office.**

In a multi story building, it is possible the industrial use will be on the upper floors, not on the ground floor, and this wording would not allow the use of general office on the ground floor with the changes you are intending. Picture a two story building with full site coverage on a 25 foot frontage lot and a building of 5,000 square feet. Upstairs is leased to Photography Lab, an outright 'industrial' use. With the proposed wording, a business wanting to locate in this building and use the 'Ground Floor' for general office such as an accountant, lawyer, notary, real estate, advertising, insurance, travel and ticket agencies would not be allowed.

This seems inherently unfair and not the intention of this change. It penalizes any property owner with a building of more than one story in that it forces them to utilize the ground floor as industrial in order to be able to utilize the upper floor(s) as general office.

A change in language would correct this. A sentence like, "B) the maximum floor space ratio shall be 1.0 for the following Office uses: General Office, which may be increased to another 1.0 FSR if an equal amount of floor area from section 4.7.1 (a) is provided in the rest of the building".

I am presuming this is an oversight, but one that can easily be corrected. I am hoping to see this change.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Your truly,

Tom Shiffman

§. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

