

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:25 AM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: Opposed to rezoning of 508 Helmcken

Categories: Red Category

From: Russ Metcalfe s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2013 8:23 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Opposed to rezoning of 508 Helmcken

I just wanted to express my disapproval for the rezoning of 508 Helmcken.

Russell Metcalfe

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:25 AM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: 508 Helmcken Street

Categories: Red Category

From: Stuart Dean s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2013 9:20 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: 508 Helmcken Street

Dear Mayor and Council of Vancouver,

I strongly oppose the proposed rezoning and development of 508 Helmcken Street. As a nearby resident and dog owner, I use the park daily and would be severely affected by the proposals.

While I commend the land swap concept and feel that additional non-market housing is good for the city, the sheer size and scale of the residential development proposed for 508 Helmcken is simply TOO BIG. It is double the height of everything else in the area. The floor plate is enormous and with the entire tower being built right to the edge of the proposed new site boundary, it will be an oppressive monolith imposing itself over the park. The TEN levels of underground parking proposed will cause extreme road traffic congestion at the confluence of two of the city's most-used bike corridors (Richards and Helmcken).

I urge you to adhere to the city's own community-planning principles and oppose this rezoning application.

Sincerely,
Stuart Dean

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:26 AM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: Public Hearing, 508 Helmcken Rezoning Proposal

Categories: Red Category

From: Alan Albert s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2013 9:55 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Hearing, 508 Helmcken Rezoning Proposal

To the Mayor and Council:

As noted by the proponents of the proposed rezoning of 508 Helmcken, the city is currently *ahead* of its own 2014 targets for social housing, and *behind* its targets for park space.

When there's a deficit of parks relative to targets, why exchange city land that's been targeted and promised for future park use, only to get land that's unusable for park space?

Can't we use *non-park* land to gain the desired social housing benefits?

And if we *have* to trade future park land to gain needed social housing, how will the city's targets for park space be met?

What *alternatives* to using potential park land to provide needed social housing has Council considered?

How do the proposed 10 floors of underground parking affect the use of protected bike lanes on both Helmcken and Richards streets?

Thank you all for listening to and seriously considering community input and not accepting *every* proposed zoning exception.

Sincerely,
Alan

Alan Albert

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:27 AM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: I am opposed to the rezoning of 508 Helmcken"

Categories: Red Category

-----Original Message-----

From: Fabio s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2013 10:53 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: I am opposed to the rezoning of 508 Helmcken"

I am opposed to the rezoning of 508 Helmcken".

Fabio Bertoni

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:30 AM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: I am opposed the building at 508 Helmcken I live right beside it

Categories: Red Category

From: glyn jones s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 6:26 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: i am opposed the building at 508 Helmcken i live right beside it

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 12:09 PM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: 508 Helmcken. I oppose.

Categories: Red Category

From: Kalinka Corlett § 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 12:05 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: 508 Helmcken. I oppose.

Mr. Mayor and Council,

I still oppose the redevelopment of 508 Helmcken.

Yesterday when I attended the Public Hearing I was surprised by two things:

How much this process can be manipulated by the developer, and how much the discussion was about social housing and not about rezoning and redevelopment of 508 Helmcken.

The Public Hearing scheduled for July 16th was about the redevelopment and rezoning of 508 Helmcken. And the question we were addressing was, how far should a developer be allowed to "push the envelope", in this case getting everything he requested from the city [density, height, width, floorplate size, etc], while disregarding all the guidelines and bylaws for the area.

There were clearly two sides at city hall, with negatively impacted residents sitting on one side of the room (to the left as you came in) and the developer and architects sitting on the other.

The first 7 speakers were all for the redevelopment, and ONLY talked about social housing, and how bad Jubilee House is, and how much maintenance it needs. Really, after hearing all that, I got to think that maybe the city is abandoning its citizens. The city might be getting some success in providing social housing but it is clearly failing in providing ADEQUATE social housing and maintaining it. It was sad to hear all the stories.

But at the same time, that discussion was out of the scope of that meeting. Helmcken is becoming a nice cozy place with all the social housing that can NOT be maintained by the city. Another East Hastings in the making.

The negatively affected citizens had their say. When they moved into the area they (we) all thought that the city guidelines, by-laws and regulations would be protective of a neighborhood. How naïve of us.

It was very nice to see, outside, the developer and architects arranging for all the residents of Jubilee House to be driven home. Nobody offered me a ride... I guess I picked the wrong side.

This is not about rich against poor. What I see is the rich (developer) using the poor (socially assisted) against the middle (middle class tax payer residents). The city should be fair.

All the reports the city provided, from the Design Panel Meetings, to the city assessments, don't have adequate and unbiased information. Several residents are still waiting for their light/air/view impact report to come back from the developer. The Council has been misguided. The Council doesn't have complete and accurate information.

Just in case you didn't hear all my comments yesterday (I was nervous reading it), you can see them below. Thanks for being kind, and not "grilling" me, and for listening.

Kalinka Corlett

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

My name is Kalinka Corlett, Yaletown resident and business owner on the downtown eastside.

At the first Urban Design Panel meeting on March 27th the comments were that the tower floor plate was too large for the site, there was too much density, the proportions didn't feel right, the building was dominating the park and it was too large for the neighborhood.

At the second Urban Design Panel meeting on April 24, which I attended, the developer presented a new project to address the concerns of the first Urban Design Panel:

It changed the floor plate from 10,367 square feet to 10,130 square feet

It changed tower width from 128 feet to 125 feet

It changed the density from FSR 17.4 to FSR 17.1 [the current zoning is FSR3]

My question is: **How does a building that was too big for the neighborhood, all of a sudden, after such a small change of around 2%, is considered acceptable?** I agreed with most of the comments that the building was out of scale, the density still too much, it is just too large.

My view is in line with the City Planning Commissioner Phil Mondor:

I will paraphrase him: "A building like this, on a small site like this, outside of the established zoning and guidelines, one can only be surprised and uncomfortable". He also said: "I cannot support the application, and can only recommend a considerable reduction in density, closer to what the zoning contemplate, and what the neighborhood and property owners expect in this area".

I was impressed with one member saying that "FSR is just a number, and what does it really mean"? Or another that said: **"let's let it happen and see where it goes"**.

The downtown South guidelines for the New Yaletown area recommends a development that provide for relatively high density while preserving access to light, view and air for residents.

The rationale for the developer to ask for everything (density, size, width, setbacks, height) is that he is providing the public benefit of social housing. It almost sounds like a bribe.

My opinion is that the city council has to have in mind the interest of 3 parties: the citizens that live in the neighborhood, the need to provide for the socially assisted, and the developer.

I only oppose this development as is, where only the interest of 2 parties is being taken into consideration: the socially assisted and the developer. The city should at least compromise:

Don't give them 36 floors. Give them perhaps 25

Don't give them FSR 17.1. Give them FSR 10

Don't give them a tower width of 125. Give them perhaps 90

Don't give them 10 floors of parking right beside the new Helmcken greenway. Give them 5

Don't give them a building that is more than 10,000 square feet from top to bottom. Give them a large podium, with a skinnier tower on top.

We know that the City tends to approve developments that include the benefit of social housing. But it would be FAIR to the neighborhood if at least part of the guidelines were respected.

BE FAIR, respect the guidelines, hear the wishes of the residents, fulfill your social housing commitments, and accommodate the developer: send this back to the drawing board. And then you can "let it happen and see where it goes".

Thank you.

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:33 AM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: 508 Helmken

Categories: Red Category

From: T s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 10:00 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: 508 Helmken

I am opposed to the 508 Helmken project.

Tyler Farstad

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:38 AM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: Rezoning of 508 Helmcken

Categories: Red Category

From: Andreea Larhs s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:17 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Rezoning of 508 Helmcken

To:
Gregor Robertson, Mayor and Council - City of Vancouver
I oppose the rezoning of 508 Helmcken
Sincerely,
Andreea and Anthony Larhs, owners of Fresia condo

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 11:40 AM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: do we live in a banana republic?

Categories: Red Category

From: Tom Voigt s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 8:45 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: do we live in a banana republic?

Dear all:

After having written several emails about the homeless shelter in the 1200 Seymour block which was opened without ANY previous consultation of the public I once again have to see that the public's opinion is not sought. The notification to attend the public hearing of the 508 Seymour high rise arrived on the day of the public hearing. I question the sincerity of wanting to have residents present at that hearing.

I am once again "speechless". Well, not really, as I could otherwise not write this email but I just can't comprehend how a monstrosity of a building would fit into a neighborhood of smaller highrises. One reason people used to like this area a lot is because there aren't big highrises like along Pacific Street and the neighborhood feels like an actual neighborhood.

Speaking of neighborhood. This neighborhood has it's peaceful feel again (without the low barrier homeless shelter) and we sincerely hope that this will remain so for the future. I have heard from several ladies that they felt like "we have our neighborhood" back after the shelter was closed as they could walk in the back alley and on Seymour Street and park again.

Kind regards,

Tom Voigt

Bengston, Kathy

From: Malcolm Ert s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2013 4:17 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Mega Tower at Emery Barnes Park

Hello, my name is Malcolm Ert, I am a 26 year old personal insurance broker who was born in West Vancouver, went to school in Victoria and now have bought a home in Yaletown. I am writing to you all today, as I am sure many others have as well to communicate to you my frustrations with the proposed development's at 508 Helmcken and 1109 Richards, directly across the street from me.

After carefully reviewing all the information that i have been able to find, i am honestly surprised and disappointed such a proposal was considered in the first place. When I bought here in the summer of 2011, I did a lot of research about the areas and every piece of information told me that any land in that block would be sold back to the city and converted into the only park in the area, a park that is very well used by everyone in the area (I can't imagine how busy it would be should the proposed building be allowed, i can't imagine the grass will have any light to grow either, i guess some of that \$30 million will be needed for the increased maintenance cost!)

Here is where I get frustrated. Why are there special rules when a \$30 million dollar cheque is being waived around? The proposed developer has not had to play by any of the same rules as any of the other towers in the area.

- it would be the 5th tower in the block. inconsistently with City policy of 4 per
- this tower is not offset - like EVERY other building in the city. This will significantly decrease property values in the area.
- a proposed FSR of 17.1!!... the area is currently zoned for 3

As a young adult in the city, I can't imagine letting something like this happen. It sets a terrible precedent moving forward that our city and our zones are for sale to the highest bidder. If anyone is able to build a building that much bigger than the current one I will consider it a personal insult that our city council does not care about what is best for its city but only how much profit it can bleed from it.

If I was not working tonight, a must as a 26 entrepreneur who owns a apartment in the city, I would have loved to have been at the meeting tonight to express my opinions and frustrations at the meeting. I trust there are a number of qualified and intelligent people who will be their in my stead.

Please, i implore you, do not let this area be rezoned.

It is a slop so slippery that I do not think i have even began to grasp the magnitude of.

--
Malcolm Ert

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2013 9:16 AM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: I oppose the rezoning of 508 Helmcken

Categories: Red Category

From: Paul Zhang s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 8:49 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: I oppose the rezoning of 508 Helmcken

To: Gregor Robertson, Mayor and Council - City of Vancouver

I oppose the rezoning of 508 Helmcken

Sincerely,
Paul Zhang

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2013 9:17 AM
To: Ludwig, Nicole
Subject: FW: 508 Helmcken rezoning

Categories: Red Category

-----Original Message-----

From: Ian Fisher s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2013 9:28 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: 508 Helmcken rezoning

Dear Mayor Robertson and Councillors:

I am writing in general opposition to the proposed rezoning of 508 Helmcken to allow the development proposed by GBL Architects.

The FSR, floor plate and overall massing of this proposed building are not consistent with the Downtown South guidelines and represent an excessive relaxation that will result in a hulking, monolithic structure relative to its neighbours. Adjacent residents would have no reason to anticipate that a building of this size could be built on this small site, based on a review of the applicable zoning and development by-laws and guidelines. The multiple density relaxations recommended to allow a site that should permit 3.0 FSR to reach 17.19 FSR are very troubling. The rationale that the frontage of the adjacent, pre-existing Emery Barnes Park can be claimed by the development as a rationale for increased density (though only up to 5.0 FSR, per Downtown South guidelines) would seem to set a dangerous precedent.

The benefits to the city overall of providing replacement of the current social housing building (Jubilee House) and guaranteed market rentals are benefits to all city residents and should not be "paid for" solely by adjacent residents and property owners as a result of proximity to a building that is so out-of-scale. The cost of providing benefits that are seen as fulfilling city-wide aims should come from all city residents and property owners.

I will write in support of the Draft Conditions of Approval, should the rezoning be approved. I support the conditions that seek to reduce the visual impact of the building's mass. I also strongly support the provision of commercial space fronting Emery Barnes Park. The provision of such space, occupied by a café or restaurant, offers the ability to increase the natural surveillance of the park and create an active, interesting public-private urban environment of a type sorely lacking in Vancouver.

Sincerely,
Ian Fisher.

Ian Fisher s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Ludwig, Nicole

From: TOLGA HABALI 5.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2013 3:25 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: 508 Helmcken

Dear Sir or Madam,

As a resident of Vancouver, we would like to see 508 Helmcken as a park; we do not need another tower in downtown.

Tolga Habali