

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: s 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 5:02 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: RE: FW: Proposed Development Vancouver 1412 Howe Street - Objection to the development - Excessive parking in the downtown peninsula

Ooooooops.

I am Frank Jameson

s 22(1) Personal and Confidential

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

Subject: FW: Proposed Development Vancouver 1412 Howe Street - Objection to the development - Excessive parking in the downtown peninsula
From: Public Hearing <PublicHearing@vancouver.ca>
Date: Thu, October 24, 2013 4:56 pm
To: s 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Further to our previous response, please note that all submitted comments will be distributed to Council and posted on the City's website, provided that the comments identify the author by name. If the author is not identified, the comments will not be circulated nor posted to the website.

If you wish to have these comments circulated to Council and posted to the City's website, please include the author's name.

Thank you

*City Clerk's Office
City of Vancouver
Phone: 604-829-4238
Email: publichearing@vancouver.ca
Website: vancouver.ca/publichearings*

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 9:30 AM
To: s 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: FW: Proposed Development Vancouver 1412 Howe Street - Objection to the development - Excessive parking in the downtown peninsula

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).

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.

Thank you.

From: s 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2013 10:57 PM

To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office

Cc: s 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Subject: Proposed Development Vancouver 1412 Howe Street - Objection to the development - Excessive parking in the downtown peninsula

LEED goes only 2/3rds of the way.

LEED is American! America is Automobile Addicted!

Except for Manhattan, every city in the U.S.A. evolves around its freeways.

The U.S. economy is massively dependent on the automobile industry.

The initiators of LEED realized that if they tackled the automobile industry head on,

they would be run over and left to die as road kill on the roadside.

Instead, they took the achievable route of shaping cities around transit and village living.

So they allocated only 1 point out of 110 to reducing parking.

LEED is based on 110 points. Only 60 are needed for gold. Of the 82 points claimed with 12 maybes, 37 and 3 which are transportation related have nothing whatever to do with the building. Out of a possible 43. 90% for doing nothing at all!

Any residence built on that site gets 37 points toward the 60 needed for gold.

This project proposes 6 storeys of underground parking with a ratio of about 1 per suite.

This is absurdly excessive in the downtown peninsula, especially at this location. 2 storeys maybe.

There isn't even enough room in the downtown peninsula for the cars which reside there today.

Further analysis is attached.

s 22(1) Personal and
Confidential

info@ October 23, 2013

LEED goes only 2/3rd's of the way.

LEED addresses energy conservation through improving building design. It also encourages locating high/medium density housing near villages, employment, parks and transit; so that residents will have the option of non car living.

But it does virtually nothing to actively discourage the urban use of the personally owned single occupant vehicle. Why such a dramatic discrepancy.

As a prime example of this glaring shortcoming, a comprehensive development project (CD-1) proposal for 1412 howe street and adjacent, can be found on the City's website [www Vancouver.ca/rezapps/](http://www.Vancouver.ca/rezapps/)

This proposal claims to be targeting at least LEED 2009 Gold rating, and probably Platinum, the highest. Of a possible 110 points the project claims 82 as yes and 12 as potential. But when it comes to SOV's it is a farce.

LEED is American! America is Automobile Addicted!

Except for Manhattan, every city in the U.S.A. evolves around its freeways. Only the poor move without cars.

The U.S. economy is massively dependent on the automobile industry. Note the financial rescue package for car manufactures in 2009, by a president who was elected on an environment friendly platform.

The initiators of LEED realized that if they tackled the automobile head on, they would be run over and left to die as road kill on the roadside. It is impossible for the U.S. to adopt a building environment rating system which challenges the automobile, road construction, and oil lobbies. Had they attempted to do so, the entire process would have produced nothing.

Instead, they took the achievable route of shaping cities around transit and village living. In this way they bring the powerful building industry lobby onside because greener buildings typically cost more to build. Later people would find it easier to give up their cars than if they were to live in a freeway dominated neighbourhood.

So they allocated only 1 point out of 110 to reducing parking, and that only within existing municipal bylaws. Some LEEDership that is. Surrey requires 1.3 parking places for a 1 bedroom condo. Build such a place, one point is awarded.

LEED is based on 110 points. Only 60 are needed for gold. Of the 82 points claimed with 12 maybes, 37 and 3 which are transportation related have nothing whatever to do with the building. That out of a possible 43. 90% for doing nothing at all!

Any residence built on that site gets 37 points toward the 60 needed for gold, before the first pen is put to paper.

Bus routes 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 32, 44, and 50 are within 3 blocks. Service to hastings or broadway at 1 minute intervals on 2 streets.

Walking to granville and georgia is quicker than unparking, driving, and parking.

English bay and the walking and cycling paths are right there.

The downtown peninsula is already home to 225 Modo, Car2Go, and Zip cars; with virtually unlimited potential for expansion.

With a 25 year amortization on a \$350K condominium, the last five years of payments are for the parking place. Payments in years 16 to 20 are the cost of driving the car. A non-car owner can pay off the mortgage in 15 years instead of 25.

Yet this project proposes 6 storeys of underground parking with a ratio of about 1 per suite. LEED imposes no penalty whatever for this amount of parking which is absurdly excessive at this location. 2 storeys would make some sense.

Council as well as the architectural review panel routinely rubber stamp whatever amount of parking the developer proposes.

Council has stated a policy of unbundling of parking from suite purchases. Has any CD1 bylaw ever required the developer to conform to this policy. Few condo developments currently on the market are selling unbundled.

Has any Councilor ever moved an amendment to reduce the parking proposed?

1/3 of greenhouse gas comes from cars. City of Vancouver needs to set its own criteria for parking, which really should be net zero. To build one parking place, one existing one must be decommissioned. Decommissioning frees that space for other uses.

The following table shows the points claimed for Howe-1412 which are car related but require zero effort by the developer. A proposal for the replacement scoring system will be posted on www.VancouverRRR.ca

Vancouverrrr.ca info@

October 21, 2013

	Claimed	Claim	May be	Poten tial	Remarks re 1412 Howe et al
	Totals	37	3	43	
1	Preferred locations	7	1	10	This is far to vague a category to even be included. Subsequent categories deal with location. Right between the onramps to an 8 lane bridge is a hideous location. Noise level will make balconies unusable. Air pollution is higher near arterial streets.
2	Location with reduced automobile dependence	7		7	Granville and Burrard bus routes 2,4,6,7,8,10,14,16,17,21,22,23,32,44,50. And everything else listed here.

3	.Jobs Proximity	2	1	3	Walk to downtown, s/b 3/3
4	Bicycle network	1		1	English bay waterfront cycling. Value is suitable for Houston Texas, meaningless for Vancouver City.
5	Walkable Streets	10	1	12	Far too high a claim. Streets have a lot of pedestrian and traffic interaction.
6	Reduced parking footprint	1		1	That's all for reduced parking.
7	Street Network	2		2	Traffic congestion downtown is hideous, often ranked among the worst in North America.
8	Transit Facilities	1		1	absolutely Leed grants only 1 for transit.
9	Transportation Demand Management	1		1	Whatever that means
10	Access to Civic	1		1	yes
11	Recreation Access	1		1	yes
12	Tree lined streets	2		2	yes
13	Schools	1		1	No. Too much traffic and area where children should not be walking unaccompanied.

Dear Council Members,

Regarding REVISED Rezoning Application - 1412-1460 Howe Street, 1410 and 1429 Granville Street, and 710 Pacific Street

What concerns me deeply about this proposed rezoning is the location and tremendous height of the proposed tower. At 52 stories, this building will be almost 20 stories higher than all but one of the towers currently in the immediate area. (At 47 stories, only the Mark on Seymour and Pacific comes close) I would ask Council to consider the following:

Within a 3 block radius, the following towers are currently under construction or recently completed:

SALT

1308 Hornby
33 stories
194 units
Coming 2014

Maddox

Howe & Drake
32 stories
215 units
Coming 2014

Tate on Howe

1265 Howe Street
41 stories
328 units
Coming 2016

The Mark

Seymour & Pacific
47 stories
300 units
Selling now

Modern

1009 Harwood
19 stories
118 units
Coming 2014

The Rolston

1336 Granville St
22 stories
187 units
late 2013

Alto

1205 Howe
14 stories
112 units
Completed 2012

Built within the last 5 years, 30 stories or higher:

Elan

1255 Seymour
33 stories
229 units
Built 2008

Pomaria

1455 Howe
30 stories
134 units
Completed 2008

[In addition, the following sites are slated for 'development in this 3 block area.'

1155 Hornby – 18 stories and 1304 Hornby – 31 stories

Umberto's on Hornby ? stories

Toyota Dealership on Burrard (50+ stories rumored)

Urban Gardener & Youth Centre on Hornby ? stories]

Six of these towers will bring **1,342 new units onto the market just within this 3 block radius**. The impact of such an influx of people (not to mention their cars) on this neighbourhood hasn't even been seen and yet you are considering allowing a giant tower like the Gateway to be built in addition to all this! The proposed combined units of the Gateway tower and the SECOND matching tower that is also in the works will be a projected **ADDITIONAL 810 units to this previous figure**. I would ask City Council members: would YOU want over 2,000 new condos in YOUR area?

I am disturbed by the amount of congestion to an already delicately balanced neighbourhood such towers will add. Traffic along Pacific is already aggressive and bad-tempered due to the number of vehicles that use this corridor. In addition, what about traffic coming home to all these towers over Granville Bridge? What massive bottlenecks are coming to the off-ramps?

The Pomaria, which was completed in 2008 is 30 stories high and 134 units. I can barely get up my own alley some days -- and neither can the people in the Pomaria -- because of the congestion (delivery trucks, parked cars, city vehicles and recycle bins) . We were promised that the alleyway would not be obstructed and we'd still get light and so on and the Pomaria would be a wonderful addition to the area etc etc. What we got was extreme congestion in the

alleyway and the loss of nearly all sun we once had. I dread that the cheery jargon-laded promises made by the Gateway development will be just as empty. It's ironic that the Pomaria will lose much of its light too if this goes through, as we did at Pacific Pallisades. (Did the developers promise them glorious views, too?)

I realize that cities need to make the best use of land and limit sprawl by allowing higher buildings. What has been happening in this area isn't a thoughtful progression of increased density, it's a real estate feeding frenzy. Will we be having this same debate in 2 years because somebody wants to put up an 80 story building? Where does it stop?

Increased density should be done at a gradual rate that respects the livability and character of an existing neighbourhood. This neighbourhood is still a liveable and appealing area for many reasons -- its green spaces, walkability, owners who actually live in their units, and its light. We can still see out, although it's getting more difficult as more and more towers ascend all around us. These proposed towers won't 'greet' those entering the downtown area, they'll merely dwarf their surroundings and block off everything behind them. **How do towers of such giant dimensions that create congestion and block light and views 'enrich' a neighbourhood? They don't fit in.**

There is also the issue of Lorne and May Brown Park on Beach. This popular neighbourhood park will be impacted by the tremendous shadow cast by the tower. Shadow studies on the Gateway site suggest that this impact will be minimized. We got the same assurances about shadow and sun when the Pomaria went up and promptly lost 80% of the sunlight we once enjoyed. I would urge Council members to go down to the park themselves, take a look at the footprint of where the tower is proposed to sit and do the math for yourselves. I ask you again, would YOU want to live in the middle of such congestion? This is Vancouver, not New York.

I strongly urge Ciity Council members to re-consider this proposal and rein in the current aggressive trend of over-development in this area.

Sincerely,



Debra Rooney

s 22(1) Personal and Confidential