

Tuerlings, Leslie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 11:54 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: 1155 Thurlow Street REZONING

From: Diana Matrick s.22 (1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 11:51 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: 1155 Thurlow Street REZONING

Dear Mayor and Councillors:

This is in regards to the Central Presbyterian Church 1155 Thurlow Street.

The efforts of the Church to create social housing is really wonderful.

However, I find it difficult to support a bulky tower with mainly market rental units owned by the developer, when the social housing units likely could be financially feasible in a less dense building that will not have negative consequences for residents in other buildings.

The main issue is whether this project should be granted the very large floor space being proposed. While the Church wants a new facility, is it the public's obligation to deal with the negative consequences of the bulky development described in this current proposal?

Based on information from the Staff Report, the Church will attain approximately \$60,000 per month as income on the affordable units. With an income of over \$700,000 per year, why was it necessary to provide the developer with 168 lucrative market rental units in the remainder of the proposed, building?

In addition, the current proposal does not meet the provisions of the new West End Community Plan for additional building density where "100% of the residential units are social housing." Almost 80% of the units in this project are market rental (a total of 168 units owned by the developer). Of the remaining 21% (45 units owned by the Church), 60% of the social housing units will rent for between 80% and 90% of market rent. This is not "100% social housing."

Are social housing units at 10% below market rent, and significantly higher than other existing rentals in the neighbourhood, really "social housing?" Is this what West End residents expected when they were shown the statement regarding the creation of "social housing" in the West End Community Plan?

For West End residents in need of truly affordable social housing, the two bedroom units renting at \$1,630 a month in the "social housing" portion of the proposed building are going to do little to address the lack of accommodation for those who have little income or are at risk of becoming homeless.

Kind regards,

Diana

Tuerlings, Leslie

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 11:42 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Rezoning of 1155 Thurlow Street

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

From: Alex Roethe s.22 (1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 11:10 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Rezoning of 1155 Thurlow Sreet

Dear Mayor and Councillors of the City of Vancouver,

I will not be able to attend your public hearing on July 15 that will deal with the proposed rezoning of 1155 Thurlow Street. However I would like to share a few observations in this regard with you.

I am the owner of s.22 (1) Personal and Confidential, and I live in the area.

I am opposed to the rezoning on the following grounds:

1. The site currently is zoned to allow a density of either 1.8 or 2.2 FSR. This was incorporated in the new Zoning Bylaw that your Council approved only just last year, after your planning department claimed to have broadly consulted the community, and claimed input from as many as 7,000 respondents.

The proposal before you now seeks a density of 9.45 FSR. This would result in a building approximately five times the size of what is currently contemplated by the Zoning Bylaw. Allowing such a rezoning will totally discredit all the planning work and consultation that went into the 2013 Zoning Bylaw.

2. A building of the size proposed will result in many neighbouring buildings losing much of their direct sunlight.

3. The project will have no green space at grade level. This is a serious liveability issue for the neighbourhood, where most existing buildings have at least a small fore-garden green space. This is what differentiates the West End from Yale Town. This point was repeatedly addressed in the 2013 Rezoning, and I believe green space at grade level should be protected.

4. If the objective is to generate new rental housing it does not need a 9.45 FSR. There currently are more than thirty projects in the City of Vancouver awaiting development permits, all for rental apartment projects, and showing a total of 3,153 proposed units. The proposed FSR on these projects ranges from as low as 1.57 FSR to an average of less than 5.0 FSR. This site has no special merit that would warrant such a high density, so this begs the question: Why here?

The site currently is utilized at what I estimate to be a 1.0 FSR, and includes a large open parking lot. There is an opportunity here to redevelop the parking lot to move parking underground, and add a residential structure above, that would utilize the site within the current zoning. There is no need for rezoning to do such a redevelopment. This would also be in keeping with the existing neighbourhood character.

5. Density is not free. It affects liveability, it adds traffic congestion and it reduces green space.

6. In an earlier submission I made to you at the time of the 2013 rezoning I suggested a blanket 3.0 FSR for the West End. That was the FSR in the 1960's when much of the existing rental stock was built. That density has worked for 50+ years. You chose to go with FSR's of 1.8 to 2.2, on the advice of your planning team. However now, barely seven months later, the same planning team is back saying "we got it wrong, by a factor of five".

7. As a property owner I view zoning as an implied contract. If I buy a house in a single family neighbourhood, zoned for such use, I am doing so on the assumption that such zoning will prevail over time, and that I can assume that I will not promptly get a gas station or a big box store as tomorrows neighbour. If you destroy this fundamental tenet of zoning,

why bother with zoning at all? I bought into this neighbourhood in 1973, knowing what the zoning was, and believed that zoning was meaningful. The proposal before you on 1155 Thurlow exceeds the existing FSR zoning by a factor of five. This makes no sense.

Yours truly

Alex Roethe

s.22 (1) Personal and
Confidential

Kelly, Melissa

From: s.22 (1) Personal and Confidential on behalf of West End Neighbours
s.22 (1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 3:59 PM
To: Public Hearing
Cc: Robertson, Gregor; Affleck, George; Ball, Elizabeth; Carr, Adriane; Tang, Tony; Jang, Kerry; Reimer, Andrea; Stevenson, Tim; Meggs, Geoff; Deal, Heather; Louie, Raymond
Subject: Public Hearing rezoning 15-July for 1155 Thurlow: OPPOSED

Mayor and Council:

We are writing to express opposition to the rezoning at 1155 Thurlow Street, going to Public Hearing today, July 15, 2014.

WEN is concerned with the development as currently proposed, for the following reasons:

1. **Excessive density** (9.45 FSR). This proposal has not earned its enormous increase in density.
2. **Impacts on neighbours:** This proposal will create shadow and privacy impacts for neighbouring properties and residents.
3. **Too much being bonused to developer in return for too little social housing.**
4. **Massing:** Massing relates poorly to neighbouring properties
5. **Lack of compliance with the recently-adopted West End Community Plan:** The proposal violates the West End Plan provisions for potential increases in density for this site only in cases where development includes 100% social housing. This proposal is NOT for 100% social housing.

We describe these in more detail below.

The City staff report suggests that increased density is being supported on the basis that social housing is being provided. But there is a minimal benefit of housing affordability here. The application appears to FAIL to meet the provisions of the newly-approved West End Community Plan for additional density where "100% of the residential units are social housing." Notably, almost 80% of the units in this project are market rental, and of the remaining 21%, sixty percent of the 45 units proposed will rent for between 80% and 90% of market rent. This is certainly not "100% social housing."

For the Public Hearing, please confirm publicly whether the City considers rental units to be "social housing" if they are only 10% below market rent (and significantly higher than other existing rentals in the neighbourhood).

Also, we do not believe that a 10% reduction from market rent is what the community expected when the City included the creation of "social housing" in the West End Community Plan.

City Council, for the record and for full disclosure, during the Public Hearing, please have the City planners and/or proponent publish the intended rents for ALL 213 suites not just the 45 rent reduced suites.

The scale and design of this building are inappropriate for this location and out of context with the lower density development to the South, West, and North of the site. The staff report says:

Form of Development — The base steps down from eight storeys at the corner of Thurlow Street to three storeys next to the neighbouring three-storey apartment building. This transition is intended to reflect the scale of nearby development ... down to the lower scaled residential area to the west.

The so-called “stepping” at the West side of the building is minimal and creates a terrible relationship to the existing building to the West. The existing windows of the adjacent three-storey walk-up building will be facing a blank wall.

Central Presbyterian Church’s efforts to create social housing are commendable. The church will attain approximately \$60,000 per month in income on the affordable units - over \$700,000 per year. Beyond that, there is no need for the City of Vancouver to provide the developer with the large number of lucrative market rental units in the remainder of the building.

The public will see this as the City being excessively charitable -- not to a church, but to a developer. Other municipal governments can and do achieve a much better deal for their citizens.

Randy Helten, Director, on behalf of
West End Neighbours (WEN), c/o s.22 (1) Personal and Confidential