

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2015 2:35 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Public Hearing Feb 26: OPPOSED to rezoning 1070 and 1090 West Pender Street

From: Randal Helten s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2015 2:25 PM
To: Public Hearing; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Hearing Feb 26: OPPOSED to rezoning 1070 and 1090 West Pender Street

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am OPPOSED to the rezoning at 1070 and 1090 West Pender Street as currently proposed.
<http://former.vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/cclerk/20150224/phea20150224aq.htm>

If you approve this rezoning, I fear you may be “giving away the farm.” Are taxpayers being short-changed — by about \$17 million?

This proposal is for a 31-storey commercial office building, with very high density, in the downtown core. Only \$2 million of Community Amenity Contributions (CACs) are being offered in return for the huge increase in overall density.

A total area of 562,135 square feet of office space is requested; this is over the maximum 353,342 sq ft maximum allowed under Downtown District zoning. The last two pages of the staff report show that the City has determined that a total CAC of \$2 million be put forward for “Childcare Facilities.”

The development seeks a density increase of 208,793 square feet (19,397 sq metres). Please compare: For the commercial project at 475 Howe, City Council approved a density increase of 149,275 sq ft, with a CAC valued at \$14,042,595. By similar math (\$94 per square foot), this rezoning at 1070-1090 West Pender should produce over \$19,641,000 in CACs for the taxpayer. To me as a layperson, it looks like the City is being short-changed \$17 million or more in this deal. That money could do a lot of good to address community needs.

Please get a full explanation on record and in public from City staff regarding how they negotiated the \$2 million proposed CAC contribution. And, putting the public interest first, if you are not satisfied that the City and taxpayer are getting enough from the deal, please send the application back to the drawing board and ask for a fairer deal.

Finally, this discussion points out the opacity of the system of determining CACs from developments. Please continue to pursue efforts to make the CAC negotiation process fully transparent to the public.

Sincerely,
Randy Helten