

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 24, 2015 4:23 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** FW: Public hearing re 1600 etc.W6th ave.

---

**From:** Celia s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 24, 2015 4:01 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Public hearing re 1600 etc.W6th ave.

Dear Mr Mayor et al.

I had hoped to attend tonight's so called public hearing regarding 1600,1600A and 1620w6th ave Pine but am ill. I want to emphasize in the strongest possible terms my opposition to such a development. I also think this hearing should be held in the neighbourhood which would make it easier for many people to attend. This was what happened with the hearing for the Henriques building which was obviously a fait accompli before the hearing. When council was admonished in the court before Christmas about not seriously listening to residents' concerns re development the response from you is to appeal using taxpayers' money. Prior to the election you, Mr Robertson made a chastened appearance on TV promising to do better if reelected. How to date have you done this.

To get back to the development above what is proposed is a veritable behemoth. It will block light and views in my own case of both bridges, the False Creek marina and the downtown and the only beneficiaries will be the landowner and some property developer. The city has refused permission to the CPR to build along the tracks about 15 feet away on the other side of the little park. Why would you consider this development? Indeed who I assume are CPR workers have spent the morning tearing out the community gardens between Pine and Fir further reducing green areas and CO2 absorbing greenery.

This proposed development will dramatically increase traffic in an area which is already bound in by 4 extremely busy streets, W4th, Broadway, Burrard and Granville, the latter two being de facto highways. I have written to you about this specific problem but have received no reply. This area does not have a resident's association as it was not a traditional neighbourhood so it seems Council is happy to let any developer ride roughshod over residents' concerns. Do any of you live within this quadrangle? Would you like to? Would this be considered in Kitsilano, Kerrisdale or Point Grey. Would the billionaire good burgerhs of Point Grey rd. ever have this thrust upon them..

This proposed building will do nothing to make Vancouver more affordable or greener -it will make it blacker and cause further air pollution.

Finally are the owners of this property or the developer known to anybody on council or anybody else involved in the decision. Have they made any financial donations during the last election and if so how much. Have any of you ever had lunch or dinner with them or been the beneficiary of any largesse no matter how small?

I am not opposed to this property being redeveloped within its existing footprint as has happened with the office building across from me on west 7th, 1600 block, the building where the Beaucoup bakery is located and a couple of other such buildings. This part of the city needs more such facilities and desperately needs more green space not more eyesores.

Respectfully yours,  
Celia Boyle.

February 25, 2015

## 1600 West 6<sup>th</sup>

The following is feedback on the proposed development for 1600 West 6<sup>th</sup>. I am proposing that the development be reduced in height to no more than 4 floors, or that it become a low-rise townhouse development, and that the number of parking spaces be drastically reduced.

1. **Wrong size for Rental:** 12 floors, while efficient to build at the front end, is not a sustainable size for a rental landlord to maintain. We have numerous examples just a few blocks south on Pine and on Fir of their inability to maintain rental stock properly – which creates an eyesore in the neighbourhood and problems for tenants. It costs \$1mm to do a roof, considerably more than that to rehabilitate windows, re-pipe, etc. , \$1mm for elevators – serious repair issues appear within 3-7 years, and the 25-year lifespan of major components is actually only 10 years. No landlord is going to dig into his pocket and pay out money he can simply keep in his pocket. Individual condo owners are already groaning under special assessments as this type of scale is unaffordable to maintain. The existing building should be renovated or rebuilt at equivalent footprint or no higher than 1 more floor – and even that won't be maintained.
2. **The Shadow studies** are insufficient – I have an actual photo showing the pre-existing short building shading out the park. That day was the 1<sup>st</sup> for sunshine in a couple of weeks and was highly valued. The park gets heavy use even though it is so small. Sunshine is an especially valuable commodity in the winter months and belongs to all residents. Otherwise why build and maintain a park?
3. **Excessive Density and cars-** 2201 Pine, 2288 Pine, Kits 360, the tower ar Fir and now this new 12 floor proposal -- there are too many parking spaces and it will overload what a quiet residential area. Current studies indicate that most young renters in Vancouver are no longer even getting a drivers licence – cars are too expensive to maintain so the proposed number of spaces is not needed. IT IS A TERRIBLE DECISION TO BUILD TOO MUCH DENSITY AT THE MOUTH OF BRIDGES WHERE PEOPLE ARE TRYING TO GET ONTO ONRAMPS – see Cambie which is at a reduced price as people are turning away from even owning condos there.
4. **Must be guaranteed Rental (no conversion to condo):** What guarantee do we have that this is not a bait and switch? The Architect who attended the last public meeting openly admitted that this building would most likely end up as condos. What commitment is in place to force the developer to build a rental building in exchange for this zoning change? If the thing gets half built, what assurances and penalties are there in place that the developer won't whine half-way through that he's not making enough profit and prevent him from wheedling a change out of the City back to condos. This is too easy a way to finesse a zoning change through a loop hole.
5. **Build within Plan, Lower heights below Broadway, and no Tower Walls -** Developers have got to start building within plan. Otherwise, why bother paying for planners at City hall. The idea of having lower heights as we move towards the water is a sound one and should not be traded away. Too many other cities are lamenting the poor decisions they made that walled off their waterfront that they cannot now change. There is too much of a 12 storey wall along 6<sup>th</sup> and developers will only use this precedent to build higher.

6. **Lack of affordable Commercial Space:** I have heard from numerous store owners (along Broadway and on 4<sup>th</sup>) that they would like larger showroom space and office space in this area that they can afford. The commercial areas in this particular district are desirable due to the large spaces and the area is developing into a key design destination. I have also heard that building owners in this area keep rents artificially high so that they can whine later that they can't get a tenant and promote the need to profit off of a condo development in its place. It is a scam. We should retain the pre-existing commercial buildings wherever possible and retain the low-rise character of the neighbourhood – it promotes walkability, pleasant “sunny” streets and storefronts for shopping. Several key design businesses have moved in recently and I want to see that commercial revitalization trend, in low-rise below Broadway form, continue. 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> already contains sufficient towers cheek-to-jowl between Fir and Burrard.

While the whole rental push is a noble gesture, there are already copious units buried within existing condos. Most of Kits 360 is rental units. The city is not promoting rental affordability as this neighbourhood commands rent of \$1800/month for the smallest units. The more critical shortage is actually houses and particularly townhouses as recently reported in the newspapers. With a park in close proximity – a townhouse development would be more appropriate scale for this space, would allow space for families, and be less noisy from the offramp for those living there.

Finally, I am disturbed that it is considered acceptable to cancel and rebook a Public Information meeting an hour before it is held and deferred only 2 days therefrom. I received no notice. I still don't have notice that it has been re-scheduled for Thursday other than what I was told (I had to ask) at the conference room. Any meeting where decisions are to be taken based on public input should REQUIRE reasonable due notice as a basic right. Otherwise the process is a sham, totally without respect for public opinion, and with the aim to avoid public comment.

Anne Creaser - s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential