

Kazakoff, Laura

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2015 10:02 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Proposed Amendments to the Downtown Official Development Plan

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Sunday, March 22, 2015 10:22 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Proposed Amendments to the Downtown Official Development Plan

Downtown Official Development Plan Proposed Amendments 2015

This entire Plan is an extremely complicated and technical document; however, I understand the proposed amendments are primarily intended to change the social and rental housing definitions and clarification of one subsection.

Now is the time to review the entire document and attempt to clarify and make it easier for the general public to understand. To that end I have the following comments and questions.

There is no reference to other specific documents that are essential to a rezoning application. For example: the Community Amenity Contribution,, Affordable Housing Fund, Public Benefit Strategy and the Greenway project.

All terms used should be defined within this Plan without the need to referring to some other document. For example: micro dwelling, live-work, social, recreational, cultural, public and institutional and dwelling unit are all not defined.

There are some grammatical errors on pages six, seven and eight of Appendix A.

The housing definitions on page 2 of Appendix C are incorrect.

If a use is not specified in a particular area, does that mean it is permitted, or is not permitted? e.g.. day care centre, school.

What is the Affordable Housing Fund? What is the criteria for the fund? Is it a charity? Can anyone contribute? Who administers it? Is there a financial statement?

**What is the Development Permit Board and who are its members?
Can the DPB override all of the Plan's rules and regulations without Council approval?
I am opposed to any changes that give the DPB more power with less public input.**

Will I receive any written or verbal response to these comments and questions?

Sincerely

Gary Young

Kazakoff, Laura

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2015 10:16 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: DODP - Comments

From: Penelope Hetherington
Sent: Sunday, March 22, 2015 6:11 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Re: DODP - Comments

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Hello again--

Since sending in my comments 2 two days ago, I've realized that my answer to question #1 was irrelevant to what council is actually proposing to do with these housing definitions. I therefore re-submit, this time hopefully better informed.

So...by retaining the phrase *social housing* along with all the connotations that it has--and will continue to have--in the public imagination, but re-loading it with a significantly different meaning, council will effectively give *wolf in sheep's clothing* status to projects that are less than socially beneficial. This would be unethical and deceptive.

Yours,

Penelope

On Friday, March 20, 2015 5:20 PM, Penelope Hetherington - s.22(1) Personal and Confidential wrote:

Hello People--

I am submitting my comments on the above in point form, roughly corresponding to the order of questions on the Comment Sheet.

1. "Social housing" and "low cost housing" are not necessarily the same thing. Unless the substitution is intended to free up the latter term to denote housing that is truly affordable to the "working poor", I see no reason to supplant one term with the other.

"Secured market rental housing" in the DODP area is a laudable initiative. (A pity, though, that it wasn't followed in the West End and South Main while there was still time.)

2. This would depend upon the nature of the commercial enterprises and the types of residential uses in this equation. Overall, however, I don't see how tweaking the proportions at this point in time will have any meaningful impact on livability for the city's user-inhabitants.

3. Hmm. Questions like this are vexing because they proceed from a position with which I already take issue. Increased height density immediately around Victory Square would damage the urban landscape beyond repair. Social and secured market housing are a dire necessity. This presents a conflict that is caused by city planners who have squandered opportunities to save existing buildings as truly affordable housing stock, instead encouraging and enabling developers to invade and transform areas like Victory Square into high-end districts. Housing for the displaced and working poor comes as a face-saving afterthought, by which time, height density is floated as the only solution.

Please try to avoid this trajectory in future. Meanwhile, leave density limits as they are. I don't trust the actual social and SMH outcomes of construction in any case.

Best,

Penelope Hetherington
Vancouver

Kazakoff, Laura

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2015 10:13 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Concerns about the DDOP

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

From: JF Williams s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Sunday, March 22, 2015 11:08 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Concerns about the DDOP

Hello, I was recently forwarded a message about the DDOP that included the following statements:

- > The City is trying to sidestep the recent BC Supreme Court ruling requiring public participation and a fair process. These changes to the DODP, if approved, will allow developments like those recently struck down in New Yaletown to suddenly proceed without any public hearings or public participation.
- >
- >
- > These changes include:
- >
- > • Massive increases in the size and density of buildings.
 - > • Creating a new "definition" of Social Housing that specifically excludes low income earners.
 - > • Creating massive loopholes from zoning restrictions for buildings that have just "some" Social Housing.
 - > • Creating a new "secured market rental" category that allows developers to double the size of their buildings.
 - > • Granting "automatic" density bonuses with unlimited density in some areas without requiring approval by City Council and with no public input.
- >
- >
- > Under the new definition of Social Housing, if just 1/3 of a building consists of tiny units rented at \$850 a month, density limits are removed. The public is given no opportunity to comment on whether, or where, the building gets built.

Either this is mostly false and you have communications problems or this is partially true and you are colluding with the developers to enforce policy at the expense of the citizens and residents of Vancouver and public participation.

As a resident who lives nearby and works in the area specified under the DDOP, I would appreciate knowing if this is bad PR or you are actively working against the interests of the citizens of Vancouver.

If these measures are designed to help alleviate some of the housing problems in Vancouver, you know there is a much better and simpler way. Allow townhouses and 4/5 storey complexes to be built pretty much anywhere in the city. This is of course not palatable on the west side nor massively profitable for the giant developers but many people, even Bob Rennie!, have pointed out that this would solve many problems.

Respectfully,

JF.

JF Williams, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Mathematics
Simon Fraser University

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

