

Kazakoff, Laura

From: Public Hearing
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 9:03 AM
To: Kazakoff, Laura
Subject: FW: Notice of Public Hearing - Proposed Amendments to the Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP)

From: Concerned Resident 5.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2015 12:25 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Notice of Public Hearing - Proposed Amendments to the Downtown Official Development Plan (DODP)

Dear Mayor and Council,

I wanted to attend this important meeting in person, but unfortunately I'll be out of town, but wanted to voice my concerns....if they will have any change on opinion or not....

Does the new definition of "low cost housing" apply to only new developments, or will this include existing "social housing / low cost housing"?

Why are they changes structured to make them so complicated the average citizen reading with just give up in frustration?

why are we making amendments to the DODP to project that have previously been approved? i.e. changing the goal posts to fit what shouldn't have been approved?

Concerned Resident
Tyler McDougall

Kazakoff, Laura

From: Public Hearing
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2015 10:08 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Amendments to the DODP Public Hearing

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: August Bramhoff
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2015 3:52 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: Sovdi, Holly
Subject: Amendments to the DODP Public Hearing

March 18, 2015.

Dear Mayor and Council;

I am writing to express my concerns and amendments to the Downtown Official Development Plan. This plan concerns many citizens and stakeholders in Vancouver, aside from the residents of the West End, Downtown East Side, and Downtown Entertainment and Business Core.

I am pleased to hear that council is recommending the term social housing to be re-termed as low-cost housing. However, this term needs to be clarified and strengthened. Currently, only 30% of rental units are mandated to be rented below market value, and unless this term is amended to at least 50%, many people in Vancouver are in threat of being displaced out of the city. My concerns centre around increasing commercial space in the Robson village over residential space. This is contradictory in our already small affordable rental vacancy rate. Downtown is a community where the residents are being pushed out of their long-term rentals for developments that are commercial in nature, overt or not. A good example is the increased renovation evictions for apartment buildings and towers designated for foreign students and investors (not residents). New condo towers are not affordable to most renters. Does the city intend to build or secure enough low cost housing options for the developments it will allow displacing residents?

I am also pleased to see that council is planning on building social housing in Victory Square. However, I believe the plan behind this is flawed. There is no reason why social housing could not be integrated throughout Vancouver rather than concentrated in the DTES. By building it into communities rather than creating a community, social stratification is lessened, and ghettos are not generated. Marguerite Ford building currently has this fate, and it should not be repeated. If the reason for building low cost housing in the DTES is to house the hard to home and those with addiction issues, it would be far more prudent to build more detox spaces or mental health ward capacity in Vancouver Hospitals to triage and treat those suffering, and then let them access housing outside of the DTES, where they can free from the drug dealers and pimps who have taken advantage of them in the first place. There are many, many low income residents in Vancouver, such as people with developmental disabilities, low wage earners, and seniors who do not live a crime and drug influenced lifestyle and just want a clean, safe place to live by themselves or with their loved ones-it's poor planning to shove everyone together and just hope for the best.

I would like to thank council for reviewing my comments and genuinely hope they are taken under consideration.

Sincerely,

August Bramhoff.