

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2015 5:07 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: 508 Helmcken Public Hearing

From: Robert Fung s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2015 4:58 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: Jackson, Brian (PDS); D'Agostini, Marco, s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: 508 Helmcken Public Hearing

Dear Mr. Mayor and Council

We are writing with reference to the rezoning of 508 Helmcken Street, and the Community Amenity Contribution associated therewith. I refer specifically to the approval by City council, of the rehabilitation of heritage buildings under the Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program between the years of 2002 and 2007. In that period, Council, including some current council members, approved certain heritage rehabilitation projects as civic amenities worthy of receiving incentives in order to be rehabilitated. The principal incentive that the City granted was transferable density that the City would then allow other developers to purchase in developing and/or rezoning their sites.

Since council's granting of these incentives, the heritage projects have been rehabilitated, leading to the economic revitalization of Gastown, Chinatown, Hastings Street, and Victory Square. However, the heritage building owners have suffered from the fact that the Community Amenity Contributions being paid by developers undertaking rezonings are being directed to pay for other City initiatives rather than directing them to pay for the completed amenity heritage projects prior to the new initiatives.

In addition, this project is required to pay over \$7,000,000 (\$651,600 towards the public art fund, and over \$6,354,000 in DCL's).

508 Helmcken is a clear example of this bias. Not only is the project delivering a turn-key 162 Social Housing unit building, the developer must provide a cash contribution to the City's affordable housing fund. This cash fund for new projects has received significant contributions from most recent rezonings, while the incentives granted by the City for amenity heritage projects completed over 5-years ago continue to remain unpaid for.

Though in 2009 and in 2013, council reaffirmed that paying towards the incentive granted to achieve the heritage revitalization projects was urgent and a priority, there continues to be a bias towards the City receiving cash contributions for new items.

We request that a portion of the cash funding that the City is receiving for this project, either through public art contributions, DCL's or CAC's be directed to paying for the incentives that were granted under the Heritage Building Rehabilitation program.

We also request that in all rezonings, the City prioritize the total payout of the heritage density granted as incentive under the Heritage Building Rehabilitation Program.

Your attention to this long-standing matter is appreciated.
Yours truly

Robert Fung