

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 8:49 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: pro-1940 First Shaughnessy property

From: cindy zhang s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2015 5:16 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: pro-1940 First Shaughnessy property

Dear Mayor and Council,

I live at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential, a pre-1940 First Shaughnessy property. I disagree with and do not support the proposed new Heritage Conservation Area proposals for First Shaughnessy.

Sincerely

Rebecca Gong

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 1:18 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Pre-1940 First Shaughnessy Property

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

From: Annie Gao s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 11:16 AM
To: Public Hearing
Cc: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Pre-1940 First Shaughnessy Property

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am the owner of s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential in the first Shaughnessy area. I disagree with and do not support the proposed new Heritage Conservation Area proposals for the First Shaughnessy. It will restrict the development of this area, and make this area distorted. There are many ways to protect the heritage, but not like this.

Sincerely

Annie

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 2:29 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: First Shaughnessy Heritage Conservation Area - Proposed Regulatory and Zoning Changes - Continuation of Public Hearing

Importance: High

From: Bernadette Bebb s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 1:58 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; Public Hearing
Cc: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: First Shaughnessy Heritage Conservation Area - Proposed Regulatory and Zoning Changes - Continuation of Public Hearing
Importance: High

Mayor and Council
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver BC V5Y1V4

17 August 2015

Re: First Shaughnessy Heritage Conservation Area – Proposed Zoning Changes – Continuation Hearing

Dear Sir and others,

I wish to address the above mentioned proposal in this letter. I live at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential, a pre-1940 First Shaughnessy property. I disagree with and do not support the proposed new Heritage Conservation Area proposals for First Shaughnessy for the following reasons:

- 1) Having the government dictate a heritage designation on a private property is contrary to the rights and freedoms an individual in Canada should have on a privately owned home. Should an individual seek such a designation of their own volition, it cannot be disputed, but to enforce these sanctions upon a home owner against their will is a direct violation of their rights as a property owner.
- 2) First Shaughnessy already has copious guidelines and bylaws which home owners must comply with when making changes to their property. Adding the additional bylaws, which come with heritage designation, will be redundant and increase permit times and expenses needed to make changes or rebuild on a site.
- 3) The majority of the homes listed to be designated as heritage are made of wood. Structures made of wood do not last indefinitely and at times the only safe and cost effective method to creating a liveable structure is demolition. Examples can be taken from other cities (such as London) where heritage designations have made the restoration of a home not financially feasible, and the property was also not inhabitable. This has left many of these properties abandoned by the owners and the city. Abandoned homes lead to a whole deluge of additional issues.
- 4) The Vancouver Heritage Foundation states "Heritage value is embodied in all the materials, forms, spatial configurations, uses, and cultural associations or meanings that together comprise a building's character-defining elements." By this definition, our home can no longer be considered heritage. In 1991-92, the previous owners completed a massive renovation, right to the studs of our property at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential. The foundation was completely torn up and re-laid and the house was raised approximately 8 feet. This project eliminated the majority of the original character, features, structures, fixtures and materials. The addition of a three car garage all but disqualify our home as being heritage since very few people even had cars when it was built. The cedar shakes that were the original roofing were replaced with three layer asphalt shingles about 5 years ago as well.
- 5) The value of the property will decrease with such a designation. If one were to simply apply one of the basic macroeconomic principles of supply and demand, it can be easily deduced that adding a heritage designation to a

home will DECREASE the property value. By adding a heritage designation there will be fewer interested buyers, this means there is less demand, this means the value of this house decreases. Some realtors estimate the number of interested parties will be reduced by 50%. The following buyers will no longer be interested in the property:

- Those who are looking at the property as a site for a new home
 - Those who do not wish to administer the additional paper work required when making alterations of a heritage home
 - Those who do not have the time to wait for Heritage Councils to review plans of proposed construction within a heritage home. The City of Vancouver indicates that there “may not be” additional time for construction permits to be reviewed, but when you look at the process that is required for the permit review for properties with heritage designation, it is inevitable that the process will be slower than permit review for regular homes. The city cannot guarantee that these permits will not take more time for review since the people on the heritage permit review board are separate from those who review other building/renovation permits in the city. It is not realistic to state that it will not add waiting time
 - Those who require rental suites to qualify for a mortgage for a home in this area but would not be able to make changes to the property due to the heritage declaration
- 6) It is easy enough to look at any MLS listing and note that houses built later (within the last ten years) have significantly more value than those built earlier (prior to 1940). When there is such a disparity between the costs of houses, that sit right next door to each other, one cannot refute the fact that restrictions on older homes reduce the value of the home. I am all for maintaining the beauty and uniqueness of this neighbourhood and its structures, however it is simply not feasible, effective, efficient or environmentally beneficial to some buildings and homes, particularly older homes. In order for homes to comply with by-laws and building codes or to add rental suites within the homes, some homes need to be completely demolished and rebuilt. I believe there should be some standards in which a home in a specific area should be held to in order to maintain the essence and nuances of that neighbourhood, but those should come from the design and elevation of the home which are already in place for the neighbourhood.
- 7) If there are any restrictions the city should place on a neighbourhood it should be the beauty of the homes being built, not maintaining something uninhabitable. At times attempting to conserve an older structure would have greater expense to the environment, the city and the home owner.
- 8) Such sanctions placed on a home has broader implications than to just the home owner. Placing these additional by-laws limits the growth and development of a city. In order for Vancouver to continue to expand and diversify the city and its inhabitants, fewer restrictions should be placed on existing homes.
- 9) Who benefits from the heritage designation? No one. We do not live in a high traffic area where many tourists can glance at the splendor of our home. Our home does not share its property line with a green space, park, stores, tourist attractions or any other publicly-commercially used area. No visitors or tourists will seek out a heritage home when in Vancouver. It does not change tourism or the “look” of the city as stated amongst the arguments for heritage designation. Preserving this home for future generations is not for the city to decide. I can see the city wanting to have their input on public buildings, multiuse buildings like those found in Gastown, and commercial buildings like the Vancouver Hotel. These are beautiful buildings that have historical significance and that many many people use and see. But a private home, our home, is not. The enforced restrictions placed on a heritage home serve no purpose within a private home. Our home is not a museum; it has no bearing on preserving the history for the future of Vancouver. This home has no national significance. It was not designed by a famous architect or occupied by anyone known for their contribution to the city. Implying that by maintaining this home, in accordance with the bylaws stated by the heritage proposal, will enhance the future of the city and preserve the history has no solid basis as an argument for this proposal. How can a handful of homes in a neighbourhood of privately owned homes have any impact on the historic, scientific, social or spiritual importance of this city? Perhaps the mayor and the council would have a greater impact on future generations by ensuring that the citizens are capable of even having a future through education instead of spending valuable time and resources governing the aesthetics of a private residence.

I would also like to add the following points:

- 1) Any relative and correlating decrease in property taxes, which will come as a result of the heritage designation, must be made. When the devaluation of this new designation occurs, we will be seeking compensation for that loss. Any changes in the home that are required after this new designation must also then be compensated by the city in full.
- 2) There have been some *studies* that indicate this designation increases property value. Any studies I have found were not conducted in this city and were completed more than a decade ago. A lot has changed in the last ten years and the Vancouver real estate market is not like that of any other city. If studies are to be conducted, they must represent the true and current situation of the target city. Extrapolations from a study conducted on Toronto cannot be the basis for the market situation analysis in Vancouver.

- 3) Some of the correspondence from the city has indicated that during the sale of a home it must be disclosed that it is a heritage home. I believe in disclosing all information about a home. Disclosing its designation, as enforced by the city, comes with it a connotation that it will depreciate the value of the home, as typically items that "must be disclosed" are items that in turn devalue the home. The following statement from the City of Vancouver website, acknowledges that this designation has an effect on the saleability of a home "... acknowledges that a prospective buyer of a designated heritage property should check with the local planning department to get the details of the designation bylaw, and particulars about the municipal heritage program."
- 4) Another message from the City of Vancouver website states "the bylaw gives local government the power to refuse approval of proposed alterations, including demolition. Such power is generally limited to the building exterior, although the 1994 amendments to heritage legislation allowed for the designation of interiors, and there have since been a few of these." This statement contradicts everything this country stands for. The government can stipulate what alterations can be made? Where is our freedom and pride in home ownership? The government should be more concerned about things that actually affect our society, not whether a home, privately owned, should be preserved or not. This does not better humanity.

With that I would like to clearly reiterate that I disagree with and do not support the proposed new Heritage Conservation Area proposals for First Shaughnessy. Also, note I will be attendance at the hearing on 15 September 2015. These actions imposed by the city remove all sense of individuality, share of voice and are disheartening, as we believe Canada to be a free country, but when we allow governments to control what we do with our private residence (inside and out), where does it end?

Regards,

Bernadette Bebb

s. 22(1) Personal and
Confidential

August 27, 2015

Via email: marco.dagostini@vancouver.ca

CITY OF VANCOUVER
Planning and Development Services
Planning – Citywide & Regional
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4
Attn. Marco D'Agnostini

Dear Mr. Agnostini:

RE: *First Shaughnessy Heritage Conservation Area – Proposed Regulatory
And Zoning Changes* --- **WRITTEN SUBMISSION**

On or after August 12th I received a letter from you regarding the proposed changes to the zoning in the First Shaughnessy Heritage Conversation Area. As I am the registered owner of a property located at civic address s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential and as my residence at this civic address was primarily built prior to 1940 I am directly affected by the proposed re-zoning and the Heritage Conservation Area Official Development Plan (HCA ODP) and associated proposed by-laws.

I wish to officially voice my opposition to this change in zoning. I have been an owner and resident of Shaughnessy since 1977 (or almost about 40 years). I expect that I will be living here for the remainder of my years. However I may have to sell my residence if my health deteriorates. I have acquired a substantial asset in my residence and have always paid my property taxes. It is my firm belief that any change in the zoning bylaws that does not allow for maximization of building potential without restrictive measure will affect the property value of my residence in a negative way. I feel that I am being punished by the City for living in an area that has become popular for developers. Any change to these bylaws restricting future development will cost me and my surviving family dearly. Therefore I strongly oppose your changes.

Please send this letter to Mayor and Counsel as I wish my opposition to be heard. You can reach me at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential if need be.

Regards,

s. 22(1) Personal and
Confidential

Lucia Butler

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

To: mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am a resident of the City of Vancouver. I want to state for your records that I disagree with and do not support the proposed new Heritage Conservation Area proposals for First Shaughnessy.

Sincerely,

s. 22(1) Personal and
Confidential

(sign)

S. M. Ma

(print name)

Sept. 10, 2015

(date)

TO: Mayor and Council of the City of Vancouver

I am wholeheartedly against the adoption of the bylaws which propose to designate First Shaughnessy as a "Heritage Conservation Area". This is a disingenuous and wrong-headed scheme to try to avoid paying compensation while depriving certain Shaughnessy owners of some of the value of their properties and effectively expropriating property rights. Many of the purportedly heritage properties are unexceptional and commonplace. They have no objective heritage value. Any heritage designation should only occur on a case by case basis in respect of those properties that merit it, with compensation paid as contemplated in Section 595 of the Vancouver Charter (SBC 1953) Chapter 55.

Please do not pass these proposed bylaws.

Date: September 10, 2015

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Signature

AI HURWITZ

Print name

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address

VANCOUVER

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Email address

TO: Mayor and Council of the City of Vancouver

I am wholeheartedly against the adoption of the bylaws which propose to designate First Shaughnessy as a "Heritage Conservation Area". This is a disingenuous and wrong-headed scheme to try to avoid paying compensation while depriving certain Shaughnessy owners of some of the value of their properties and effectively expropriating property rights. Many of the purportedly heritage properties are unexceptional and commonplace. They have no objective heritage value. Any heritage designation should only occur on a case by case basis in respect of those properties that merit it, with compensation paid as contemplated in Section 595 of the Vancouver Charter (SBC 1953) Chapter 55.

Please do not pass these proposed bylaws.

Date: September 10, 2015

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Signature

John L. Boyd.

Print name

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address

VANCOUVER

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Email address

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, September 11, 2015 9:05 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: opposition to Shaughnessy Heritage plan

From: Frank Hook s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 9:11 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; Public Hearing
Subject: opposition to Shaughnessy Heritage plan

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am wholeheartedly against the adoption of the bylaws which propose to designate First Shaughnessy as a "Heritage Conversation Area".

I grew up near Commercial Ave, have lived in Vancouver for all of my 71 years and have resided in my current home at s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential since 2000. I have not experienced anything as outlandish as the current proposal to arbitrarily change my home and others in our neighbourhood to "heritage status" because of their age only [pre 1940]. This is like declaring that every piece of art, piece of furniture etc has a heritage status simply because it was created before 1940. Has there been a independent professional architect -- trained as a heritage specialist -- commissioned to review these homes to confirm your statement that they deserve, each and every one, to have heritage status?

And talk about consequences for this assumption.

We hear from you that our homes may depreciate about 5% but state that this is a judgement call. So could it be 10%, 20%, 30%, possibly more? How would you react to a blanket inaccurate clause affecting your own houses, that had extremely serious financial effects.

What happened to this elected council's commitment to consult with concerned citizens before creating changes affecting them? A few decades back, a consultation process was used to preserve the character of this neighbourhood and a workable plan was found. Why would this process not work today and why is it not being used? I would suggest to you that the people of this neighbourhood care as much or likely more for this neighbourhood than anyone - what could possibly be more straightforward than to strike up a working committee from the city and the neighbourhood to work like it did in earlier days?

As mentioned, my home is on s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential not a prime location due to the traffic on Granville St. and its proximaty to King Edward. Under your arbitrarily inaccurate heritage declaration, we would watch our property value drop significantly.

I hope that you as both council members and citizens of this city can step back, allow the city staff to meet with people of this neighbourhood as it succesfully did decades ago, arrive at an updated workable plan for the area together, and once again leave a legacy of the power of elected city represtatives and its people when they work together.

Sincerely,
Frank Hook

TO: Mayor and Council of the City of Vancouver

I am wholeheartedly against the adoption of the bylaws which propose to designate First Shaughnessy as a "Heritage Conservation Area". This is a disingenuous and wrong-headed scheme to try to avoid paying compensation while depriving certain Shaughnessy owners of some of the value of their properties and effectively expropriating property rights. Many of the purportedly heritage properties are unexceptional and commonplace. They have no objective heritage value. Any heritage designation should only occur on a case by case basis in respect of those properties that merit it, with compensation paid as contemplated in Section 595 of the Vancouver Charter (SBC 1953) Chapter 55.

Please do not pass these proposed bylaws.

Date: September 11, 2015

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Signature

SHELINA EDGAR

Print name

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address

Vancouver BC

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Email address

TO: Mayor and Council of the City of Vancouver

I am wholeheartedly against the adoption of the bylaws which propose to designate First Shaughnessy as a "Heritage Conservation Area". This is a disingenuous and wrong-headed scheme to try to avoid paying compensation while depriving certain Shaughnessy owners of some of the value of their properties and effectively expropriating property rights. Many of the purportedly heritage properties are unexceptional and commonplace. They have no objective heritage value. Any heritage designation should only occur on a case by case basis in respect of those properties that merit it, with compensation paid as contemplated in Section 595 of the Vancouver Charter (SBC 1953) Chapter 55.

Please do not pass these proposed bylaws.

Date: September 11th, 2015

Pamela Lenns

Sig. s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Print name

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address

Vancouver

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Email address

TO: Mayor and Council of the City of Vancouver

I am wholeheartedly against the adoption of the bylaws which propose to designate First Shaughnessy as a "Heritage Conservation Area". This is a disingenuous and wrong-headed scheme to try to avoid paying compensation while depriving certain Shaughnessy owners of some of the value of their properties and effectively expropriating property rights. Many of the purportedly heritage properties are unexceptional and commonplace. They have no objective heritage value. Any heritage designation should only occur on a case by case basis in respect of those properties that merit it, with compensation paid as contemplated in Section 595 of the Vancouver Charter (SBC 1953) Chapter 55.

Please do not pass these proposed bylaws.

Date: September 11th, 2015

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Signature

CIARAN KEOGH +

Print name

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address

VANCOUVER

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Email address

TO: Mayor and Council of the City of Vancouver

I am wholeheartedly against the adoption of the bylaws which propose to designate First Shaughnessy as a "Heritage Conservation Area". This is a disingenuous and wrong-headed scheme to try to avoid paying compensation while depriving certain Shaughnessy owners of some of the value of their properties and effectively expropriating property rights. Many of the purportedly heritage properties are unexceptional and commonplace. They have no objective heritage value. Any heritage designation should only occur on a case by case basis in respect of those properties that merit it, with compensation paid as contemplated in Section 595 of the Vancouver Charter (SBC 1953) Chapter 55.

Please do not pass these proposed bylaws.

Date: September 11, 2015

s. 22(1) Personal and
Confidential

Signature

Peter Miles

Print name

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address

Vern., B.C.

s. 22(1) Personal and
Confidential

Email address

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

TO: Mayor and Council of the City of Vancouver

I am wholeheartedly against the adoption of the bylaws which propose to designate First Shaughnessy as a "Heritage Conservation Area". This is a disingenuous and wrong-headed scheme to try to avoid paying compensation while depriving certain Shaughnessy owners of some of the value of their properties and effectively expropriating property rights. Many of the purportedly heritage properties are unexceptional and commonplace. They have no objective heritage value. Any heritage designation should only occur on a case by case basis in respect of those properties that merit it, with compensation paid as contemplated in Section 595 of the Vancouver Charter (SBC 1953) Chapter 55.

Please do not pass these proposed bylaws.

Date: September 11, 2015

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Dr. Rosalyn Miles
Print name

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

A

Vancouver, BC

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

En

mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca

Frank and Pearl Bailly

s. 22(1) Personal and
Confidential

Ladies and Gentlemen

I am writing you my 2nd letter concerning the HCA of First Shaughnessy. I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes and the carless way that this bylaw proposal has come about.

Firstly I would like to dispel the prevailing attitude exhibited by many of you that property owners in this area are a bunch of SOBs who can afford to have their property rights taken away even though they will suffer great devaluation in their land values. I can speak for myself as a person who grew up in a family of seven with a father that always worked at least two jobs and could not afford to send me to University when time came. I followed in his footsteps and have worked to get ahead from the age of eleven. The property my wife and I presently own on Pine Crescent represents our retirement Plan for the last 20 of the 28 years we have live in the house. There are two other senior citizens on my street, both widows, one who was a nurse for in excess of 40 years, now in her 80's and another in her 90's who do not fit your standard of people who can be classified as those who should tone it down and suck it up.

The loss to me according to your own Coriolis Report Economic Analysis page 24,7.3.2 from the perspective of a developer would be a minimum of 23.95% and a dollar value of in excess 2 to 3 million dollars.

The financial loss is one thing but the draconian way in which this proposal is being forced on the people most affected is quite another. I know by speaking to many of the people in my neighborhood that they are either unaware or confused by what is going on here. It may be more palatable if all the 317 pre 1940 houses had some heritage significance but the simple truth is that most do not and would be better replaced with character new construction that is within keeping of the technology of the modern world. It is obvious that of those living in First Shaughnessy prefer the area to remain predominately single family. The idea of densification as a way of placating those who will be stuck under this new proposal is basically a non starter.

And having to look over your shoulder for the Heritage Police is far from appealing. Having to ask permission to paint your house a certain color etc. will only cause people to tighten up when it comes to doing anything to improve their place. Forget about section 606 of the charter how about Section 4 ,4.2 and 4.3 of the Heritage Property Standards of Maintenance By-Law. Yikes.

Please do all of us a favor and rethink this proposal before it becomes a fiasco. There are better ways of maintaining this beautiful part of the city before it becomes what will be referred to as Kitsilano 2.

Frank and Pearl Bailly