

Castro, Maria

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 11:34 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposition Comments, R. Hilson, Refers to Item No. 5 - Rezoning: 1755 West 14th Ave, Reconvened Public Hearing, Thursday Jan 21, 2016

Citizen: Roxsane Hilson

Email: "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Comments:

Subject: Proposed Rezoning of 1755 West 14th Avenue

I am opposed to the proposed rezoning of 1755 West 14th Avenue due to the negative impact this development will have on my family's life, my neighbours lives and the surrounding neighbourhood. The 12 storey tower does not fit with the residential homes directly opposite this site on the south side of West 14th, as well as the homes on West 15th and on the west side of Burrard Street. It is totally out of scale and out of context with the residential neighbourhood. The developer said he adjusted the development to respond to the initial negative comments of the community by deleting the townhouses to the east of the existing tower. This was the one aspect of the proposed development that actually did fit within the context of the neighbourhood!

The 12 storey tower will have a devastating impact on the loss of privacy and daylight. The 1700 block of West 14th will now be a solid 12 storey wall of concrete that will be visible well above the trees. My family will no longer be able to see any blue sky from the front of our home. I walk the streets of my neighbourhood on a daily basis and am saddened by the number of vantage points throughout the community where blue sky and mountain views will be blocked by this 12 story tower. There is a current shortage of street parking in the area. This results in major traffic congestion when taxis and deliveries block the traffic. The 1700 block of West 14th is narrower than 1600 and 1500 blocks. With cars parked on both sides of the street the remaining street width is only sufficient for a single lane of traffic. This occurs on a regular basis now and will only get worse with over 100 additional cars brought into the area by the 116 additional units this development will bring. The developers own parking study acknowledges the current renters in the existing building own on average 1 car per unit. This can only be extrapolated to expect over 100 additional cars to this site. As the annual city parking permit costs approximately one month of underground parking fees it is expected a significant number of additional cars will be parked on the street.

The 1970's rezoning which allowed for the development of the existing apartment tower was approved conditional on the buildings garden space being maintained and not available for any future development. This was to acknowledge the negative impact on the neighbourhood of demolishing the homes that were on this site which were similar to the homes on the south side of West 14th. The garden space provided some commitment to maintain a context with the neighbourhood. It appears this commitment to the community, made by the developer and the City, has been forgotten. I request Council deny this application for rezoning and the development of a 12 story tower.

Castro, Maria

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 9:41 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: 1755 West 14th Ave., Vancouver

From: Frances Lagnaz "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2016 10:34 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: 1755 West 14th Ave., Vancouver

Mr. Mayor & council, I would like to register my opposition to the proposed high rise building at 1755 West 14th Ave., Vancouver. As you know, there is a park that is used by many people, in the Summer especially, that would be deprived of sun & light - forever! - making the park not as attractive to local people who may not have yards & who come to play with their children. As I live on the "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential" "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential": I am also concerned about the issue of sun & light that would affect the whole block - forever. Frances Lagnaz

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"



Castro, Maria

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 1:40 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Item 5 Apartment development Burrard & 14th

From: Lea Johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 12:17 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Item 5 Apartment development Burrard & 14th

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

Unfortunately Item 5 was not completed last night. I will not be able to attend the Thursday meeting, so instead I am writing this letter to you. The discussion was a bit 'light' last night with the city not being able to answer some questions and some others not prepared? Best wishes on Thursday, hope things go better.

Given council's seeming attitude toward the apartment development downtown (approved last night), its penchant for West End living and the development on Burrard and 14th (Item 5) it seems to me that council's unofficial plan is to populate the West Side with apartment buildings in a similar fashion as the West End?

My wife and I live [REDACTED]

I am a registered professional engineer and working in international development for over 30 years, so I am for development - well thought out sustainable development: satisfying the social, economic and environmental needs of the present while not compromising the needs of future generations.

In addition to other stated concerns about the Burrard and 14th development I have a concern about the geological stability of that site for any future development.

We all know that a creek from Shaughnessy used to flow on the surface through our properties, the park and the proposed development site. Now the creek continues to flow underground - some, including us, have had negative experiences with this creek. Is this creek and creek bed a possible hazard during a 8.0 - 9.0 earthquake event or from erosion or damming due to water flow?

If the creek is deemed to be a hazard what is the risk of the buildings collapsing onto adjacent buildings south and north? And what would be the consequences of such a collapse? It has happened elsewhere.

If there is a geotechnical report please point me to it.

Also I have a question about the assumption expressed by council that if people want to live here in Vancouver we have to accommodate all new comers. Given food, water and security what is the upper capacity for the City of Vancouver?

I understand from last night's public hearing that the community goal is improved access and quality of life for both renters and owners. Apartment buildings are but one way to do it.

I agree with the last speaker. Among other things, this apartment development speaks for the possible future of many high-rises in this area and other areas and turning this area into something like the West End (which is a nice place, I enjoyed living there for years and love it. Now I enjoy the life style here and enjoy sharing that). I am encouraging all of us to think carefully about this.

I support the speaker's proposed idea that the city create a collaborative and transparent plan to find an optimal solution for increased rental housing - this could be a template that could be used by other areas of the city. Also with the upgrading of the water and sewer system on Burrard coming up from 1st Avenue to 17th Avenue it is an opportunity to look at what good things the future can bring for this area adjacent to and including Shaughnessy. For example, should there be apartment buildings along 16th and 17th and how many?

I do not support the proposed development on 14th and Burrard. I think we need to look at a broader solution.

The question is this: what is the best approach to achieve an optimal balance of rental and market housing in our area and realize what we value: improved personal, business, social, economic and environmental conditions?

Judging from last night we are a long way from specifically describing what we do that will allow us to experience what we value.

I am looking forward to seeing a 'dialogue' and seeing not only what you come up with but how you do it.

Best wishes,

Yours truly,

Lea Johnson

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Burke, Teresita

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 9:59 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Proposed rezoning of 1755 West 14th Avenue

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

From: Judy Taylo "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2016 8:52 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Proposed rezoning of 1755 West 14th Avenue

January 20, 2016

The Mayor and City Councillors
City of Vancouver
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

By email to: mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca

I am a resident "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential" and am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rezoning at 1755 West 14th and to outline my concerns in this regard.

I attended the truncated public hearing about this matter last night but will be unable to be present when the matter comes before Council again on Thursday for further discussion. I am therefore sending you my comments for your consideration before you make your decision.

I have objections to the proposed rezoning on both procedural and substantive grounds. I attended the neighbourhood meetings on this matter and was disappointed with City staff's attitude towards the input of the local residents. It appeared to me that they were merely going through the motions and that they were already fully prepared to support the developer's proposals. This was particularly disappointing in light of the commitments exacted by the Vancouver City Council of the day, and undertaken by the developer, when the property was initially rezoned to permit the nonconforming nature of the existing building. Both at the neighbourhood meetings and at the public hearing last night, staff seemed to consider the promise not to request any further development on the site as trivial and absolutely no barrier, either legally or morally, to redensification such as is now proposed. At the public hearing in Council chambers yesterday evening, I had the same impression: i.e. that minds were already made up. I hope that I was mistaken, and that members of Council will be open to really hearing the concerns of those who speak in opposition to the application on Thursday evening.

My substantive objections to the rezoning proposal are several and relate to the scale of the proposed development in contrast to the existing homes in the area, it's disregard to the character of the neighbourhood, the resulting loss of sunlight and privacy to nearby residences, and, most critically, the effect on the traffic and parking congestion on 14th Avenue. I fear that the more general of these objections will fall on deaf ears, but if this development is to go ahead with Council's approval, over the objections of the neighbourhood, please, PLEASE, listen to the objections of the current residents of the area as regards to the traffic and congestion issues and insist that the developer make changes to his design to mitigate the traffic and parking nightmare which adoption of the plan being considered will result in.

This block of 14th Avenue is already congested and often impassable. Staff has implied that traffic studies do not indicate any serious issues, but I live here! I KNOW there are problems. The 1700 block is, for some reason, narrower than the blocks to both the east and the west and when there are cars parked on both sides of the street it is impossible for two way traffic to proceed without one or other of the vehicles backing up to an intersection, one of which is the dangerously busy Burrard Street. When there are delivery or emergency vehicles on the street, the problem is even worse. As an illustration, the other day an ambulance and a fire truck responding to an emergency in the existing rental apartment building had the street blocked for over half an hour. As if vehicular traffic were not problem enough, it was with great concern that the audience heard, for the first time last night, the plan to make 14th Avenue a bike route. I am a keen cyclist myself and appreciate the ongoing development of safe and convenient bike routes in the city, but this block is far too narrow and has far too many cars parked on it to be anything but a danger to both drivers and cyclists alike. If there is a plan to ameliorate this problem by prohibiting parking on one side of the street, as has been the case on some other bike routes, the parking problems arising from the additional residents in the new building combined with the reduction in on-site parking, will be even further exacerbated.

Surely it would be both possible and reasonable to ask the developer to allow for additional on-site parking in the new building and to provide some kind of pull out or other dedicated space for the accommodation of emergency and delivery vehicles.

I ask that you please consider my concerns and suggestions before making your decision on this rezoning application.

Yours Truly

Judy Taylor

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

January 21, 2016

City of Vancouver
City Clerk's Office
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver, B.C.
V5Y 1V4

Attention: Mayor and Council

RE: Notice of Public Hearing
1755 West 14th Avenue, Vancouver

For over 20 years, I have been a renter, and have just purchased my first home – a 3 bedroom townhouse "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential". As a result I know as well as anybody the challenges this city faces with regards to affordable, quality, family orientated rental accommodation. To rectify this situation the Vancouver City Council simply can not continue to approve developments that are comprised exclusively of tiny sub 750sqft apartments. I was shocked to learn, that this rezoning application was to facilitate a building that will do nothing to address the shortage of affordable family sized 2 or 3 bedroom units this city so desperately needs. Tiny studios and one-bedrooms are abundant – family oriented accommodation is what is desperately needed – this development does not have a single unit that addresses this need.

Earlier speakers spoke of the need to have a community development plan. I second this. If we allow this development to go ahead, we are forgoing an opportunity to build the 3 storey, 3 bedroom units the area needs. If we squander this opportunity, where will these townhouses go? A plan will address this, and show how mature, and developed this neighborhood is. Options for building the high demand 3 story family oriented townhouses are limited – while I understand the council cannot force the developer to build townhouses, the council does not need to concede to the developers rezoning demands either. If council is not looking out for families who is? If developers want a rezone, then they should expect to be proposing developments that address the needs of the community, not just the returns of the developers share holders.

A plan will also take into account the building form of the developments at 1755, and in the surrounding neighbourhood. For example, the city planner mentioned in her presentation that the existing building at 1755 is “unique” in that it is very it has a very substantial frontage, this is true. That is why it is bounded by green space on its sides. To add another massive tower as has been suggested in this proposal will create a massive wall, which is simply out of touch with this area. 14th ave is not downtown. To replace the current transition zone with a tower is poor urban design, transition zones matter.

Further the city planner referred to the large cedar trees along Burrard which under the current proposal are to be retained, however she then went on to say the transportation planners are planning to remove these trees! When the transportation dept planned to take these trees did they know the

land department was planning on taking the garden? At best the city's left hand doesn't know what the right is doing, at worst the planning dept knew these trees were to be taken but didn't reveal that until the night of the hearing. A rezone of this magnitude simply cannot be approved without the context of a larger community plan.

Before I go on, I would like to point out I am an engineer by trade, graduate of UBC with over 20yrs of experience. For the last 12 years or so I have specialized in urban transportation, I have advised and lead major projects in Australia, the USA and here in Canada including projects in Toronto and here in Vancouver. So I know and understand how data is collected and interpreted. Earlier it was mentioned parking surveys were done and parking was available. Well at 3pm on a Tuesday afternoon during normal work hours when these surveys are often done, I have no doubt spots are available. But at 7pm at night, parking on the street is jammed. Much of engineering is about how you interpret the data, understanding how it was taken, and how it was comprised, massaged and its limitations. The conclusion that parking is not already a major issue is one such erroneous conclusion likely caused by limited survey data. Another example was the suggestion by the developers consultant, that this area had somehow had below average new development, again this is easily explained when one considers the age and maturity of the area including all the increase in density this area experienced in the 70s and 80s. It was postprosperous to suggest new developments in this area should keep pace with new residential areas.

Another example of misinterpretation of data was by a councillor, it was mentioned the current building parkade is not currently full therefore the new building didn't need parking. I would suggest what this really tells us is that the charge for a parking spot in the current building is too high; thus in reality, can we conclude the the current building is not as affordable as the developer would have us believe? Regardless is this council really going to entertain the development of a 12 storey building with no new parking? Being close to bus routes or not, people in Vancouver still own cars, they may not use them for every trip, but car ownership is still high, thus so is parking demand.

I would like to conclude by reiterating my objection to this redevelopment application as it does nothing to address the shortage of affordable family housing, is out of character with the neighbourhood, represents poor urban form with no transition zone, and is based on faulty interpretation of data such as parking. Thank you for your consideration and in advance for standing up to developers and looking out for working families.

Regards,

Kevin Karaloff