

## Dragnea, Irina

---

**From:** genevieve meillon "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2018 8:52 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Subject:** Comment submission for public hearing re Hull Street develop application - July 10

To whom it may concern,

First I would like to thank you for organizing another public hearing to provide a platform for further discussion regarding the construction proposal before it is finalized.

I would also like to sincerely thank your team for all the efforts made to accommodate changes to the original construction proposal and in taking into account the comments and requests of those affected by the project, namely the removal of original North-South access lane and the reorientation of the underground parking structure. Additionally I would like to commend your current design, particularly in the absence of windows on the building sides which face Marshall St, which will to some degree preserve the privacy of those adjacent to the development.

All that said, my sole remaining concern as regards this project is the massive loss of trees in the proposed developments footprint. I certainly do understand the complexities involved in such a large construction project and the necessity of removing trees to accommodate construction in our growing city. However, I do find the substantial loss of so many trees to be a real heartbreak and a true loss for our community. I would strongly request that in order to somewhat offset this loss, that a plan be made to incorporate landscaping, which would see the planting of trees along the side of the proposed construction adjacent Marshall St. The addition of trees along this path would help in preserving the privacy of homeowners and would help to maintain the natural beauty of this area.

I hope that you find these comments to be constructive and impactful.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Meillon

Dear Council,

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

I am writing to you as a resident of [REDACTED] who has an interest in the Rezoning Application for 3560-3570 Hull Street & 2070-2090 East 20th Avenue, made by the Molnar Group/ Brook Pooni Associates.

I live in the heritage house scheduled for preservation in this application and have for 8 years. I pay a rent of \$1147 for a one bedroom, plus a loft. A livable amount to share between two working professionals, who aspire to further their education, save for retirement, a trip, or put some money aside for an emergency fund unforeseen event.

I have grown up in Vancouver, I love this city and feel it is my home, and the rent I have been paying, at times the full \$1147 and at times split, with a roommate or boyfriend, has felt like a reasonable expense to stay in the community and city I adore. The looming displacement that is coming from this development is causing some anxiety as I do not feel confident my boyfriend, myself and our dog will be able to find a rental suite that is as livable in terms of space, cost, and convenience to our respective workplaces. My situation is not unique.

Large developments that come into neighbourhoods such as mine cause a large influx of people, enforce high rental rates, and are disruptive to the communities already established. I enjoy neighbourhoods like trout lake because there is park space, a community centre and the pace of the neighbourhood is slower than other denser areas of the city. And it is specifically this (previously) low density that I chose, as it is removed from the hectic pace that comes with other areas of town.

Although increased density developments are veiled as a housing solution, I believe they are a large part of the problem that is making Vancouver unlivable for many people. To offer increased density options in communities that have been built and sustained themselves on lower densities, with lower more "neighbourly" rental rates, rather than market rates, is not a reasonable solution to the issue of providing accessible housing. The creation of densified new housing that enforces inflated market prices is actually a disservice to the people it is somewhat targeted to assist, since you are replacing, in my case two houses with multiple roommates, my house with three suites, and a house with a family in it, all paying somewhat reasonable rent because of the creative options

afforded with “single” dwelling rentals, with 68 units of market (higher) priced rentals.

Within the policy document guiding this development, Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy, there is a report to council that quotes tailoring the rental market to real incomes. The definition of “real incomes” is broad in reference to the middle class. The document details: “Focus on affordability solutions for those households with moderate incomes (which currently range from \$21,500 to \$86,500)”. Needless to say, the lower end of the spectrum of this wage range will have much more difficulty sustaining itself on market rental rates than the mid to high end of this grouping.

I have friends who have grown up in Vancouver, or who have moved here and tried to establish roots, who have been pushed around or out by “reno-victions”, rapidly increasing rental and housing market rates, and densification projects, as well as those who have been fortunate enough to purchase a home in a relatively quiet neighbourhood, but now ultimately construction and increased densities are also causing them to want to relocate.

Limited vacancies is a factor that makes neighbourhoods less livable but creating market housing that replaces reasonable rents with increased rates further pushes people out of neighbourhoods and the city as a whole, in a way that discriminates against low income earners.

Community minded solutions could include:

- Redefining who new densified market housing is realistically targeting
- More streamlined/targeted development bringing access new housing to wage earners currently residing within city limits, not as a tool to shape the city with the desired demographics
- Adjusting the income range for needed affordability concession to 20,000-45,000
- Reassessing and redefining which income brackets are being targeted by specific policy, with no more than 25K annual gap in targeted income accessibility applications
- Enforced cap on rental rates (based on rent to income relationship)
- Improved opportunities for rental income, for landlords who have an additional suite or opportunity to build a laneway house

- Restrict the number of land assemblies that can go toward big densification projects, by neighborhood with community integration according to community engagement and current condition criteria
- Limit on densification in neighbourhoods, as is the case with Trout lake, with The Porter, the Strand application, and the Molnar project (all within the same 10 block radius increasing the number of residents in this area by hundreds all together)
  - perhaps for example, allowing densifications over 50 units should be limited to one within a 40-block radius to maintain the integrity of a community that is already established

No matter what the perception of a neighbourhood is, there are actual people who live and feel at home there, and noticeable efforts should be made to accommodate these folks, rather than “improve” or tailor housing to a developing industry or projected city plan. Rapid growth and densification is disorienting and creates instability in our personal lives, communities, neighbourhoods and cities. Goals should be to reinforce as many (positive) aspects of people’s physical surroundings as possible and I can’t say that I support projects like this that drastically increase density, support increased rental rates, and rapidly change the nature of an already established community.

Thank you for your time, for this public engagement measure, and for the opportunity to express my opinion on the issue.

All the best,  
Rainbow Whiteside