

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Justin Tompson "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 11:07 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 1st & Clark Drug addiction rehabilitation facility

To whom it may concern, I am a resident of Grandview-Woodland, residing at "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential" Vancouver. I am in complete support of providing drug rehabilitation and counselling/psychological services as well as recovery housing options. However, I see this project's proposed location and services ill sited. In particular, with the announcement of the new St. Paul's Hospital RFP coming out, and the undeveloped land within the False Creek Flats, I see a convincing prerogative to have certain components of this proposed project consolidated within immediate proximity to health care facilities. Case in point, this neighbourhood already has a subsidized housing project that has nearly daily calls of first responders. Having a triage and treatment facility within a health care providing area would reduce the response time and calls of first responders as health care providers of various levels would be immediate available.

The proposed project would be better suited for the occupants and for external service providers if the direct health care scope was consolidated to the FCF area of the new St. Paul's and the housing component remain at the proposed location with an appropriate form and context revisit.

Thank you for considering these comments.
Sincerely,

Justin Tompson
Resident, Grandview-Woodland

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

February 21, 2019

Mayor and council,

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard. I was at the evening session yesterday but could not speak as time ran out. I am unable to attend this afternoon and am submitting my comments in writing. Both, the site and project type bring challenges; I have to say that I was impressed with the session yesterday; the comments expressed, both in favor or against have validity and will make your decision harder.

My name is Danielle Pepin, myself and my husband live in the neighbourhood, 3 blocks away from the proposed development. We have been here since 2006 and have grown to love our neighbours, our "hood" as we refer to. One of the things we like the most is probably the social mix of the residents. Political and colourful at times, the bottom line is that we all get along and talk with each other.

We are **not** in support of the proposal for reasons mentioned before me and more specifically the following; the non-conformance with the current zoning guidelines; the mix-use components of the project; the site development; and the unknown social impact this project type and clientele will have on our neighbourhood.

Non-conformance of the current zoning guidelines:

The rezoning proposal **is not** in conformance with the Grandview Woodland RM-4N with Industrial along Clark Drive in which considerations for a **6 storey building** would be given for **100% secured rental housing** - the 1st and Clark proposal is, as you know, for a 10 storey mixed uses project. In addition to the height non-conformance, we are looking at higher density and massing variation.

The danger with modifying the "rules" is that we create precedent... and the next development to be proposed along Clark or 1st Avenue could very well request a variance. And so on...

Mixed use components

Mix-use facilities in my mind are great and can offer synergy and opportunities between residential, commercial and or community centre. The 1st Avenue/Clark mix-used proposal brings limited opportunities for the residents unless you need the services offered by the detox centre. What it does bring in my mind are uncertainties as it remains an unproven model...

The proposed drug addiction centre is not a small clinic, it is in fact 2 storey clinical facility with a drop off loop, requiring drop off and pick up of linens and waste; the sheer layout of the site makes for the rooms to be organized along long institutional

corridors, its lower floor mostly below grade. We have heard that the new detox centre will not add more capacity for treatments – just improve the delivery of services. There were no mentions of success rate of current treatments. We were told that a typical stay for recovery treatment is 30 days. I was researching and found that the success rate for these short stay is low; about 10 – 25% according to the information found on a couple of websites. Are we doing the right thing or should we look at making it better, increase capacity and success rates otherwise we are just feeding the kitty.

The 20 bed sobriety centre is a detention facility for 23 hours. Someone mentioned during a neighbourhood consultation that a similar sobriety centre with 10 or 15 cells was receiving approximately 2000 person /year. Is it fair to assume that the centre will see between 3000 people a year – 8.2 people a day? What happen at the release time...are they angry, confused, how do they get home? Do they take the bus, walk over to the train station along Clark or thru our "hood" ?

Having the mix of rental units in the project from the small studio to 3 bedroom units is excellent, sadly of the units will be located along high traffic noisy and polluted roads. I worry about the location of some of the amenities spaces. We were told that the roof garden would be accessible to the rental units as outdoor green space. The drawings show a green space and laundry facilities located at level 4; it appears to be the floor could be the transitional housing floor with its kitchen, multipurpose room and admin space. Are we exposing residents and vulnerable clients to each others? I would feel uncertain and uncomfortable walking the corridor to access laundry or outdoor deck not knowing how well the residents on this floor are feeling. The nearest public green spaces and laundromats are blocks away.

With this type of facility we will see an increase of unwell people to our community. Now you are going to say, no worries they are inside getting treatments... but their friends are outside waiting, getting high dropping needles. I did witness a lot of needles in the lane adjacent to the upholstery store near the treatment centre on 2nd have before this proposal came to life. I worry about the children; unlike St-Francis Xavier school students who get driven to the private school most of our neighbourhood children walk to school and could be exposed to unnecessary dangers.

The site development

I do not believe that the project is a good fit for the site; the adjacent streets are main arterial routes, busy with cars and large semi trucks servicing the port facilities creating pollution and noise. You know that any attempt to cross 1st Avenue or Clark Drive mid-block would result in someone getting hurt.

The unrest energy of the site is not conducive to healing or living in my mind. Why would we want locate treatment centre and housing along Clark Drive without proper set back is beyond me unless we do not care about the dignity and comfort of the residents.

The long and narrow site cuts in 1st avenue step slopes thus putting the lower floor of the treatment centre in the basement with limited access to natural light and views.

The onsite vehicular access to the project is limited to the lane with one access point to be shared with emergency vehicle, staff, visitors and residents. Due to the existing traffic restrictions and proximity to the intersection will result in a vehicular traffic increase thru the residential streets. Also, there is no space on the site to allow for emergency response vehicles like fire trucks and ambulance. Where will the emergency response vehicles go? 1st Avenue / Clark Drive? Both very busy roads; will it be safe for the responders? Wont the delays causes by these interferences will just add to more car idling, noise and pollution?

Social impact

I am well aware of the drug addiction issues that plague our city. I have heard comments during past public consultations about having a centre that would offer **dignity** to the addiction clientele.

What about dignity and respect for the rental residents? How will they feel about living above a treatment centre and sobriety centre? Amongst people in transition from addiction? With limited amenities? Will they feel safe moving around the building on the edge of busy streets?

What about the current neighbourhood residents, don't they deserve to feel safe, in peace and respected?

To conclude:

I am in favor of housing project **without** the treatment and sobriety cells to be part of the project – putting them together in a project this scale is **unproven and risky**.

In a perfect world what I would like to see are centres that would include detox treatment, sobriety cells and transitional housing, on a smaller scale, incorporated in more neighbourhoods than ours.

Rental housing is okay, I would hope that the current residents will be supported to return to the "hood" they know and like after the construction is completed. I would also be in favor of a large allocation of units for low income with better set backs

from Clark and 1st avenue – maybe a portion of the little park stays and offers a buffer or is relocated above the one story enterprise space.

I appreciate the time and care you are demonstrating in the review process and thank you.

Kind regards,

Danielle Pepin

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Jackie Ross <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:28 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 1st and Clark Development

Dear Council – I'm a resident residing at [REDACTED] in the Grandview Woodland Area. I'm writing to express my deep concerns and opposition to this development and object to it in its current form for the following reasons:

- 1) The scale of this project (11 stories) does not comply with the Grandview Community Plan for the area. It is simply too big and dwarfs all other structures in an already high density residential and commercial area.
- 2) The mixed use nature of this site (housing, sobering and recovery services) have not been studied enough to conclude there is a strong social benefit.
- 3) It displaces current long term current residences and does not provide "social housing" but 50% at HILs rates and 50% at market. At current rates proposed it does not help those living on pensions/welfare access affordable housing.
- 4) The project concentrates access to services to 1 site in Vancouver to service sobering needs with 4000 people expected to be released into the Grandview/Commercial Drive area after being held temporarily for intoxication.
- 5) There is no community policing plan to account for all this above mentioned activity
- 6) This project overall reduces the total number of beds patients have access to once you close all other facilities.
- 7) There is insufficient parking provided for both staff and residence and will spill off into an already congested area with current parking issues.
- 8) The Terminal and Clark intersection is a very dangerous one with a high rate of accidents according to ICBC. It is not pedestrian friendly.

I do object to this development and but don't take issue with a recovery, sobering and housing complex that fits with the current structure of our established community plan. This project needs to a rethink.

Jackie Ross | [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: TD Studios "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:29 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: In opposition of Detox housing

Dear Mayor and Council,

I live in the Grandview-Woodland area and wish to express my complete opposition to this project because it is trying to be too many things for too many people. It makes no sense to combine a 24 hr. Detox, Drunk Tank, and 90 units of housing altogether. The idea of cramming people with completely different purposes and needs into one massive building on a daily basis, without doing proper research and refusing to do impact studies is extremely irresponsible.

It's a residential neighbour hood that will be greatly impacted by this development and many current tenants, some for decades, will be displaced from their homes. The False Creek area or by New St. Pauls always seemed like a the better area for addictions and sobering services. It's closer to the current E. 2nd Detox and the hospital which recently announced will have addition beds.

There are better options, don't rush to move forward on a plan that wasn't properly thought out.

best,

Todd Duncan

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Judy Biluk s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 4:06 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Proposed Detox Sobering Center Clark & 1st Ave

This proposal is just wrong and unsafe for the patients and the community!

We are not opposed to social housing but putting detox center in a housing project is ridiculously dangerous and threatening to the residents and their children! What are you thinking

People in social housing are generally there because they don't have many choices.

Detox and treatment present serious and unpredictable challenges. People can relapse. People can easily make connections to get drugs or alcohol brought to them. People who are desperate can resort to violence and property crime.

A better solution would be to put the Detox Sobering Center near a medical facility. It should have 24 hour security for the patients and those visiting them like the new St Paul's Hospital area for example.. If you want them to succeed,

Telling people they have to accept being "warehoused" with people who are unwell because they cannot afford anything else sends a very disturbing message. Families and their children are important and if the city is offering social housing, it must be a safe and healthy environment.

Would you raise your children there ?

Please do not support this proposal.

Judy Biluk

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10