

Hildebrandt, Tina

s 22(1) Personal and Confidential

From: Jennifer MacDonald <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 9:32 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Opposition to resining at 4575 Granville

I am firmly opposed to having a development for townhouses that is exempt from all the rules and bylaws that other homes must adhere to.

It is absurd to include this project in an affordable housing plan . Does council think we are all stupid ?

When VHS was built many restrictions were imposed and had to be adhered to.

Pure profit inspires this developer so please side with those who stand for the finer standards of people helping people.

Do not allow this development
Jennifer MacDonald

Jennifer MacDonald

Hildebrandt, Tina

From: Bill Burgess s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 9:26 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 4575 Rezoning application

I understand the deadline for submissions is close, so please accept this letter and distribute it to the Mayor and Council:

June 20, 2019

Dear Mayor and Council

Re: Application to rezone 4575 Granville St.

I live in an apartment in West End. I want to first emphasize that I strongly support 'densification' in general, and I particularly support densification of Shaughnessy.

However, I urge Council to reject this re-zoning application, for THIS proposal, at THIS site, at THIS time.

My first reason is that the public interest in protecting the hospice is greater than the public interest in housing that is promised.

This is especially true given my second point – that the merits of this particular site and proposal are mediocre. It would NOT be a good ambassador for 'gentle density' and the 'missing middle'.

I have to voice these points because they are not adequately addressed in your staff report. I think you should send the proposal back for a proper documentation of these issues, before making your decision.

When evaluating the public interest on both sides, please bear in mind the cardinal point that the hospice provides a public service. Your staff report does not help you evaluate that public interest versus the public interest in additional housing. It does not discuss the significance of hospice services to the citizens of Vancouver. It fails to acknowledge that THIS hospice is one of the very few places in Vancouver where people can access Medical Assistance in Dying.

Yes, a promise of 21 units of rental housing is not be sneezed at. But where is the acknowledgement that each year 150 people live at the Hospice? It may be only for a short time, but that time is a precious period in life. And each year there are hundreds and hundreds of family and friends whose time spent at this location is also among the most meaningful in their lives.

These are not accidental results. They are very consciously nurtured by the location and design of this building. They are made possible by the incredible volunteer effort to build and support this kind of building at this location, to provide one of the different kinds of hospices that are needed in a large and diverse population.

Please register that the particular character of this hospice, and its extraordinary quality of care will be tangibly diminished if this request for re-zoning is approved.

Please, don't take seriously your staff report's suggestion that the construction noise will be mitigated by a white noise machine! Please, recognize the other examples of 'lipstick on pig' - like potted plants to screen the hospice-facing sides of balconies, but which can be tossed at any time!

My second point is that the merits of the applicant's site and proposal are mediocre. There are better sites available, and which avoid the trade-offs being discussed here. As a result the public interest in housing is less than advertised.

I also want to insist that it is false and impermissible to assume that the alternative to this proposal is construction of a huge single-family house on this property. Your duty is to consider the application in front of you. If you reject the application and a monster house results, the hospice will have to deal with it – but this bad outcome will not have been imposed by you.

Please note that this block of Granville already has in place 'gentle density', namely the hospice. That means there are already dozens of private people and service vehicles coming and going via the alley access.

Are you aware that this is NOT a typical alley that follows a straight line from one street to the other? It takes two turns, one about 35 degrees in one direction and then 90 degrees in the other. The hydro poles are 2 or 3 feet inside the lane. Even if all the vegetation was cut down to widen the lane, these poles and some kind of pedestrian lane reduce the width to less than two lanes. I question if a fire truck could get around the 90 degree turn.

So in practice almost everyone will come in the Caunnaght St. side. The applicant has indicated they will move the parking garage entrance from the hospice side to this side next to Caunnaght St. I think I should publicly voice what I think you have all thought privately, that this is where they always wanted it but they initially placed it would be on the other side so they could then make the change and appear responsive to neighbours.

Yes, there will be good transit service available at this site, but that is about it for location merits. This will not be walking-oriented housing, as the nearest grocery stores and other essential services are about 20 blocks away. I could not find any libraries or recreation centres nearby. This is not one of those developments that will prevent a public school from closure or restore small business prosperity.

Meanwhile it is a site that will turn the property to the north into an island between itself and Caunnaght Dr., and it will have to somewhat accommodate the hospice on the other side. So, for example, the south-facing windows will be frosted. Why not find a location where these renters can see the sun and the moon? Why plop them down here rather than a better location for everyone?

Yes, 21 units of housing. But contrary to supply-side-trickle-down theories about housing, building new units - any kind of units – does not resolve the housing crisis. According to Statistics Canada, from 2001 to 2016 there were 119 units of housing added in Metro Vancouver for every additional 100 households. The supply-side zealots twist and turn to avoid this simple fact, but facts are stubborn things. Not any kind of units will do, they have to be the right kind of units. And at the rents that have been projected fail on affordability.

To conclude:

- 1) Please don't let the supporters of this re-zoning turn this into for or against a general policy of densification along arterials.
- 2) Please focus on weighing the balance of public interest, and please find that protecting the character of the public services provided by the hospice outweighs the proponent's private interest in developing his property.
- 3) Please note that the merits of this particular site and this particular proposal are mediocre, and that there are alternatives opportunities available that will be good rather than bad ambassadors for our needed densification along arterials.

Sincerely

Bill Burgess
s 22(1) Personal and Confidential



Virus-free. www.avg.com