

## Wong, Tamarra

---

**From:** Judy Osburn s. 22(1) Personal and  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2019 2:22 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing; Fry, Pete  
**Cc:** Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Stewart, Kennedy; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael  
**Subject:** Issues Against 1805 Larch Street Development

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Councilor Fry,

In response to your questions of me during the Public Hearing for the 1805 Larch Street proposal;

You referred to the fact that the church sold the building due to the lack of attendance and therefore financial income or support from their congregation.

You as well as I, are well aware that churches do not pay property taxes on their lands.

This church did not pay any property taxes for the 110 years that they owned the land. They owned the building outright and they rented it to various other groups who in turn offered amenities to the community.

Usually churches are morally mandated to put covenants on the sale of church lands.

Why did this community church not have any covenants in place?

Why did this church not contact the Provincial Government to inquire about partnering with a program to help house lower income people as other churches have done?

Why is a church, which has not contributed financially to the city, allowed to sell it (were there capital gains on the sale?) without the city or the province having any say in how the land will be used in the future?

In order to buy the land, the developer told the church they must end the leases for all of the tenants, including the Montessori Preschool.

If the developer has such a great sense of community, as he spoke of on Thursday evening, why did he not allow the Montessori Preschool to stay -

-at least until there were approvals for redevelopment and rezoning permitting?

Here we have a situation where a church - long time member of our community and a developer, who says he cares about this community, make a deal to sell/buy this land which has paid nothing to the City for its use and gives absolutely no consideration to the context of the development to the neighbourhood in which it will stand.

I completely understand where you were going with your questions - what's done is done. So now, what do we do to remedy the above?

The answer is simple - the city looks at ways to partner with the developer (other than the usual waivers for the MIRHPP) and works with the community to find a way to build a structure that will create more moderate income rental units while still providing some of the amenities once provided by this church. The design submitted by Merik Architects is not a creative solution - they need to go back to the drawing board.

We have all stated over and over again - we are not against densification. We are not against moderate income rentals. We are not against rentals.

We are for a reasonable structure which will integrate into the context of our community.

Let us take a breathe and find a reasonable solution together.

Thank you for your consideration and questions.

Respectfully,  
Judy Osburn

## Wong, Tamarra

---

**From:** Judy Osburn s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 15, 2019 8:08 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Stewart, Kennedy; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael  
**Subject:** I am against the rezoning of 1805 Larch Street  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Mayor Stewart and Councilors;

Tonight I read some of the letters in support of the development proposal at 1805 Larch Street to which you heard me speak on Thursday evening.

One of the letters I read this evening states the following "Meanwhile, the widely publicized comments by Judy Osburn comparing 1805 Larch to "the ghetto" cannot be understood as anything other than racist and exclusionary, and I hope that that makes clear what the stakes are regarding this project. It is a bitterly ironic and deeply unsurprising that such attitudes exist in this community, as we can trace a clear line between this racist rhetoric and the condition for the building of the "heritage" properties in Kitsilano that the likes of Osburn are committed to defend."

While I wholly believe in the freedom of speech and in my freedom to describe the building proposal as a "ghetto" - it was in reference to the structure - not the future inhabitants - I am appalled by the low level this individual has chosen to reduce the forum of open discussion of what is community and what we as community can hopefully agree upon that is a good solution for us all.

This structure looks like a Soviet era Communist barracks. It looks like a ghetto building from the 50's. It is the worst kind of architecture. That was my initial reaction and I stand by it today. I strongly believe there are far better designs and ways for us to reach a common goal of increased affordable rental housing with destroying the integrity of a strong community structure.

To call me a racist is more than pathetic. I am part of and proud to be part of a multi-cultural family and those who know me, know that.

Judy Osburn

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Wong, Tamarra

---

**From:** Katsuko Brown s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 15, 2019 12:51 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Note in opposition to 1805 Larch - graffiti on redevelopment sign

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

When we were walking on Saturday morning, we noticed graffiti on the redevelopment sign in front of the site, which was advocating approval of the application.

Please don't vandalize our neighborhood.

KB

## Wong, Tamarra

---

**From:** Jeanette Jones s. 22(1) Personal and  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 14, 2019 4:05 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** Joseph Jones  
**Subject:** 1805 Larch Street Public Hearing

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

To: Mayor and Council

Staff has stated that only the MIRHPP unit (#107) in this project is considered to be a 3-bedroom unit. This one unit proposes a bedroom with no exterior walls and clerestory windows. Units 207, 307, and 407 are considered to be 2-bedroom + den.

Please note that according to the floor plans posted on the Rezoning Applications web site:

1. Units 207, 307, and 407 also contain a room with no exterior walls – identical in all respects except for the lack of clerestory windows with the third bedroom in unit 107.
2. Units 207, 307, and 407 are colour-coded as 3-bedroom units.
3. The only furniture indicated in the furniture layout for each of these windowless rooms is a bed.

<https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1805larchst/documents/1805LarchSt-RezoningApplication-ParkingandFloorPlans.pdf>

**This glaring inconsistency between the developer application and staff interpretation calls for your scrutiny.**

Jeanette and Joseph Jones

## Wong, Tamarra

---

**From:** David Buckle s. 22(1) Personal and  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2019 9:42 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** How can we build affordable housing?

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

This was a question that came up at the Public Hearing on Thursday December 12th.

Here is a good example

<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2017/feb/10/councils-innovative-projects-social-housing>

other thoughts

-Church's have a social responsibility to the neighbourhoods that they operate in, they don't pay property tax. They must work with government bodies, non profits and the neighbourhood when they sell. Co-op housing.

-deal with Air B&B, . Police it properly. Tax legal ones appropriately and designate those taxes to creating affordable rentals.

-increase tax on vacant property owned by people who are not resident of BC, not indiscriminately as in cottage on pender island. But on properties in the city that are obviously taking away from the rental stock. Again use the tax for affordable rentals.

- for all levels of government. Stop selling land. Don't let Little Mountain happen. 224 households lost.

- New condos, allow an extra floor and have a mix of strata for sale and secure rental in the same building

Ask the community, create a task force, city hall meeting with the public.

Thank you  
Janet Buckle