

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 11:24 PM  
**To:** Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Stewart, Kennedy; Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Support for 1805 Larch Street Moderate-Income Rental Rezoning

Hi there,

I would like to voice my strong support for the 1805 Larch Street rezoning.

Council has repeatedly stated its support for rental supply to respond to the housing crisis, especially below-market rental. This is one of the first projects to offer below-market rental rates, despite the difficult market conditions that act as barriers against new rental, under the MIRHPP (Moderate income rental housing pilot program).

I hope that Council approves this application, because it is a demonstration that we can use private development to deliver below-market units. The City is far behind its targets for rental housing, and the vacancy rate is desperately low. It would be hypocritical for Council to reject this application during this housing crisis.

Some are opposing this application because they feel it is too large. While I understand that it is Council's job to listen to all opinions, Council also has a responsibility to weigh those reasons and consider their validity. Council should note for example that there are already large apartment buildings in the area, across the street from this site! This proposal meets the policy that was passed by Council - Council's job at public hearing is not to re-write the policy to meet one's own particular opinions at the moment, but to assess whether or not this application meets the policy, which it does.

I believe that in an apartment zone where rental is desperately needed and which is near transit, it is imperative to have more rental buildings. I therefore think that Council should require that this building be even higher, to accommodate more families without any significant impact in terms of building size.

Thank you

Adrian

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Amy Severson "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 10:32 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Support for 1805 Larch rezoning

I support the rezoning of 1805 Larch, to create 63 new rental units.

I see that it includes a variety of suite sizes, from studio to three-bedrooms, which means families could move in.

And is a disused church, displaces nobody, and keeps the trees!

I am fortunate to own a small condo in this city, and fully support addition of more rental buildings.

We desperately need more rental throughout the city, and more densification in this city. In the 60s, my parents were able to rent in Kits on a PhD student allowance. This is laughable, now. This city should be open to more than just the rich, or those that bought into kits 40 years.

I hope this project goes through.

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Tracey Tabata "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 9:55 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Rental Housing at 2nd and Larch

I support the proposal to build the 5 storey apartment building at 2nd and Larch. Vancouver is desperately in need of rental housing, and this building represents a good start.

Thank you,  
Tracey Tabata  
"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Sent from my iPad

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Christopher Raftis "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 9:22 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 1805 Larch Public Hearing

Hello,

I am emailing in support of the proposed development at 1805 Larch Street.

I am a renter who lives "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" from the proposed site and I feel strongly that we need more rental accommodation in the City of Vancouver and this area in particular.

Though I believe all reasonable efforts should be made to address the concerns of the local community, the people who say the proposed development is not suited to the neighbourhood are wrong. For more than a year I lived in a 10-storey building that is located "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" the 1805 Larch Street site that has been there longer than I have been alive. It provided a home that my partner and I could afford as we attended school and commuted between to UBC and downtown.

I believe it is the responsibility of council to not only consider the interests of people who currently live in the community, but also the people that would benefit from living here if the development is approved. Many of the people who would make their homes at 1805 Larch for decades to come are not able to voice their support through the city's public consultation process. Therefore, I believe it is incumbent on the council to take their interests to heart.

Furthermore, the units reserved for moderate income households are an important component of ensuring more people are able to afford to live in Vancouver and a significant reason for approving the project.

Thank you,  
-Chris Raftis

More Homes | More Neighbours | More Friends

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** Jade Buchanan "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 8:38 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Rezoning Application - 1805 Larch Street

Hello,

I'm writing to comment on the proposal to rezone 1805 Larch Street. I live in Kitsilano [redacted]. I support the rezoning. I oppose the reduction in density and the height reduction.

I also object to having a public hearing at all. Most people who live in Vancouver are working long hours to narrowly afford living here. We elect representatives to make decisions in the best interests of the city, not so we can invest 10 hours a week doing the job of city council. By having a public hearing every time someone wants to build a home, you delay the development of the new housing this city desperately needs and give a megaphone to the ultra wealthy.

Thank you,  
Jade Buchanan

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Jerome Deis "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 5:09 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 1805 Larch Street - REZONING - SUPPORT

I fully support this rezoning application -

Firstly I'm wondering why there is even a debate over this application? We are in need of all types of housing in the city – and especially rental housing.

All rental applications should be expedited and building should begin almost immediately.

I'm in amazement that this city council continues to debate something so simple and elementary – and listen to the few people that have time to oppose such an application – when the majority of people do not have the time to attend these meetings, because they are too busy working 2 jobs to pay for their unaffordable rent.

When will you people get it? The city has been in crisis for the past 30 years -when are you going to wake up and start to do something about it.

This council, as many people in city hall are all 20<sup>th</sup> century thinkers- well let me tell you – the world has changed – we need to move more quickly and adapt more quickly.

Again – I fully support this application and if the developer wants more density – let him have it.

Thanks

**JEROME DEIS**

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Will Cleveland "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 4:02 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Rezoning of 1805 Larch St - SUPPORT

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my support for the rezoning of 1805 Larch St in Kits. Our city needs more rental housing and there is no reason to confine it to certain areas. To only permitting housing units of a certain size in major swathes of our city is to legally enforce economic segregation. I don't expect that every household should be able to afford every housing unit but it is, in my view, completely insane that we have a system where the City's powers have been used to actually make it illegal to build certain kinds of housing in certain neighbourhoods.

Sometimes new projects can have tough tradeoffs involving new housing vs existing tenants on a site - but there are no tough tradeoffs that I am aware of for this site.

My last point is that really there is no reason that each and every project of this size should require this level of process. Please just do a blanket allowance for more density across and lets get on with building enough housing.

Thanks for your consideration & happy holidays

Will Cleveland

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** Doug Purdy "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 3:24 PM  
**To:** White, Robert; Public Hearing  
**Cc:** Doug Purdy; Anthony Pappajohn; Kirsty Dick  
**Subject:** REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT  
**Attachments:** Letter re 2 & Larch to CoV.doc

Dear Mayor & Council: Please find my letter of support for this rezoning proposal.

**DOUG PURDY,** "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"



Monday, December 9, 2019

TO: Mayor Kennedy & Council Members

RE: 2<sup>nd</sup> & Larch Rezoning Application

Dear Mr. Mayor & Council Members: I am writing to express my strong support for this greatly needed rental housing development at 2<sup>nd</sup> and Larch that will replace a church its Christian owners have deemed redundant and no longer needed. by them.

I do not live in the community. I live in a modest bungalow at [REDACTED] in a rapidly changing environment – the Cambie Corridor where densification is occurring and our single-family home environment – I have lived here for almost a quarter of a century – is being transformed now and will be transformed to higher density over the coming years.

I also wish to disclose that I have a perceived conflict of interest because I assisted James with their initial public consultation process for the proposed redevelopment. I am no longer retained by James Holdings.

Furthermore, like you Mr. Mayor, Councillor DeGenova, James Holdings and I were also subjected to close scrutiny early on in the process. In our case, a neighbour registered a Freedom of Information request with the City – name not disclosed because of protection of his or her privacy. I can presume they were hoping to find something untoward for use to challenge the project or our character. Nothing appears to have come of that enquiry.

I arrived in Vancouver 55 years ago for graduate school at UBC. I completed my MSW, eventually joined the City of Vancouver as a Social Planner. I was appointed Deputy Director for 11 of the 19 years here. In 1989 I left the City and became a development consultant. I was also co-founder and co-owner of CPA Development Consultants. We built non-profit, assisted living and care residences throughout the Lower Mainland. For the past 6 years as an encore career, my team and I have provided tenant relocation services to developers and non-profits redeveloping lands primarily for replacement rental housing.

Being in the business of helping tenants find alternate rental housing, my team and I know a lot about the dire need for all forms of rental housing in Vancouver. Not tomorrow, not in a few years, but right now.

The neighbours claim the loss of the church is a loss of amenities and programs to the community. They are right in one sense and one sense only. There is a loss of amenity and community service by disappearing churches. But this has been happening for many years now as Anglican and United Church sites have

been and continue to be repurposed for housing throughout the Lower Mainland and across Canada. The sites are being repurposed primarily for rental housing. My former company, CPA, helped redevelop 3 such sites over the years.

The church in question and its prior functions are no more and have not been for some time. The church that owned the site has a right to sell the property. Its congregations – Anglican, United and others - were aging, shrinking and disappearing or new and emerging. The building had served its purpose and that purpose, subsidized by past congregations, is finished. It is no more.

As for the proposal to build rental housing here, opponents cite a number of reasons why Council ought not to approve the proposal. They describe their street as a jewel. In reality, the jewels have two faces:

- A. The street face is a pleasant, heavily treed and landscaped façade.
- B. The backside presents an entirely different picture. The lane is unpaved and narrow and the rear massing of the jewels reveal 3.5 and 4-storey old-style tenement buildings with massive, ugly exit stairs. But, to their credit, they do provide needed rental housing.

Vancouver is in the process of being reimagined and reshaped throughout the city as we meet here tonight. Some long-term residents do not like the changes and are resistant to them. They prefer things exactly the way they are.

They genuinely and sincerely believe that their neighbourhood and street are so special that they ought to be exempt from any change and that if there is to be change it should happen everywhere else but in their area and on their street.

I disagree and would like to offer 10 reasons why the site is appropriate for the proposed rental housing use and why Council should approve this proposal:

1. Living in Vancouver is a privilege not a right. In every public venue, before a performance starts, a representative states, "We are on the unceded territory of .... "
2. We are all visitors and guests here. Our stay is temporary, not permanent whether we acknowledge it or not.
3. Change in the city and the Kitsilano area is inevitable and necessary.
4. Density and redevelopment opportunities should and must be distributed to all parts of the city, including Kitsilano.
5. Kitsilano desperately needs more new rental housing and at present there are few options and opportunities available without rezoning.
6. This specific area of Kitsilano needs more **new** rental housing to complement the older rental housing stock that serves a useful purpose;
7. The site is across the street, a mere few yards away, from a zone that permits the proposed use and density;
8. This repurposed church site is an excellent option for the proposed use:

9. The site is of a size to accommodate the proposed building scale and height with limited negative impact. A similar relationship of acceptable building scales and sizes are evident in the zone across the street.
10. Mayor and Council, it is the right thing to do. Please exercise your civic right and responsibility and approve this rezoning proposal.

Thank you for permitting me this opportunity to present my views to you.

Doug Purdy, "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** Daniel Varga "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 3:19 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 3. REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT

Mayor and Council,

Please approve 1805 Larch St, as renter would makes less than \$40k in this city. There are few places available, this program provides housing for people who are struggling to find homes in this city. I strongly believe it should be taller to allow for more people to live in this neighborhood. I also believe it should have less parking to meet the climate emergency goal set by the city.

Thank you,  
Daniel

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Alex Mandel "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 2:32 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 1805 Larch St project

Dear Council,

I would like to voice my support for this rental project. This is an unused lot and the building will displace no existing tenants. A total win won for the neighbourhood. I am a renter in Kerrisdale in a building that is 3 blocks from an arterial. I would welcome more high quality rentals to move in to. I pay a relatively low rent for my very standard and old unit, which would be suitable for someone with half my earnings. I am saving money in order to move later once I can make a down payment, since it is almost impossible to get good value as a renter in this city. Building higher quality, "luxury," rentals or even condos to increase that supply will allow people like me to free up units that are suitable for lower income people.

Please approve more rentals, and especially when they are not on noisy and polluted arterials!

Best,

Alex

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** Tara Sundberg "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 1:56 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** White, Robert  
**Subject:** Second and Larch proposed development - 1805 Larch Street

Dear City of Vancouver,

As a lifelong resident of Vancouver (46 years), who grew up for a number of years in Kitsilano and attended Kitsilano Secondary School I would like to voice my support for this project.

I grew up in rental buildings with my mom who was a single parent. Eventually she was able to buy a house, but we would have been stuck in basements or shared accommodation if it wasn't for reasonably priced rentals. The city of Vancouver desperately needs more rental options, and this is a perfect place for more rental.

I live in a family housing development run by a nonprofit organization, the only thing that allows me to continue to live in the city I love and close to my place of work. Vancouverites need options, and more rental is crucial for middle income earners such as myself.

Property owners who oppose projects such as the above mentioned are often retirees, with time and resources to devote to preventing community building developments like the one at 2nd and Larch will be. They have time to go to public hearings, to write letters, to organize like-minded people and to sway public opinion. I hope your development permit staff and City Council take this into account when rendering your decision. Wealthy landowners cannot be the only voices heard in crucial decisions about the community we all share.

Thank you for your time, and feel free to contact me if further discussion is warranted.

*Thanks,*

Tara R. Sundberg

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

  
  


This e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed (the "addressee") and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use that a person other than the addressee makes of this communication is prohibited and any reliance or decisions made based on it, are the responsibility of such person. We accept no responsibility for any loss or damages suffered by any person other than the addressee as a result of decisions made or actions taken based on this communication or otherwise. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this e-mail.

Ce courriel est strictement réservé à l'usage de la personne à qui il est adressé (le destinataire). Il peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. L'examen, la réexpédition et la diffusion de ce message par une personne autre que son destinataire sont interdits. Nous déclinons toute responsabilité à l'égard des pertes ou des dommages subis par une personne autre que le destinataire par suite de décisions ou de mesures fondées sur le contenu de cette communication ou autrement. Si vous avez reçu ce courriel par erreur, veuillez communiquer avec son expéditeur et en détruire toutes les copies.

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Elliot Hoyt "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 12:55 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Support for Rezoning Application - 1805 Larch Street

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to express my support for the rezoning application of 1805 Larch Street. This project will bring 63 rental units to a neighbourhood near a future mass transit line, bringing much needed housing supply to a growing neighbourhood. As a renter in the city of Vancouver, I know how thin the supply and vacancy rates are, and how desperately more rental is needed, across all neighbourhoods. Building more rental on sites that create zero displacement of existing renters should be the first priority of council, and as such, this proposal should be accepted as it - with no increases to parking minimums, no loss of floor space that renters sorely need in this city, etc.

Thank you for your time

Elliot Hoyt,

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** marianne amodio "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 9:02 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** Boyle, Christine  
**Subject:** 3. REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT

Dear Mayor and Council

I write in full support for the rezoning at 1805 Larch Street. Rental 100 housing projects such as these that alleviate our housing affordability crisis.

Its time for Council to resist the well organized, preservationist and elitist groups who make an entitlement claim to swaths of neighbourhoods that can support real families. I continue to be disturbed by the sentiments of these single family neighbourhood groups, whose “feedback” from notification meetings call for fewer units, more parking and less height and compare the creation of housing in communities that are emptying out, as “ghettos”. I am appalled that as a city, we are still valuing these voices above those who cannot afford or find a home.

The notification process is flawed. It is the privileged few who are demanding a ban on housing for many. I sincerely hope that logic and data will prevail here and our absurd and untruthful subjugation to the false altar of “Character” and “neighbourhood input” will soon end. People make character, not the shape of a roof or how many doors you see at the front entry. Neighbourhood input should also be made by people who strive to live in low density, green communities and established neighbourhoods, rather than those who already live there.

Council needs to take a strong position here to avoid 2019 from being the worst year in a decade for rental approvals by City Council. I believe most, if not all of you, ran on platforms to alleviate the housing crisis.

Thank you.  
Marianne

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted] "s. 22(1) Personal

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** marianne amodio "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 4, 2019 8:14 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Rezoning Application - 1805 Larch Street

We are fully completely 100% in support of this project. There should be zero debate regarding its necessity.

Marianne Amodio "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Jeffrey LeMay "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Monday, December 9, 2019 8:24 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 1805 Larch St.

Dear Mayor and Council:

I would like to offer my support for the proposed rental building at 1805 Larch Street both as a Kitsilano resident and as a moderate income earner with grave concerns about the affordability of this neighbourhood and city. However, with that support I must also share my concerns about the effectiveness of the Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program as a means of delivering affordable housing.

I am generally sympathetic to arguments against development that would destroy the physical or social fabric of existing communities. But despite some claims by my neighbours, this is not what's at stake in Kitsilano. Some homeowners west of the proposed site argue that the new rental building would alter the character of the neighbourhood. To refute this claim, one only has to go to the corner of Larch St. and West 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave. and look around. For many blocks east of the site, apartment buildings abound. These buildings are not recent additions to the neighbourhood; many have stood there for over half a century. And many exceed ten storeys in height—*double* that of the proposed structure. Furthermore, since the new building would replace a church, it sets no precedent for the destruction of single family dwellings and should not be viewed as a threat. Rather than ruining the architectural character of the neighbourhood, the building's scale would make it a highly appropriate intermediary between the larger RM-4 zoned buildings east of Larch and the RT-8 zoned houses to the west. The architect's landscape plan further mitigates problems of scale by retaining mature trees and providing new plantings akin to those growing in the yards nearby.

Some of the neighbours' objections to the project, as quoted in the media, seem to be based implicitly on NIMBYism and snobbery. In her objection to the smallest proposed apartments, one neighbour likened the building to a "ghetto," a word—however she meant it—that carries the ugly implication that only a certain class of people belong in the neighbourhood (1). The proposed building is actually commendable for its wide range of apartment types, from studios to three bedrooms, and would house people diverse in both income and family composition. Many of the apartments would be similar in size to the basement and accessory suites in houses nearby. Another neighbour quoted in the *Vancouver Sun* implied that higher density buildings should be located in suburban communities instead of in Kitsilano (1). This suggestion ignores Kitsilano's own need for moderate income workers and buildings to house them; the proposed building would provide homes these workers can afford. I earn a moderate income of \$35,000 a year from two jobs as an independent woodworker and as a reading and writing tutor; my neighbours in Kitsilano should not expect others like me to commute from Surrey to repair their homes or educate their children, but should allow the provision of affordable homes, granting local workers the chance to participate fully in the community. As a renter, I spent five years as a leader in a community garden; as a renter, I have been a member of a club that promotes sport among LGBTQ people; as renters, countless other people make valuable community contributions that are lost as high rents drive them from the places they call home.

To reject the proposed project would be to cruelly deny 13 individuals and families stable, affordable homes in an increasingly hostile rental market. Vancouver's rental market is highly dependent on condominium owners as landlords. But this arrangement is inherently unstable, as owners may legally evict tenants in order to occupy the units themselves. Many do so strategically—and temporarily—when they feel their rental income has fallen too far below what the overheated market will bear. When our landlord moved in (after renegeing on a promise

to renew our lease) he gave me and my partner five weeks to find a new home—which was 14% more expensive and 17% smaller than the one we left. Many families who rent cannot endure such a demand on their time, space, and money. Purpose built rental suites will ensure that they never have to.

What is unfortunate, however, about 1805 Larch and the other MIRHPP developments is that they fail to deliver *enough* affordable housing for people with moderate incomes. Under the program, for every affordable, rent controlled unit, four others must be built and offered at *unaffordable* market or near market rates. Critics of the City's Rental 100 program rightly point out that the units produced by that program are affordable only for those earning \$80,000 or more—meaning that someone with an average renter's income would need a *59% pay increase* in order to afford one (1). The market rate rental units that will comprise up to 80% of MIRHPP dwellings appear to suffer from the same problem. Dan Fumano's *Vancouver Sun* article in April explained that the MIRHPP model is designed to fulfil both the city's need for affordable housing and the developers' need for a profitable projects—and this raises the question: without the need for profit, could the city do better than achieve its affordable housing goals at a mere 20% rate of success?

I believe it can. One job of government is to provide residents what the free market will not. It seems clear that Vancouver's building industry will not create affordable housing on its own; nor will the City's incentives and requirements through MIRHPP induce it to provide enough. A better solution may be for the City to *become* the developer and commission exactly the projects it needs in order to provide enough housing for people ignored by market forces. The apartments in City-commissioned projects should be subject to the same rent controls and tenant income requirements as those outlined in the City's MIRHPP Fact Sheet (2). These controls and requirements seem likely to be MIRHPP's greatest success and legacy. Rental-only zones should be established (with allowable densities high enough to increase property values, thereby avoiding the kind of legal challenges launched by owners in New Westminster) in order to induce builders to produce market rate rentals of whatever type or combination the City deems desirable based on the needs of diverse Vancouver residents.

Please move in favour of rezoning the parcel at 1805 Larch Street in order to provide stable, affordable homes for a community that desperately needs them.

Sincerely,

Jeff LeMay, "s. 22(1)  
Personal  
and  
Confidential"  
"

#### References:

1. Dan Fumano: "The fight for – and against – affordable rental housing in Vancouver." *Vancouver Sun*, updated April 5, 2019.
2. City of Vancouver: "Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program Fact Sheet," October 2018.

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Grant McMahon "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 8, 2019 10:31 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 1805 Larch Street Rezoning

Grant McMahon  
"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

To Mayor and Council,

As a resident of Vancouver I am sending this email to give voice to my support for the rezoning of 1805 Larch Street. It is my understanding that the proposed 5 storey building would be a part of the MIRHPP, the Moderate Income Housing Pilot Program, a program I support even though my family would not qualify. This is an imperfect but much needed step in the right direction for creating a wider range of housing options in our city.

Respectfully,  
Grant McMahon

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** M L "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 8, 2019 7:02 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Rezoning Application for 1805 Larch Street

To whom it may concern,

This email is in regards to the Rezoning Application for 1805 Larch Street. I would like to express my support for this community benefiting development. As someone who lives "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" away from this site, I know the community and area very well. This is an area that has many existing buildings over the proposed height of 1805 Larch Streets application; thus the arguments suggesting the building is "too tall" are invalid. Additionally, the proposed building fits into the neighborhoods character; Kitsilano is an amalgamation of SFH, Apartments, Condos, and several towers.

This rezoning will benefit the community. Many Vancouverites, UBC students, staff, and faculty struggle to find affordable housing. Not least because many neighborhoods like Kitsilano have been reported to have less than 1% rental vacancies. This project can ameliorate the lack of rental supply whilst providing affordable and market rate rentals in close proximity to transit. Indeed, the project is two blocks away from a major transit orientated street, West 4th avenue, and only 3 blocks away from Cornwall avenue.

On the topic of rental housing, and lack of rental supply, the City of Vancouver should be taking action to increase rental incentives. Policies such as the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy must be made permanent, and broader in scope. It is absurd that the City of Vancouver only allows 1 application in a 10 block radius. Please ameliorate these policies to ensure there are more options to build affordable rental housing.

Kind Regards,

Maximillian Lepur

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Lee Hawkings "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 8, 2019 4:25 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT

Dear Mayor and Council,

I write today to support the Rezoning of 1805 Larch Street. As a young professional in Vancouver I am concerned at the gross undersupply of affordable and market rental housing stock. I am one of the lucky people who is fortunate enough to have secured relatively stable and relatively affordable rental housing but I know many who have not. I am honestly scared about finding housing if I ever have to move from my current residence.

This type of rezoning should not be controversial. We should not be sacrificing our city's future by blocking reasonable rental housing developments in order to maintain the status quo of single family neighbourhoods and cater to people who's biggest concerns may largely be centred on neighbourhood "aesthetic" or "character". This type of thinking is literally excluding people like me from finding places to live and forcing us out of the city or underground into dingy basement suites.

Further, I would like to express my deep concerns about the public hearing process in general. As a busy young worker I do not have the time or energy to attend public hearings, organize or put up the same level of campaigning that it seems generally older, richer and often retired residents seem to be able to muster when development is proposed for their neighbourhood. As I stated above this type of project should not be controversial and should not need a public hearing for approval. I don't think holding this type of hearing is a good use of public funds. City staff should have greater latitude to approve projects like this so long as they meet certain pre-conditions developed by council.

Please do the right thing and approve this project and hopefully many others like it in the future. The future of our city is in your hands.

Sincerely,

Lee Hawkings

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Ken Thompson "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 8, 2019 3:51 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** I support re-zoning in Kitsilano

Everybody deserves to live on a quiet street (I live on W Broadway and would like to leave!), up-zoning side-streets so that regular folks like me can live there is the way to go. It is not right that only wealthy families can afford to have a quiet sleep in this city.

This is why I support the 1805 Larch St project.

Ken

-----  
Ken A. Thompson  
"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
[Redacted signature block]

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** tom davidoff "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 8, 2019 3:06 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Re: Thank you for your email

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

I am writing to express my support for the rezoning at 1805 Larch Street. I live in Kitsilano and do not believe that this new housing will reduce the quality of life here meaningfully. New rental housing will provide choices to people that would have to live elsewhere absent this project. Like all other new housing, that will have the side benefit of reducing demand pressure throughout the housing market and thereby lowering prices and rents throughout the region, particularly here in Kitsilano.

Some neighbours will argue that because this project will add density to their neighbourhood, their lives will be made worse, and therefore the new renters should not be allowed to live at 1805 Larch. As a matter of public choice, how should we evaluate the tradeoff between people wanting to live in a neighbourhood and incumbents wanting to keep new residents out?

\* A TEST FOR WHETHER OR NOT TO APPROVE NEW PROJECTS \*

An easy test for whether rental housing is being built too densely is the following. Consider a graph with housing units per lot on the horizontal axis (zero units at the left end, more and more units moving to the right) and total rent collected minus annualized development and operating costs on the vertical axis. Total rent is approximately equal to the product of how many people live on a lot times how much they value living there. The value created by the project to the developer can be measured as the annual benefit expressed in rent less the annualized cost. But we must consider the impact on neighbours, housing cost, and the environment, too.

Suppose then, hypothetically, that council represented a profit-maximizing developer that owned the entire area around Second and Larch. That developer would consider not only the profitability of a given lot's development, but also the spillover onto other lots. The latter effect is what neighbours will complain about to you. Thus, if you would build at a greater density on all lots than is being proposed at the LarchStreet site, there is no serious case to be made against this project. Note that because rents express the value residents attach to living somewhere, you want to maximize the product of people enjoying the area times value per resident (approximated by rents). Too few units and the product will be small. But the graph is hump shaped -- too many units and the lower valuation per resident will suggest reducing density.

You do not care only about the profits to be made from developing Vancouver. Because density lowers housing cost (a stated goal of council) and avoids sprawl and hence environmental damage (another stated goal), you should support new development for sure if it is less dense than that at which a monopolist would build out all of the neighbourhood. And in fact, given the external effects, you should accept projects a bit more dense, too.

\* IS THE LARCH STREET TOO DENSE RELATIVE TO THE TEST DENSITY? \*

We now have a guide as to what a profit maximizer would do if unconstrained by regulation: the new Squamish proposal around Burrard Street. Since that appears to be designed to maximize private profit, and since council should approve projects at that density or lower (and even a bit above), then as long as the 1805 Larch project is at a lower density, it should be approved. My back of the envelope math suggests that the Squamish project is proposed at a far greater density than Second and Larch.

You should thus approve.

\* A REMARK ON AFFORDABILITY\*

Because the units are to be rented, they will of course be affordable to the tenants by definition. Absorbing demand from upper middle class households has a very positive effect on affordability off site, since the tenants housed on Larch street at market rents would otherwise outbid most other tenants for the housing on which opponents hope to force the putative residents. Also, there will be some subsidized units.

Regards,

Thomas Davidoff

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Benn, Mike "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 8, 2019 2:27 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 1805 Larch

I write in support of the project at 1805 Larch. If anything the project should allow for more density and not less. It is vital to the survival of this city that we increase the amount of rental supply.

Please approve this project and allow for more density across the city

Regards

Mike Benn

Get "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

---

This email may contain information that is confidential. If you are not the intended recipient you may not distribute or copy this email or any attachments. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete this email and attachments from your system immediately. Thank you.

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Cameron White "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 8, 2019 12:27 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 3. REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT

Dear Mayor and Council,

I urge you to approve the rezoning application at 1805 Larch Street. There is simply not enough rental units available in the area, and in the city period. This project will help add to the supply and I encourage council to approve more projects like it, especially as it is not displacing any existing tenants. It is also important that some of the units are reserved for people on moderate incomes. Until this city allows enough new units in the city to meet the growing demand and bring rents down to a reasonable rate across the board, this type of policy, and project is a necessity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cameron White

"s. 22(1)  
Personal

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Josh Anderson "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 8, 2019 11:27 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Subject:** REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am owner and resident of a house at "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential". I fully support the rezoning at 1805 Larch. It is shameful that we can't approve more projects like this on the west side, largely because of misguided fears by NIMBY residents.

Please approve this much needed rental housing in our neighbourhood.

Josh Anderson  
"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

[Redacted signature block]

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Denis Agar "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 8, 2019 9:21 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** info@abundanthousingvancouver.com  
**Subject:** 3. REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT

Dear Mayor and Council, we need more housing, and especially more affordable rental housing that does not displace existing rental housing.

Please vote yes on the 1805 Larch rezoning.

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** Robyn Gerry "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 8, 2019 1:23 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** info@abundanthousingvancouver.com  
**Subject:** 3. REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT

Dear Mayor and Council

Please support all murhp projects! They are vital to our future, our city and our economy! Please pass these projects!  
Weeeee need them!

Sent from my iPhone

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** Jennifer Bradshaw "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 7, 2019 11:40 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** Abundant Housing Vancouver  
**Subject:** Spam: 3. REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I support every MIRHPP project. Please build them all and stop with the pilot - it needs to be extended by right to every neighbourhood.

Best,  
Jennifer Bradshaw

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Joshua Prowse "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 7, 2019 11:23 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** Abundant Housing Vancouver  
**Subject:** 3. REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT

Dear Mayor and Council,

I'm someone who has lived about "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" from this proposed development for some years. As I read articles like this one: <https://dailyhive.com/vancouver/1805-larch-street-vancouver> I'm encouraged that this is a development that will provide truly affordably rental units. I see from articles like <https://www.vancourier.com/real-estate/some-moderate-income-rental-homes-might-be-on-the-way-1.23997683> that there has been some opposition to the building, including a petition against it from a few hundred people. In the end, it seems that this is a developer who is doing exactly what council has asked, producing a very reasonable proposal. I'm concerned that if this proposal isn't approved, council will be sending a message that it isn't serious about the MIRHPP policy or creating a predictable environment for those who aim to produce new rental housing. I do believe that secure and stable rental housing belongs in every neighbourhood and that this is a good site to add much needed housing for Vancouver renters like myself.

Thank you,  
- Joshua Prowse  
Vancouver, BC

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** Ian Robertson "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 7, 2019 9:25 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 3. REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT  
**Attachments:** 2019\_12\_07\_21.16.59.jpg

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to strongly support the MIRHPP project at 1805 Larch St.

This project has been demonized by incumbent neighbours who are comfortably housed and who feel the sky will fall for having more neighbours.

I used to live less from a block from this project, and I know that across the street are 4 and 6 story buildings, so not only is the argument that there isn't sufficient context to build this building hollow, it is also 100% wrong.

(See attached photo)

This project should be approved even were it not for this context, but with this context also, it must be so.

Arguments that density will ghettoize a neighbourhood can not help but carry the spectre (if not the overt smell) of racial, ethnic, ability and lifestyle discrimination, and should be strongly denounced whenever they are heard.

The loudest way to denounce this behavior is to approve this, and every similar project. Please do.

Regards

-Ian

Ian Robertson  
Fairview Vancouver



Google  
© 2019 Google



1848 Larch St

Larch St

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** Nicole Hansen "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 7, 2019 9:09 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Rezoning: 1805 Larch street -- SUPPORT

Good day,

I am writing in support of rezoning at 1805 Larch St to allow for a five-storey apartment building.

Vancouver desperately needs more rental housing, everywhere. Kitsilano is close to downtown and UBC, with good transit options, allowing for a significant increase in population in the neighborhood.

While an even-higher building would have been preferable, this is a good step in the right direction for housing people with average incomes in Vancouver. It also presents a great opportunity to house more people without displacing current tenants.

Please approve the rezoning request.

Nicole Hansen  
"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Michael Adria "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 7, 2019 8:58 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Subject:** 3. REZONING: 1805 Larch Street / SUPPORT

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing in support of the rezoning at 1805 Larch Street, which is a "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential". This city is in dire need of more rental housing, and opportunities to build more without causing displacement are few and far between. I look forward to welcoming my new neighbours once this project is completed.

Thanks,

Michael Adria

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Avery Mann "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Friday, December 6, 2019 9:28 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** In support of 1805 Larch St.

Dear Council Members.

As a small Vancouver business owner, and as a Vancouver resident who lived in the city from 1970 – 1997 and then returned in 2017 (to present) with my wife and children, I am very much in support of the proposed rental development project at 1805 Larch.

Having watched the meteoric rise of Vancouver real estate prices from my departure from the city in '97 to my return in 2017, I am thankful for new projects that focus on the needs of renters. We struggled to find an affordable rental unit on the west side of the city, and were thankful to find something in Kitsilano, just before our move. The neighbourhood is extremely conducive to a healthy lifestyle and the safety is great for our young children.

I encourage Council to approve this project, since it focuses on allowing more people an affordable rental opportunity in one of the city's most livable neighbourhoods.

Thank you,

Avery Mann  
"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



December 3, 2019

Mayor and Council  
City of Vancouver  
453 West 12th Ave  
Vancouver, BC  
V5Y 1V4

Cc: Robert White, [Redacted]

"s.  
22(1)  
Perso  
nal  
and  
Confi  
denti  
al"

**Support for 1805 Larch Street Rezoning**

There is immediate demand for rental housing throughout the City of Vancouver. Downtown Vancouver is experiencing a boom in office tower development, with 5 million square feet of office space to be completed in the next few years. The companies that will occupy these spaces will rely on an adequate supply of housing within a reasonable commuting distance to attract and retain employees. We can therefore expect the demands for rental housing to continue to increase.

Family-sized rental housing units are also in short supply in Vancouver. 41% of the units at 1805 Larch Street will be two or three-bedroom units.

20% of the residential floor area will be permanently secured for moderate income households. The City's Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP) is an initiative that provides housing options for people that might otherwise be priced out of the city.

The project site is near transit and well connected to other parts of the city which will allow its future residents to have an efficient and sustainable commute to jobs and services.

For the reasons noted above, we ask that Council approve this rezoning application.

Sincerely,

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

[Redacted Signature]

Charles Gauthier

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

[Redacted Content]

[Redacted Footer]

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** William Robitaille "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 3, 2019 8:14 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Cc:** White, Robert  
**Subject:** 1805 Larch Rezoning Application - Comment of Support  
**Attachments:** 1805 Larch - W Robitaille.pdf

Attached is a letter to Mayor and Council for review.

Thank you,

William Robitaille

December 2, 2019

Mayor and Council  
City of Vancouver  
453 West 12th Ave  
Vancouver, BC. V5Y 1V4

Dear Mayor and Council:

**Re: Support for 1805 Larch Street Rezoning Application**

I live at "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" from the proposed rezoning and development at 1805 Larch Street. I support the project and I ask that Council do the same.

I've heard that some residents living closer to the development who are opposed say it's out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood. I disagree, but not for the reasons you might expect. It's true that the new building will be taller than many of the buildings in the area, but it certainly won't be the tallest. More importantly, the new apartment building will be much nicer and environmentally efficient than many of the older buildings surrounding it that have been left to age ungracefully and added to like patchwork quilts so that the alleys are filled with ugly stairwells leading to much-needed multi-tenant units are surrounded by crumbling fences and recycling bins.

I lived in Kits for many years as a young adult. It was an inexpensive place for a young chef like me. Lots of my friends also lived there. My wife and I moved back to a Kits by choice many years later and what we found was a very different community than the one I had left. Gone are most of the independent retail stores and the university crowd. Some independent restaurants remain but fewer than before; all of them struggling to find qualified employees who can afford to live close to work or willing to travel long distances for each shift. It's still a friendly community, but increasingly I find my neighbours look like me – middle-aged wealthier people with free time on their hands. That's not sustainable. We need diversity, we need the next generation. We need to make room for them, and building up is an efficient way to do this.

I know that a long time ago, the planners deemed Larch Street to be the magic zoning divider between RT-8 and RM-4, but times have changed. This is a unique site and the old St. Mark's church has not been actively used for a long time. Five storeys is a small price to pay to make room for 13 families who would not otherwise be able to live here.

My wife attended the open house for this project and was talking to someone opposed to it. When my wife said she supports it the person she was talking to said her opinion doesn't count because she lives east of Larch. My wife came home to inform me that we live "on the East West Side". We laughed, but it's not funny. Living in this area and walking my dog every day I know that Larch doesn't separate two different communities – the people who live on either side travel back and forth across that magic divide all the time. And my opinion as a local resident and someone who wants Vancouver to survive DOES matter. Please vote in favour of this project.

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

"s.

Bill Robitaille

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** Graeme Barker "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 26, 2019 5:43 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Rezoning Application for 1805 Larch Street

Hello,

I am a bit disappointed this project has taken this long to get to public hearing.

My family and I live "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential", and we whole heartedly support this project in full.

Thank you

--

**Graeme Barker**

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

[Redacted]

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Pamela Esil "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 28, 2019 2:17 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 1805 Larch Street

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Pam Gwyer and I am a 33-year old new mother and home owner on "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" in Kitsilano.

I am writing council to give my feedback on the upcoming rezoning at 1805 Larch St.

Over the past several months, there have been numerous signs put up around our neighbourhood opposing this project and canvassers going door-to-door soliciting support to oppose the upcoming rezoning.

Last week, I spoke with one canvasser who was holding a community meeting of Kitsilano residents that he wanted me to attend. When I told him that I was largely in support of the project, he refused to tell me where the upcoming community meeting was being held. I can only conclude from his actions that any opposition from this community group is unrepresentative of the broader Kitsilano community. In addition, whoever was putting up signs in opposition of the project put one up on my property without my permission.

Regardless, I believe that this project is in the public interest of Kitsilano and Vancouver. Additional housing choices and density are required for a growing city, and I already have a close elementary school teacher friend who is excited about the prospect of renting in this building in the future. While I'm not crazy about the architectural look of the building, I understand that there are necessary tradeoffs to achieve affordability. In addition, the other 3 corners of this particular block house some of the blandest buildings in Kitsilano, so it certainly fits the character of the immediate neighbourhood.

Once again, I would like to thank council for considering this application and hope it makes the right decision to support increased housing choice for the future residents of Kitsilano.

Sincerely,

Pam Gwyer

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Trina Bester "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 26, 2019 6:04 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Rezoning Application for 1805 Larch Street

Thanks for sending out the information but I cannot attend the meeting. I live close to the site and have sent my kids to all the schools, care centres and community spaces in Kitsilano and this kind of housing is desperately needed to keep this a neighborhood where everyone can live. My family of five is in full support of the project as designed and hope council will make the zoning change.

Thanks for letting me contribute,

Best regards, Trina Bester

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Mike Ee "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 26, 2019 10:59 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Re: 1805 Larch Street is a good environmental idea

Further to my previous email:

floor space could reduce the emissions associated with the production of building materials for homes in G7 members by 50–60 per cent by 2050, given the already existing building stock. It would also reduce heating and cooling demand by up to 20 per cent, pending the retrofitting of existing buildings.

Policies that support homeownership may have the undesirable effect of subsidizing large residences through tax breaks and other measures. In some locations, spatial planning prevents the construction of multifamily residences and locks in suburban forms at high social and environmental costs. A reform of planning rules could bring about multiple benefits in this regard (Jones *et al.* 2018). One mechanism to increase the intensity of use is to strengthen incentives for older residents to downsize when

children move out. Property taxes as well as an elimination of taxes on property transactions, such as the stamp duty in the United Kingdom, can have such an effect.

There is a wide variation in building lifetimes, from less than 25 years in some East Asian countries to more than 100 years in Europe. Extending building lifetimes can therefore have widely different effect. In China, extending the lifespan of buildings to 50 years could reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 400 Mt per year or about 20 per cent of construction-related emissions (Cai *et al.* 2015). In Europe, new buildings have lower energy use due to improvements in building standards and technology, with lifetime extensions resulting in higher total emissions compared with replacement buildings, unless the building are retrofit to a high energy standard (Serrenho *et al.* 2019). If only new, efficient buildings have

From here: "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Quoting this: <https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2019>

Thank you.

Mike Vlasman

On Nov 26, 2019, at 10:17 AM, Mike Ee "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" wrote:

RE: 1805 Larch Street

We have a shortage of housing, especially rental housing.

Gen Xers, are a financially precarious generation with a preference for areas that offer plenty of shops and restaurants within walking distance.

This zoning change addresses those issues.

The development is totally innocuous.

There are already high rises nearby and the sky has not fallen because of them.

As someone who lives in the neighbourhood, I support this zoning change and this development fully.

Thank you.

Mike Vlasman