

Choi, Rowena

From: Phil Gough "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 2:13 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 3680 East Hastings St.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

City of Vancouver Cybersecurity WARNING: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Vancouver City Council,

I am submitting my objection to amending the by-law from C-2C to CD-1. My reasons are:

1. The current by-law serves the area adequately as far as housing is concerned and the increased density would not contribute to making the area more livable than it is
2. Additional retail and residential would put pressure on the adjacent streets for traffic and parking, something which is becoming a problem more than not (people using adjacent streets as park and ride for the Kootenay Loop, for using businesses on Hastings Street and overnight parking as new developments lack sufficient facilities)
3. Noise is a consideration as the stretch of Hastings between Boundary and Cassiar with more solid barriers amplifies sound, in particular truck and motorcycle traffic
4. The question of where the workers will be parking and where trucks servicing the construction will be parked has not been addressed by the builder
5. Changing the zoning sets a precedent where the next request will be for even higher buildings
6. There is no need for more retail space as the existing space either sits vacant for long periods or changes hands regularly, partially due to lack of foot traffic as this is not an inviting section of the street to stroll and a lack of parking

Thanks,

Phil Gough
Vancouver

Choi, Rowena

From: Gelein, Marcel
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 9:01 AM
To: Choi, Rowena
Subject: FW: NO TO THE 14 STOREY BUILDING EAST VANCOUVER

Hi Rowena,
FYI – correspondence sent to me for 3600 and 3680 E. Hastings.

Thanks!

Marcel

From: mercedes rovi "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2020 10:16 PM
To: Gelein, Marcel; Planning Info
Subject: [EXTERNAL] NO TO THE 14 STOREY BUILDING EAST VANCOUVER

City of Vancouver Cybersecurity WARNING: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Dear Marcel, I won't be able to attend the hearing tomorrow due to work, but I want to remind you my opposition to the terrible project that some people want to do in my neighborhood.

This is a copy of my first email:

Dear Marcel Gelein.

Thanks for the work that you are doing to improve our lives in Vancouver. I am writing to you to let you know my opposition to the project 14 STOREY TWIN TOWER ON HASTINGS AND BOUNDARY!

This will create long term havoc with our already stressed Hastings corridor:

1. Traffic is at maximum already, especially with rush hour and bridge incidents.
2. Make parking even more impossible. THE 212 UNIT PROJECT ONLY PROVIDES 68 PARKING SPACE.
3. Remove existing business from the area
4. there is not enough transit infrastructure to support the proposed density, which is double what would normally be allotted for the area. add buses would only add more congestion.

PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS PROJECT!

Thanks for reading my letter,

Mercedes Romero

TO: Mayor and City Council, Vancouver

FROM: Niall and Sandra Murphy

DATE: Monday July 8, 2019

RE: DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL - 3600 and 3680 East Hastings Street

We are writing to Mayor and Council about the proposed developments at 3600 and 3680 East Hastings Street in Vancouver. Before we share with you why we feel that these are inappropriately sized for this neighbourhood, let us tell you a little about our neighbourhood.

We live in the pocket bounded by "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" It's a small and space-bound neighbourhood, "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential", and while we stand with our neighbours across "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential", our issues are quite different.

Our own home has a small modest house with a large food and ornamental garden. In the summer, we set up a table tennis table in our front yard and have tournaments with friends and neighbours. We have a dog, and walk daily in the neighbourhood as do many of our neighbours, including young families and elders with roots in China and Vietnam. We're not wealthy and don't have a loud collective voice or media influence. We don't have a neighbourhood association, although some of our residents are good at rallying support when needed. But we're feeling expendable.

We have owned our house since 2006. A short time after moving to this home, we contacted the City of Vancouver with concerns about the east-west-east traffic flow through this neighbourhood every morning and afternoon, and the disregard of motorists for the four-way stop at our corner, and other corners. While a traffic study was done, we were advised that there were 'other worse areas' in the city that needed more immediate attention, and so we waited, asked again and still wait.

In that time, the traffic that floods our neighbourhood has worsened, with each street often choked to a standstill. If there is an accident on the bridge – and this is not uncommon – traffic on Hastings and all of the arterials can be blocked for hours. Parents have been open with the City about their children's safety on the streets in this neighbourhood, yet still we wait for attention.

Within the last two years, we attended a neighbourhood discussion hosted by the City. Maps were spread out on tables, and City staff at each table invited attendees to mingle, talk about the neighbourhood's issues, and to mark on the maps the sites at issue. The maps were liberally dotted with residents' concerns, were taken away and not a further word was ever heard.

Last year, the City closed the Adanac Overpass to vehicle traffic, ostensibly to protect the neighbourhood, but in practice more a protection for the neighbourhood to the west of ours. The closure did not stop motorists from bypassing the arterials streets to find their best route through our small neighbourhood: we understood from a City representative that there was even a popular traffic

app that was leading motorists to weave through our streets. Pressure from residents has caused the City to reopen the Adanac Overpass, but we understand that this is not a final decision on its fate.

Which brings us to the recent June 4 Open House. I'm sad to say that attending the City's events related to proposed new construction generally leaves us feeling like a box has been ticked – with relief – on the City's side, but that none of our words have been absorbed. The City representatives who were onsite at the Open House did not appear to have any familiarity with either our neighbourhood or its issues.

I would first like to stress that we have fully supported all of the new six-storey rental housing that has been proposed and built in the neighbourhood. We're neither anti-building nor anti-renter. We also fully supported the use of the former Ramada Hotel as transitional housing, in direct opposition to some of our less accepting neighbours: yes, we had words.

But here's the thing about the proposals at 3600 and 3680 East Hastings Street:

Notifications: the City delivered a notice to a 2-block radius for this Open House. That showed a lack of understanding on the part of the City as to the impact that more than 212 new households would have in this neighbourhood. If one of our neighbours had not taken on assertively leafletting the larger area, many citizens would have missed the opportunity for feedback.

Developer Feedback: We attended the developer's event earlier this year and gave honest feedback both in writing and in conversation with the developer's representatives, as did many other people in the neighbourhood. We found out from one of the City representatives at the June 4 Open House that the developer provides all of that feedback to the City, along with an independent assessment of impact on the neighbourhood (including potential traffic issues). We cannot understand how this development has reached this point if an open and candid package was indeed delivered in a full and frank format to the City. Perhaps this goes to process, but getting a proposal approved does not seem like a difficult ladder to climb if there is no oversight or verification.

Density: in addition to the 212 new households that are proposed in these two developments, two *other* six-storey developments have just been approved at 3532 E Hastings Street (34 secured market rental units) and 3435 E Hastings Street (45 secured market rental residential units) for an additional 79 units that bring the increased number of households to **291**. That does not include something else that we discovered at the June 4 Open House, that the space between 3600 and 3680 will also be designated for rental housing, bumping up the number of households even further.

We asked each one of the City representatives that we spoke to at the June 4 Open House the reason that **two of the 20 projects included in this pilot** (10% of the projects) were being targeted for **one neighbourhood on one single block**, and no-one could answer that question beyond saying that it 'fit what was allowed under the Moderate Income Household plan'. We were left with the belief that no thought or explanation as to whether it *should* happen had taken place, only that it *could* happen under the regulations, and we were expected to accept that as a reasonable response.

We acknowledge that we live close to a main street and we embrace that. One of us takes transit every day. We believe that rental housing makes sense along arterials and near transit hubs. But the City's criteria for the projects includes '*neighbourhood fit*' and we cannot see that this has not been expressed in any way in either the developer's or the City's Open House presentations.

Traffic and Parking: Increased density at the proposed level will lead to a circus of increased traffic and parking issues. Residents departing from the lane-exit parkades in the morning and returning after work will compound the existing and identified traffic issues which have never been relieved by any action on the part of the City. We don't believe that the City would be able to sidestep resident concerns were there an issue of commercial truck traffic on a side street in Dunbar, but it's a regular occurrence – dozens of times an hour – in this neighbourhood. Our residential streets have no hope to exist as residential streets, and receive no protection from the City.

Together, the two proposed buildings have 98 parking spots, which includes commercial, visitor and disability spaces. Not even half the proposed residences would have a guaranteed parking space, pushing those cars out into the rest of the community every day. We currently have a parking crunch with vehicles that are left through the day and evening by commuters and transit workers, so this is already a constant issue for residents.

Sightlines: We spoke to other residents at the June 4 Open House who were extremely concerned that proposed buildings of this height will allow for inappropriate views into their homes and gardens, and that is valid. Two 14-storey buildings will also effectively blot out much of the sky for many current residents.

The proposed buildings are completely out-of-step with the scale of building in this neighbourhood: there was an attempt in both the developer's and the City's presentations to cite higher level buildings in Burnaby, but that is immaterial: *this is Vancouver*, and there is nothing of that height in this Vancouver neighbourhood. Nothing exceeding 6 storeys in our Vancouver neighbourhood was identified on the maps provided.

Amenities:

One of the City representatives urged our group of attendees to be 'open to this kind of renewal in the neighbourhood, to see what it could bring in terms of energy and amenities', which was honestly insulting. The developments that have been built so far have a sad array of small niche retail stores. This is unfortunately not a walkable neighbourhood: there are no restaurants, no grocery stores and no drug stores within a reasonable distance on foot, so residents are forced to be on the road for any amenities. That is unlikely to change and must be considered.

It is our very sincere hope that the City can prove that Vancouver's citizens have a voice. We fully support the increase in rental stock in our neighbourhood but there needs to be an equitable distribution of new buildings and a respect for the character of existing communities. The City can help to mitigate the impact on this neighbourhood by declining the current proposal for two 14-storey developments, and instead review proposals for six-storey developments. The City can help to alleviate

the existing pressures on this neighbourhood by getting serious about a comprehensive plan for traffic and pedestrian safety. We've been waiting, and we think it's our turn.

We appreciate your attention to our thoughts, and we are happy to provide any additional information that you may require or to speak to Council as necessary. We look forward to the City's informed decision.

All the best,

Sandra Murphy and Niall Murphy

"s. 22(1) Personal and
Confidential"

Choi, Rowena

From: Lisa Pinoni "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2020 3:47 PM
To: Stewart, Kennedy; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael; Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Cc: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Hearing 3680 and 3600 East Hasting Street

City of Vancouver Cybersecurity WARNING: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: City of Vancouver, Mayor Stewart and Council

This letter is **opposed to the building of two 15 floor towers at 3600 East Hastings and 3680 East Hastings.**

1. 3600 Hastings – 94 rental residential with 20% moderate income/41 underground parking +125 bicycle spaces – 15 story building
2. 3680 Hastings-118 rental residential with 20% moderate income/57 underground parking + 125 bicycle spaces – 15 story building

I live on the "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential". My comments are heartfelt, I love my neighbourhood and have lived here for over 17 years. Our neighbourhood has already been impacted with housing that does not accommodate parking, just ask anyone that lives on "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" with the two buildings on the northside of Hastings.

1. My corner has "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential". People blow through these stop signs on a regular basis. Add 200 more people into this area is asking for a disaster. – safety concern!
2. Parking – I live on a corner, I have 3 children, a husband and myself. We have room for parking on the street for our own vehicles, at lunch I go home to take my dog out and sometimes I cannot even find parking in front of my own house. I don't want to be one of those neighbours who will call 311 if a person parks for more than 3 hours in front of my house, but I would like to be able to park in front of my own house.
3. I don't want to be covered in shade from the buildings – the buildings will cover up my sunshine and I will live in darkness.
4. The buildings are too tall for this area, the tallest buildings currently are the container homes, which are 6 floors just after Victoria Drive. Visually, these will stick out like a sore thumb. A better alternative would be to incorporate the proposed **2735 East Hastings characteristics - In comparing 2735 East Hastings – this is 63 market residential rental units/ 61 underground parking + 126 bicycle spaces- 6 story building. – this one is way better – from the height of the building and the number of parking spaces.**
5. My concern is when there is an accident on the Iron Workers Memorial Bridge – when this happens I can wait in my parking space (I park on the road facing Hastings but on Kootenay, and I can sit there for over 10 minutes with my signal on and my hand waving – the people who are cutting through to Hastings are merciless and don't have any courtesy in letting me out of my parking space. Along with this, the Rupert and Not in service

buses go down Kootenay to Adanac and or down Kootenay and turning left onto Pender to get to Boundary Road.

6. **Cars trying to leave either building via vehicles??** – have you ever tried to get out of that alley, especially when there is an accident on the bridge? I wouldn't even try to get out of the east facing alley onto Boundary, it is a safety issue – cars turning right onto Boundary from Hastings which also include buses that cross into the other lane. It seems very probable that many accidents will happen at this site.
7. Your vision – is not a solution for homelessness – if 20% of the suites are for moderate income and the rest are for market rents – realistically two incomes are needed to cover the rent for those who are not eligible for the moderate income rental suites. I am most certain that if two incomes are required to cover the rent that at least one will be working where a vehicle is needed.
8. Seems that the rules can be broken just because they are offering a 20% of moderate income suites, it is very clear that the owners of these buildings are more concern about making a profit, as they are not giving back to the community in good faith. It seems that they are providing a smoke and mirror magic show to get their permits. I can guarantee that no one on the city panel actually live in our neighbourhood and/or are planning to move into these towers once they are built.
9. My proposal is to build 6 floors and to mimic with some alterations of **2735 East Hastings. Reducing to 63 suites, maintaining the 20% moderate income but also include 20% Low income rentals, which will still allow for 60% of market rents.**

Here are some pictures of backed up traffic on Hastings due to an accident on the bridge.





UP YOUR LEATHER


From the farm
(to your box)
to your fork.
www.growyourfood.ca

88 800AM - 11:00AM
八折酬賓


Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Lisa Pinoni, GBA

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

A large rectangular area of the document is redacted with a solid grey fill, obscuring several lines of text.A rectangular area of the document is redacted with a solid grey fill, obscuring a few lines of text.

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

A large rectangular area of the document is redacted with a solid grey fill, obscuring a significant portion of the lower half of the page.

From: Ning Tang "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2020 9:26 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I have to say no to the high rise rental buildings at 3600 and 3680 Hastings st

City of Vancouver Cybersecurity WARNING: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi City of Vancouver,

This is Roy, a resident in "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" area. Since I am out of town, I cannot attend the public hearing tomorrow. Instead, I am writing this email to present my concerns on the high rise rental building proposal at 3600 and 3680 Hastings st.

It's been more than half a year since last open house. During that open house, we raised a bunch of concerns on traffic(including parking lot), safety and public recreation area with the builders. We also suggested the builder to show us more research result on supporting their proposal. However, I haven't heard any update from them, even though I registered my email and phone number in several places. Instead, we received some very biased report about that open house: <https://cityduo.wordpress.com/2019/06/21/borderline-disgusting-middle-class-renters-slandered-and-unwelcome-in-east-vancouver-neighbourhood/>, which really upset me because I feel our voice is weak and the builders are controlling the media to maximize what they need. Since builders have more power and financial support, what if they try to use media to publish more articles about "fake" news, or even create "fake" research report and neighbor feedback to support what they need? I really concern about it and wish government could pay extra attention to avoid above case and get real and sincere voice to be heard.

And now it's the public hearing. As an individual, I know my voice is weak, but I really want it to be heard. As a resident, I really don't want our neighborhood to be ruined by builders that don't consider our concerns.

1. **Security.** There are already a bunch of rental buildings in our neighborhood. Introducing such a big rental plan will definitely introduce more temporary population and increase crime risk. As there is an elementary school very close by, I am really concerning about the security for our kids.

2. **Traffic and parking lots.** The traffic in our area is already very bad, nearly every morning there is traffic jam on Hastings st between Boundary and Hwy 1. Introducing such a big rental plan will make it much worse. Besides that, the building seems not plan enough parking lot. Use 3600 Hastings proposal as an example, it has 94 rental units but only 41 parking lot. As public transit in Hastings Sunrise area is not as good as any places close to skytrain, I would image more people will prefer to drive their own car, or public sharing car. However, those cars will not be affordable in buildings' parking lot, and eventually be parked into neighborhood streets, which will cause more parking issues.

3. **Rental Demand.** Do we really need that big rental buildings in Hasting Sunrise neighborhood? As I know, there are already several rental buildings got built up in our neighborhood, I would suggest government to do a research on the filling rate and rental term length on those rental buildings.

On the other hand, people are always talking about encouraging rental to resolve housing issue for younger generation. I think that is only a temporary solution. As I am at 30s, I spent more than 5 years rental before

eventually bought my property. Even though younger people have to choose rental, they are always looking for buying a property which is more financial friendly. Once the opportunity comes, they will just move to their own place. In contrast, in the proposal(<https://council.vancouver.ca/20191210/documents/rr11.pdf>), it seems try to rent places to families that have \$60,000 or higher yearly income. As analyzed above, I believe those families are always looking for opportunity to buy their own property. As a result, I don't think rental could be a longer term housing solution, and for lower income people, they won't choose those new high rise buildings since the rental fee will be much higher than older building or individual rental price.

Besides that, as saying rental is a temporary solution, it directly means more temporary population and the security concern mentioned by #1.

4. View blocking. We call this neighborhood as "Hastings Sunrise" partially because of the stunning view. So far there is no high rise in our neighborhood. Building 2 high rises will block our southern view and sunshine. It would be much more welcoming if it just builds a low rise, as other new buildings in this area.

5. Lack of recreation community. I don't think this proposal has any plan to improve recreation community in our neighbourhood. Instead, it will destroy some historical recreation places such Oscar Pub.

Above are my concerns based on what I know about those rental buildings so far. In one sentence, I have to say NO to the high rise rental buildings at 3600 and 3680 Hastings st. Thanks a lot for reviewing my email! If you have any question, just let me know.

Thanks,
Roy

--

Feel the wind~