

Kennett, Bonnie

From: Erica Clark [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 1:36 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Public Hearing Notification - 1980 Foley 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.

Hi Folks,

I am writing in my concerns on the above proposal for 1980 Foley Street to increase the height limit on the building they are intending to construct.

Unfortunately I cannot attend the town hall January 23rd, **please consider this email my objection to the proposal and vote against increasing the height limitation on the new building.**

We are home owners in the area and increasing the height restriction will obstruct our little view we have of the north shore mountains. We paid far too much for our condo and the views made it worth it! Please don't take away our slice of view with a building.

My vote is to NOT allow adjustments to the height restriction.

I have also submitted email and forms in previous communications and stages of the proposal, also requesting not to adjust the height limitation

Sincerely,
Erica Clark

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Planning Info** <planninginfo@vancouver.ca>
Date: Fri, 17 Jan 2020 at 13:52
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Re: Public Hearing Notification - 1980 Foley Street
To: Erica Clark [REDACTED]
Cc: Vissers, Leifka <Leifka.Vissers@vancouver.ca>

Hi Erica,

Thanks for the email. The feedback you had previously sent before the project was referred to Council would be taken into consideration and summarized amongst all the feedback provided. If you submit again after referral, the comments will be distributed to Mayor and Council.

Hope this clarifies things for you.

Marcel

Rezoning Centre

From: Erica Clark [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 17, 2020 10:50 AM
To: Planning Info
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Public Hearing Notification - 1980 Foley Street

Hi Lex,

I previously sent an email to Leifka and filled out this [feedback form](#).

Will that form and concerns get brought to the meeting or, do I need to submit yet again? If they are already getting brought to the meeting I'd like to save time and not write-in again .

Thanks!

Erica

On Mon, 13 Jan 2020 at 12:01, Planning Info <planninginfo@vancouver.ca> wrote:

Hi Erica,

Thank you for your email. You can submit your comments by email to publichearing@vancouver.ca. Emailed comments will be circulated to Mayor and Council and posted on the City's website.

Let us know if you require any further information.

Warm regards,

Kennett, Bonnie

From: Cherry, Ruth (AADNC/AANDC) [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 22, 2020 12:22 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Massive Lululemon HQ rezoning at Public Hearing January 23rd, no CAC proposed

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.

Dear Mayor and Council;

It has come to my attention that there is a rezoning proposal for a 215 foot office tower at Great Northern Way and 1980 Foley. It is appalling that there is a proposal even being considered that is increasing the maximum building height from 120 feet to 215 feet (or 36.6m to 65.5m.

Also, there is no Community Amenity Contribution or CAC in this rezoning which is insulting to the community that will potentially have to deal with this monstrosity.

This rezoning potentially will affect the land value in the neighbourhood much more expensive, as has already occurred where such developments (not quite this massive) have been allowed.

Please veto this development.

Sincerely,

Ruth Cherry

Kennett, Bonnie

From: N H [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 22, 2020 2:30 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 1980 Foley Street - letter of opposition

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.

I am writing to express opposition to the proposed increase in height restrictions at 1980 Foley Street. I've read the supporting documents and I understand that much has been done to consider the development's impact on the surrounding area. I believe, however, that there are factors that have been overlooked.

The overall mass of this proposed building will increase the feeling of being "hemmed in" for many residents. Living in a dense neighborhood such as ours is stressful. The close proximity of neighbours and busy vehicle corridors contribute to a constant encroachment on private space.

Having access to open vistas - from the vantage point of China Creek Park, an upper storey apartment, or while travelling through the neighborhood - provides relief.

The experience of park users, for example, seeking open, unstructured green space and sky will surely be less positive with such a great, looming building mass rising above the north western corner of their green space.

I'm greatly concerned, too, about interior lighting being visible from the outside at 1980 Foley Street. I sorely regret not being involved in the public consultation prior to development of the Samsung office building further west. I experience that building as visually exhausting and ugly. It is worst when the office lights are on (and they often are, all night). I hope council will consider the impact of interior lighting on people outside of the proposed Lululemon development.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my thoughts on this development.

Regards,
Nana Hashimoto

Kennett, Bonnie

From: Rob Grant [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 23, 2020 8:27 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Hearing January 23rd- Agenda Item #6, 1980 Foley (Lululemon Building)
Attachments: Lululemon Building.pdf

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,

In regards to the proposed Lululemon Building, I am submitting arguments for a significant modification to the proposal in the attached pdf file. Unfortunately I will not be able to attend the public hearing but if you have any questions you can contact me at the coordinates below.

Regards,

Rob Grant MAIBC (retired)

[REDACTED]

Rezoning Application – Agenda Item #6 - Public Hearing - Thursday January 23rd
1980 Foley Street – Lululemon Building

Recommendation: Approval Subject to Conditions

Foster and Associates, one of the world's most respected architectural firms who have devoted themselves to zero CO2 emissions in the operations of their buildings, has recently changed directions. In a recently released manifesto, they acknowledge the emerging awareness of the impact of embodied carbon in the construction of buildings.

It is estimated by some that 20%-60% of the average building's carbon emissions are embodied as opposed to operational. It is also estimated that 2 trillion square feet of construction will have taken place between now and 2050 or the equivalent of a New York City is being built every 35 days, and that the impact on global temperature rise will be immediate.

One of the biggest culprits in embodied carbon emissions is Portland cement, an essential ingredient in concrete the most widely used building material in the world. Another is aluminum. Both of these materials are present in abundance in this proposal.

In the thirteen storeys above ground it is now possible to build the structure in timber with various wall systems such as hempcrete where CO2 is actually sequestered from the atmosphere.

As for the five storeys below grade, not only will they have to be built of concrete, many months of CO2 intensive excavation and trucking to off-site locations will be required. The operational carbon needed to ventilate and light this structure 24/7 for the life of the building is another factor.

Our society is banking on the replacement of gas-powered cars with electric vehicles and depending on the source of electricity, there may be savings in CO2 emissions. What is often missed is the embodied CO2 in the production of automobiles, which is particularly acute in electric vehicles with their dependence on the mining of rare metals. The "green" car is still an oxymoron.

This proposal is on Great Northern Way, an important bike route, a short walk to an existing transit station and a shorter walk to a planned transit station.

A survey recently conducted on behalf of GWL Reality Advisors, among almost 600 office workers in their buildings, revealed that a mere 8 per cent of Vancouver's under-35 population favoured personal cars for getting to work, and that almost 60 per cent of under-45s relied on public transit. Is this not the demographic of those who will actually be working here? Why is it then that, incredibly, 840 parking spaces are part of this application?

UCLA planning professor Donald Shoup in "Parking and the City" a book that should be read by City staff, has eloquently exposed the pseudo-science behind the parking bylaws of North American cities, the extraordinary environmental degradation associated with parking, loss of urban vitality and the impact that parking has on housing affordability especially for the poorest who don't own cars. He has also argued that just as a transit station is an integral part of that transportation mode, every parking space is an integral part of the infrastructure for the private automobile.

The aspirational document Transportation 2040 puts the private automobile at the bottom of a hierarchy of preferred transportation modes after walking, cycling, transit and taxi/car share. The reality is that our parking bylaws put the lie to this document and that the baby steps touted by the City to reduce parking minimums do not recognize this reality or the urgency to shift to a new paradigm.

Given that the proposal is advanced in the approval process and the issues being raised come late in the process, I recommend approval of this project subject to the following conditions:

1. Design development to use timber construction for the above grade 13-storey portion of the building. (Note to applicant: As a global name brand, the use of a relatively new but tested structural system that has a lower embodied carbon footprint will cast a positive light your products which would appeal to your marketing demographic.)
2. Design development to reduce windows to 50% of the exterior wall surface. Consider materials such as "hempcrete" which can provide a well-insulated breathable wall system, while at the same time sequestering CO2 from the atmosphere.
3. Design development to remove all but one storey of below grade parking, and that no below grade storey project past the perimeter of the main floor directly above. (Note to applicant: In addition to the considerable environmental savings in the form of embodied energy and operation of the parking, savings in construction costs will accrue, including a significantly shorter construction period.)

Rob Grant MAIBC (retired)

2020/01/22

References:

Embodied Carbon

<https://www.buildinggreen.com/feature/urgency-embodied-carbon-and-what-you-can-do-about-it>

<https://www.fosterandpartners.com/media/2639219/sustainability-manifesto-2019.pdf>

<https://thewalrus.ca/the-false-promise-of-green-housing/>

Parking

https://www.amazon.ca/s?k=parking+and+the+city&gclid=EAiaIQobChMIwviByNuX5wIVAtlkCh39mQdVEAAYASAAEgIpPfd_BwE&hvadid=267371757019&hvdev=c&hvlocphy=9001551&hvnetw=g&hvmmt=e&hvrnd=7870085926036037858&hvtargid=kwd-444974265577&hydadcr=2810_10285876&tag=googcana-20&ref=pd_sl_9z4cv86z6_e

<https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2018/05/parking-is-sexy-now-thank-donald-shoup/560876/>

<https://www.citylab.com/perspective/2019/09/parking-lot-urban-planning-transit-street-traffic-congestion/598504/>

Hempcrete:

https://www.architectmagazine.com/technology/dazed-and-constructed-how-hemp-could-alter-material-selections-in-architecture_o

<https://greenbuildingcanada.ca/2017/advantages-building-hempcrete/>

Kennett, Bonnie

From: Granville Airton [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 23, 2020 11:35 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Lululemon's new building on Foley 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.

Dear City of Vancouver:

Our apartment is in [REDACTED] It is one of three very small bachelor suites in the building and so was not assigned off street parking when the building was strata titled many years ago. As a result, we have to park on the street. During the day it is often virtually impossible to find a parking spot anywhere near our apartment because there are already scores of cars parked on our street by employees and/or students from the buildings already on the north side of Great Northern Way (Emily Carr, MEC etc). We know that is the case because we often see the drivers park their cars and then head downhill towards their buildings on or adjacent to Great Northern Way (or else they are going to the Skytrain station to avoid having to park downtown).

We have no problem with Lululemon putting up a new building on Foley St. on the strict condition that they will be required to provide free parking to anyone working or spending time in the building with very stiff penalties (along with towing of the offending vehicles) for anyone lending or selling their free parking sticker to someone else. If the parking is not free they will not park there and our street parking problem will get worse to an insufferable level.

We suggest that a partial solution to the problem would be for the City to install "2 hour parking for non-residents" signs on the streets in our area. Our building (and several adjacent ones) has/have a lot of rental units and many of the occupants do not have cars. As a result, it would be impossible to get enough signatures to compel the City to install "residents only permit" signage on the streets in our area.

Therefore, our vote is yes to Lululemon's building on the condition that the above noted free parking is provided (or the 2 hour parking signs for non-residents are installed) and no if these provisions are not met.

Yours truly,

Granville and Gloria Airton

Granville Airton
[REDACTED]

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101013704613

Case created: 2020-01-22, 02:53:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

0. **Advise caller: Your name and comments will be made available publically as part of the official record for the hearing. Contact information will not be made public.**

True

1. **Subject (address if applicable):***

1980 Foley St.

2. **Position:***

Oppose

3. **Comments:***

Mayor and Council

I oppose this rezoning application.

Mt. Pleasant has had an overkill of building in just the last few years and it seems the developers want more height with every new development. The application for this site is far too much in height even at the original 120 ft. My concern is that we are losing another view of the mountains and this building sets a precedent for taller buildings along Great Northern Way. The Mt. Pleasant Community Plan allows up to 6 stories except for 3 sites but the city has constantly allowed for more height with every new application. I was extremely dismayed when the view cone on

Main St. was destroyed and it continues as developers keep building over the allowed height. I hope you will take consideration of how important the mountain views are and turn down this application.

4. **Attachments**

0

5. **Full name:***

Leona Rothney

6. **Organization you represent:**

RAMP

7. **Which neighbourhood do you live in?**

Mount Pleasant

8. **Email:***

[REDACTED]

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: LEONA ROTHNEY

Address: [REDACTED]

Address2:

Phone:
Alt. Phone:

Email: [REDACTED]
Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101013708032

Case created: 2020-01-23, 12:50:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location


Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

0. **Advise caller: Your name and comments will be made available publically as part of the official record for the hearing. Contact information will not be made public.**
True
1. **Subject (address if applicable):***
1980 Foley Street
2. **Position:***
Oppose
3. **Comments:***
Hi,
I am unable to attend the public hearing.
I am opposed to this increase of the maximum allowable height.
Please respect the neighbourhood and park by rejecting this proposal which would not fit at this location.
Thanks
4. **Attachments**
0
5. **Full name:***
Rob Groombridge
6. **Organization you represent:**
7. **Which neighbourhood do you live in?**
Mount Pleasant
8. **Email:***


Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Rob Groombridge

Address:

Address2:

Phone:

Alt. Phone:

Email: 

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -