

Public Hearing 2020-Jul-07 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B (OPPOSED)

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/03/2020	13:14	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Oppose	We are residents of s. 22(1) Personal and and familiar with the building site. In our opinion, the building site is not large enough for a six storey building. We urge that Council enforce current regulations in terms of height and site coverage. We do not support a variance for the developers. Yours truly, Carol Herbert snd Fred Swartz s. 22(1) s. 22(1) Personal and I Confidential	Carol P. Herbert		s. 22(1) Personal and fid i l	Fairview	No web attachments.
07/03/2020	15:46	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Oppose	See attached letter.	Charlene Rooke		s. 22(1) Personal and fid i l	Unknown	Appendix A
07/05/2020	11:15	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Oppose	I am an approved speaker, but my work schedule precludes me from phoning in: please accept my written comments. I am writing in opposition to the six-storey development proposed for 1595 2nd Avenue West, current the site of informal community gardens on former rail lands and a commercial parking lot. I believe that construction on this parcel will not only be highly disruptive in the short term to nearby live-work buildings, but in the long term, with other proposed developments, will reckless over-densify the area. I have been a resident of s. 22(1) Personal and I am a renter, currently paying in excess of \$2,200/month for a one-bedroom. I do not own a car and rely exclusively on public transit and walking. Like many of my neighbours, in addition to a "day job" I run a home-based small business (writing and editing). A peaceful setting is crucial to the type of white-collar/office work many of us do: architects, designers, photographers, artists, stylists, a midwife and retirees as well as commercial hair salons, a children's art studio and a restaurant are among my neighbours. We are already subjected to lots of loud, large-truck noise, due to massive cement mixers from nearby Granville Island Concrete rumbling by on 2nd Avenue all day long. As well, the nearby luxury car and motorcycle dealerships are a constant source of loud engine noise. I simply don't understand the addition of yet another residential project to a neighbourhood facing multi-year development of the proposed 6,000-unit Senakw project of the Squamish nation (for which the access road is a block away, where Fir Street meets 1st Avenue West). Heavy construction traffic will already plague this area for years to come, with few of the amenities and infrastructure upgrades required to support thousands of new residents. The tightly bounded, oddly shaped lot has no adjacent space for equipment or crews, so the construction of this project would severely impact public, pedestrian and business traffic on the narrow nearby streets, likely causing many residents and businesses to relocate. I cannot picture how a 6-storey building will be crammed onto this small triangle of land, which is steeply pitched down to the former railway tracks on its north side. As a former condo owner on the west side of Toronto, I have lived this before. I watched my loft on a quiet west-side street become nearly uninhabitable when the massive Liberty Village development overbuilt the area. Overnight, transit became oversubscribed and impossible to access. Grocery store shelves could barely stay restocked. Excessive noise was constant. This will be the future of southwest False Creek after this project, Senakw and others come onstream en masse. Why overburden a single live-work neighbourhood with so much development at once?	Charlene Rooke		s. 22(1) Personal and fid i l	Fairview	No web attachments.
07/05/2020	16:57	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Oppose	seems short sighted to forever write off a mini line along there	David Leith		s. 22(1) Personal	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/06/2020	08:47	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Oppose	I am opposed to the Amendments to the False Creek Area Development Plan for Area 10B and any re-zoning that would eliminate pieces of the Arbutus railway corridor as a potential transit corridor from my community.	Rebecca Temmer	resident	s. 22(1) Personal and fid i l	Kitsilano	No web attachments.

Public Hearing 2020-Jul-07 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B (OPPOSED)

07/06/2020	11:50	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Oppose	Hello, I want to oppose the height of this building which will severely damage the city views of thousands of residents. This building should not be allowed to be six stories tall. All the other buildings in the "brewery" area have been zoned to five stories. Now a six story building will destroy the views and sight lines for thousands of residents living in and around this location. The building will be like a wall blocking off all visibility to Granville Island and False Creek. If this building cannot conform to the 5 story height zone of the area, then it should not be built. Thank you, Gene and Eleanor Derreth. <div>s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential</div>	gene derreth		<div>s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential</div>	Fairview	No web attachments.
07/06/2020	13:31	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Oppose	Building on this parcel would erase a vital railway connection, and would preclude an eventual extension of rail public transit to the Squamish Nation development at Senakw. There is no urgent reason for the rezoning. The parcel should be retained, and designated for Transportation use. If necessary, the City of Vancouver should simply purchase Parcel "F" as is, and keep for future use.	Mr David Gibson		<div>s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential</div>	Kitsilano	No web attachments.

July 7 Public Hearing, 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B

Hello,

I am an approved speaker at this hearing, but my work schedule precludes me from phoning in. Please accept my written comments to the Mayor and Council.

I am writing in opposition to the six-storey development proposed for 1595 2nd Avenue West, current the site of community gardens and a commercial parking lot. I believe that construction on this parcel will not only be highly disruptive to the live-work buildings nearby, but in combination with other proposed developments will add too much density to the area without the infrastructure or amenities to support it.

I have been a resident s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

I am a renter, currently paying in excess of \$2,200/month for a one-bedroom. I do not own a car and rely exclusively on public transit and walking.

Like many building and neighbourhood residents, in addition to a "day job" I run a small business from home. In my case, it is a writing and editing business and consultancy. As you can imagine, a peaceful and quiet neighbourhood is most conducive to the kind of white-collar/office work many of us do. In this building there are architects, designers, photographers, artists, stylists, accountants, a midwife and retirees as well as commercial hair salons, a children's art studio and a restaurant.

The residents of this neighbourhood are already subjected to too much loud, large-truck noise, due to massive cement mixers from nearby Granville Island Concrete rumbling by on 2nd Avenue all day long. As well, the many luxury car dealerships that have recently found homes in this neighbourhood are a constant source of loud engine noise. In addition, the proposed 6,000-unit Senakw development nearby -- for which the only discernible existing site access road is a block away, where Fir Street meets 1st Avenue West -- raises further concerns, as heavy construction traffic could plague this area for years to come. I simply don't know how this immediate area can support more construction and residents.

Because of the oddly-shaped lot at 1595 2nd Avenue West, and no adjacent space for equipment or crews to locate, the construction of this project would severely and negatively impact public transit, pedestrian traffic and business on this and nearby streets. The noise and interruption of construction will not be conducive to my work during business hours, causing me and many others to relocate from the neighbourhood.

As a former condo owner on the west side of Toronto, I watched my loft on a quiet west-side street become nearly uninhabitable when the massive Liberty Village development overbuilt the area. Transit became oversubscribed and impossible to access. Grocery store shelves could barely stay restocked. Noise complaints became much more common. This will be the future of southwest False Creek after this project, Senakw and others come onstream en masse. Thank you.

Public Hearing 2020-Jul-07 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B (OTHER)

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/05/2020	14:26	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Other	Unable to find the correct page to go to for online listen/watch for the July 7 at 6pm re Amendments to the False Creek Area Development Plan for Area 10B (1595 West 2nd Ave)	KARANNE LAMBTON	personal	s. 22(1) Personal d fid i l	Fairview	Appendix B

June 23, 2020

APPENDIX B

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Amendments to the False Creek Area Development Plan for Area 10B (1595 West 2nd Avenue)

Vancouver City Council will hold a Public Hearing on:

**Tuesday, July 7, 2020 at 6:00 pm
to be convened by electronic means**



ILLUSTRATIVE

Council will consider amendments to the False Creek Area Development Plan for Area 10B (Area Development Plan). If approved, this will create a new Development Area for the site located at 1595 West 2nd Avenue. The amendments would allow for the future development of a six-storey affordable rental residential building with commercial uses on the ground floor.

PUBLIC HEARING

This Public Hearing is to be convened by electronic means as authorized by Ministerial Order No. M192, "Local Government Meetings and Bylaw Process (COVID-19) Order No. 3"

Members of the public may attend at City Hall to hear and watch the meeting proceedings but are strongly urged to listen and watch the proceedings via the City's website or follow Twitter @VanCityClerk. Due to COVID-19, it is recommended that speakers participate by telephone or provide written submissions; however, space will be made available at City Hall to accommodate those who are unable to participate by telephone. Protective masks are recommended.

DRAFT BY-LAWS & MINUTES

Copies of the draft by-laws will be available for viewing at all times starting June 26 at 1pm at vancouver.ca/councilmeetings.

Minutes of the Public Hearing will also be available at this location approximately two business days after a meeting.

Public Hearing 2020-Jul-07 - 3. AMENDMENTS to the False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B (SUPPORT)									
Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/03/2020	10:25	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to he False	Support	see attached file	Chris Shelton	self	s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	Appendix C
07/05/2020	10:32	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to he False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Support	See attachment.	Chris Whyte	RePlan Authorized Working Group	s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Fairview	Appendix D
07/05/2020	18:37	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to he False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Support	This would be a great building in what is now an underused lot.	Chris Higgins		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Grandview-Woodland	No web attachments.
07/06/2020	06:37	PH1 - 3. AMENDMENTS to he False Creek Area Plan for Area 10B	Support	Looks like a good project. Hopefully there will be a lot of bike parking, considering how close it is to Granville Island and the seawall. I only heard about this project because I saw a post claiming this will cut off the Senakw project from a future streetcar network, but I haven't heard any such concerns from Khelsilem, the Squamish Nation, or anyone else involved in Senakw. Hopefully the concern-trolling N MBY's won't block more housing from being built in Vancouver.	Ryan Sinowski		s. 22(1)	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.

Dear Mayor and Council:

Please consider these comments and questions in your deliberations and discussions regarding selling to the CPR three lots listed in the Arbutus Corridor Official Development Plan.

On page 2 of the Report to Council the comment should be that the first nation people were 'evicted' with 48 hours notice, not 'displaced' from their village.

On page 3 of the Report 'the site was formerly used by CPR as part of their serving the Molson Brewery', not true. It was owned by CPR and leased to BC Electric Railway which became BC Hydro Rail in 1961.

On page 3 of the Report 'a 9 km section of railway track' is incorrect it was 9 km of rail right of way (RoW) as the track was removed in accordance with the Net Salvage Value as per the Canadian Transportation Act.

Again on page 3 the Arbutus Corridor Official Development Plan was from the CPR trestle bridge beneath Burrard Street Bridge to the Swing span bridge over the North Arm of the Fraser River. The purchase was from 1st Ave to Merton Street.

On page 4 The 'Arbutus Greenway' was formerly know as the 'Arbutus Corridor'.

Please note that before the City's 1995 Greenway Plan there was the False Creek South Rail Line Study (November 1991) which included the three lots, as well as the City of Vancouver Transportation Plan (May 1997), as well as the Downtown Transportation Plan (July 2002), as well as the Downtown Streetcar Benchmarking Report (December 2004), as well as the PPP Review of Vancouver Streetcar Project (May 2002), and the Downtown Streetcar Preliminary Design Report also referred to these three lots. When will Council get the total information of all studies that include these three lots to be used in an at grade LRT project?

Please note that the Arbutus Corridor Official Development Plan Bylaw states:

This plan designates all of the land in the Arbutus Corridor for use only as a public thoroughfare for the purposes only of:

- (a) transportation, including without limitation:
 - (i) rail;
 - (ii) transit; and
 - (iii) cyclist paths....

I would suggest that the numerical placement shows the priority of the Council Bylaw which is ignored by the sale of these lots. Could you please explain how and why the limitation "future streetcar/light rail line", page 4 of the Report to Council, was included into the plan, design and ignore light rail for these three lots as well as the False Creek South Rail Line and the whole of the Arbutus Corridor/Greenway? Please note that the first mention of this limitation can be found in the Engineering prepared Transportation 2040 Report page 60, which was prepared after the Bylaw was approved.

The term 'engineering and safety constraints' was not in the Bylaw, but is found in the Agreement of Purchase and Sale, however there is no definition for either word. Can your staff please explain to Council and the public if the Engineering Department Referenced the articles produced by the National Academy Press on the safety of LRT, such as 'Improving Pedestrian and Motorist Safety along Light Rail Alignments' (nap.edu/14327) or their 'Guidebook on

Pedestrian Crossing of Public Transit Rail Services (2015)' (nap.edu/22183). Both report are free and reject the safety issues of the Engineering Department's explanation of the word.

Given that the rail RoW is about 1 chain or 66 feet or 20.1 meters wide and the Engineers want to engineer the placement of LRT, automobiles, delivery trucks, bicyclists and pedestrians into the Fir Street RoW which is 1 chain, 66 feet or 20.1 meters wide, can Council explain if this is good engineering? Meanwhile all the municipal utilities, such as the combined sewer and rain runoff are beneath Fir Street, 6th Avenue and Arbutus Street. Is this not another infrastructure project? It should be noted that the rail RoW has no utilities running under it, although some cross it in the shortest distance. Is this baste and switch process good and ethical management of a City?

I note that the City of Vancouver Streetcar Feasibility Study (November 15, 2019) is not mentioned in this report to Council. Can you explain why this obstruction is happening? Please ask your staff to explain to Council how the LRT line from Science World to Arbutus and Broadway is the \$0.50 Billion alternative, while the Broadway Subway Project at \$3.00 Billion. Is this economical? While you are at try to explain how the Broadway Subway, which has no cars because Bombardier Transportation, which is the sole provider of trains to Translink of the LIM technology, does not exist any more.

There is a recent academic paper published by Environmental Research Letters in 2019 and written by Lubanjo Olugbera, et al, "Embodied Emissions in Rail Infrastructure: A Critical Literature Review;" all are Professors of Engineering at the University of Toronto. Its conclusion states:

The statistical model finds that overall 941 ± 168 tCO₂e are embodied per kilometre of rail at-grade, while tunneling has 27 ± 5 times more embodied GHG per kilometre than at-grade construction.

In plain English, not engineer speak, building the Broadway Subway will increase the GHGs by 2,200% to 3,200% over the at grade alternative: the result of the significant use of cement to reinforce the tunnel walls and stations. How can any project like the Broadway Subway, that creates so much extra GHGs, then be considered as respecting Canada's international obligations under the Paris Accord on the Environment and 'Canada's 2030 emissions targets and forecasts?' I note that the OECD's International Transportation Forum uses this study to document their Decarbonizing of Urban Mobility project.

Historically, these three lots were the RoW to the lot immediately to the north which was the depot for the inter urban line to Steveston and New Westminster along the north shore of the North Arm of the Fraser River. Due to the colonial mind set of the day it was taken from the Coast Salish Nation's Kitsilano No. 6 Reserve, there was one lot to the CPR, one lot to the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway which was owned by the CPR and one lot was taken out by the City of Vancouver to build the Burrard Street Bridge which connected the CPR's downtown District Lot 541 with their uptown District lot 526 that was given to the CPR by the Province of BC; about 7,000 acres. I do not know if the City paid anything for this lot, could Council please report if there was any exchange of money for the lot? I can not imagine why anybody would like to give these three lots that are worth millions back to the CPR for \$1.00.

Public Hearing Submission – July 7 2020

Regarding: A By-law to amend False Creek Area Development Plan for Area 10B
By-law No. 5478

Speaker: Christopher Whyte. s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

I am speaking in favour of the amendment.

I speak on behalf of the Authorized Co-op Working Group, a sub-committee of False Creek South housing co-operatives within the False Creek South Neighbourhood Association's RePlan initiative. The co-ops are Alder Bay, Creekview, False Creek, Heritage, Twin Rainbows, Marina and the Greater Vancouver Floating Home Co-operative.

I am a current resident of s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential and a former resident of s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential. Together with my family we have lived safely and securely in both s. 22(1) Confidential for forty years.

The city's planning principles invited development that is specifically attune to the Contextual, Land Utilization, Community-building and Housing Options that support future change in the area. ("*Why Are We Here?*" City planning document). As the Amendment specifically includes housing co-operatives as potential partners, we welcome this opportunity to discuss why a housing co-operative is an ideal development partner on Site F. The question is what would be the advantage for the City to have a housing co-operative as a development partner at this site? A second question is how would a housing co-operative best meet both the goals envisioned by the City's planning principles for False Creek and the broader needs of the City? I would like to address how a housing co-operative can achieve the outcomes described in the vision statement and planning principles developed for False Creek South as reported to Council in 2018 (RR-2 Policy Report May 1, 2018).

The city's ten provisional guiding planning principles developed in 2018 recognize both the unique character and history of False Creek South but also the need to develop Site F in the context of complex, incremental change occurring in the neighbourhood and beyond.

First, consider the Context of Site F's location. Site F sits at a nodal intersection between the Burrard Slope commercial downtown-support area, the future Senakw development, and the False Creek residential area. It sits in a transportation corridor serving the nearby seawall, Granville Island, the Arbutus Greenway, and corridors to the Burrard St. bridge, Granville bridge, Kitsilano, Fairview Slopes and South Granville neighbourhoods. False Creek already celebrates over forty years' of successful, safe, affordable housing in co-operatives. Marina housing co-operative, where I moved to in 1980, is next door. Although not in the FCS planning area, Harbour Cove Housing Co-operative in the Pennyfarthing development is just a block away. Creekview Co-operative is a short walk east, at the entrance to Granville Island. A new co-operative at Site F will benefit from joining a family of successful housing partners with deep experience providing stable, supportive housing in False Creek. This includes our collective membership in the BC Co-operative Housing Federation, and our long-term partnership with the City to plan, build and promote False Creek as a historical inner-city neighbourhood in Vancouver.

Next, consider Utilizing the Vacant Land – both honouring the False Creek development plan and addressing housing affordability. In 2017 the City General Manager of Planning commented “...the False Creek South Neighbourhood Association and its sub-committee RePlan has been instrumental in advancing these efforts.” (RR-1 Administrative Report May 16, 2017) He goes on and I quote “[RePlan] is a unique stakeholder in the City’s make-up. It has representatives from all of the strata and co-operative housing enclaves on the land leased from the City, as well as those on freehold properties, and buildings operated by non-profit housing societies.” The RePlan group is actively engaged in an ‘Intergenerational Hub’ planning process on the west edge of False Creek South and is supporting member co-operatives to plan and finance re-development opportunities with all levels of government and other stakeholders.

Increasing Housing Options is the most important reason the city should partner with a housing co-operative to develop site F. A housing co-operative offers unique but enduring investment through a values-based commitment to affordability, diversity, equity, security and connection. Using a Social Return on Investment approach, a co-operative can demonstrate measurable outcomes that benefit residents, housing providers and the local economy. It can offer a combination of diverse unit types, 100% affordability, and long-term tenure and fiscal responsibility. It will address right housing needs for existing and future Vancouver employees and their families, and it will address growing seniors housing pressures in False Creek and its adjoining neighbourhoods. It will offer sound financial management and responsible self-governance that has a proven track record with tenants, landlords (the City) and both public and private stakeholders.

Finally, a housing co-operative will Integrate into the Community (including the famous Waterfall building) by drawing on a wealth of growing knowledge and expertise within the False Creek community dedicated to a revisioning process in design and livability. Site F is especially important as a ‘community edge’ site, adjoining both neighbouring industrial supports for downtown, other area residences, and the soon to be created Senakw development. It’s location adjacent to a multi-use transportation corridor also means the site will provide a community-defining entranceway. Several other housing co-operatives already provide such significance in False Creek South, such as Creekview at the entrance to Granville Island, and False Creek and GV Floating Homes co-operatives adjacent to parkland and seashore, respectively.

The Official Development Plan Guiding Planning Principles created for False Creek South have greater resonance today than when they were drafted several years ago. These principles: providing social connections through design, increasing housing affordability and access, honouring uniqueness of character, ensuring connectivity and accessibility, ensuring diverse integrated transportation, enhancing activity, water’s edge engagement, city-wide stakeholder engagement, and fiscal responsibility are essential guideposts as we gradually renew this vital part of Vancouver. A housing co-operative can do this responsibly, ethically and healthily. We are prepared to deepen our relationships with the City and other stakeholders to promote the long-term viability of False Creek South as a unique and inter-connected community in the heart of Vancouver.