

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221677

Case created: 2022-07-25, 08:25:00 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):***
June 28th Public Hearing Item 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue
2. **Position:***
Oppose
3. **Comments:***
I oppose this development. The city should do better. This housing should be for families/single-parent households in need, not single men. It jeopardizes and doesn't leverage the existing neighbourhood - the nearby women's centre, school and toddler park, among others.
4. **Full name:***
Sonia RM
5. **Organization you represent:**
None
6. **Which neighbourhood do you live in?**
7. **Email:***
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
99. **Attachments**
0

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Sonia RM

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Alt. Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221778

Case created: 2022-07-25, 09:43:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

- 1. Subject (address if applicable):**
CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue
- 2. Position:**
Oppose
- 3. Comments:**
Please please don't rezone this area and build social housing. I work near Chinatown and constantly feel unsafe. I moved to Kitsilano because it was a safe and clean neighbourhood. Building this housing will not make a dent in homelessness. It will make the area less safe for the people who work hard and pay insanely high taxes. Homeless people come from across Canada for our mild weather, and access to free/cheap clean drugs. House them and more will come to replace them. It's not fair to hurt the people who have worked hard and followed the laws in order to house people openly doing drugs and leeching disability. The people of Vancouver are tired of having their tax dollars spent on keeping this population comfortable.
- 4. Neighbourhood:**
Kitsilano
- 5. Full name:**
A
- 7. Email:**
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
- 8. Subject classification:**
PH4 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: T

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221794

Case created: 2022-07-25, 10:00:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

- 1. Subject (address if applicable):**
Arbutus and Seventh Avenue Supportive Housing Proposal
- 2. Position:**
Oppose
- 3. Comments:**
See attached PDF; 432 words.
- 4. Neighbourhood:**
Kitsilano
- 5. Full name:**
Benson Westerterp
- 7. Email:**
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
- 8. Subject classification:**
PH4 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Benson Westerterp

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Any web links (URLs) in this case have been altered so that they cannot be opened, as a security measure to protect against malicious links. If you believe a link to be safe please replace the "hxxp" at the beginning with "http" and open in a browser window. If you're unsure if the link is safe to open and you need to open it, please contact the Service Desk.

Dear Council,

I am 28 years old and have lived with my partner in Kitsilano for the past 6 years. We pay a substantial amount of rent to be able to live in one of country's most desired neighbourhoods. I am originally from Ontario, my partner from Vancouver, and this area is paradise. We dedicate the vast majority of our income to live in as renters and are even willing to forego the opportunity of becoming homeowners altogether just to stick around.

I believe that the proposed Development comes from a sincere place and has the interests of our most vulnerable at heart. I began my career volunteering time in the Downtown Eastside to provide free legal services. I have an uncle turning 70 with no pension, on disability with a mental health illness, and homeless. When I think about this development I think of my uncle as well as my cousin (who is the same age as me and may never mentally recover from his past drug addiction and may be destined to a future of the same). This development would be an amazing opportunity for either of them.

However, as a resident who has worked hard to climb out of a precarious upbringing and who sacrifices his entire salary to live here, I feel uneasy. I am concerned that the proposed Development is likely to attract characters (whether tenants or associates of tenants) that are one binge or episode away from seriously harming someone (physically, emotionally or sexually). I've had to de-escalate many of these scenarios as a teen and moved to Kits to escape it.

Kits is a terrific place for working families and to raise children. Why can't the Development focus on struggling lower and middle income families looking to give their children a great life by the beach, surrounded by opportunities to get involved in the numerous public sailing, tennis, volleyball, rowing, swimming etc. clubs that are desperate for a new generation to carry the Kits culture and energy? What an amazing opportunity this would be for those children! There is no shortage of these families struggling to find spaces like this that are closer to jobs downtown, and they offer so much to the community. The area has the institutions to accommodate this – at least more so than other neighbourhoods in Vancouver developing at much faster rates.

I want to help others as well, but I think this development is not focusing on those that could utilize this space the most. Please prioritize those families that offer the community so much.

Thank you for your time.

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221799

Case created: 2022-07-25, 10:12:00 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):***
Arbutus housing
2. **Position:***
Oppose
3. **Comments:***
After listening to the compelling educated speeches given by judge goves and dr sommers, I am writing in to spread my opposition. Please listen to these EXPERTS and listen to them, they are telling you this will fail as is.
Thank you
4. **Full name:***
Carolina Charles
5. **Organization you represent:**
6. **Which neighbourhood do you live in?**
Mount Pleasant
7. **Email:***
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
99. **Attachments**
0

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Carolina Charles

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Alt. Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221801

Case created: 2022-07-25, 10:18:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

- 1. Subject (address if applicable):**
Low barrier Arbutus housing
- 2. Position:**
Oppose
- 3. Comments:**
Volunteer architect was able to provide a more attractive better fitting building with more space that would not require rezoning. Why couldn't bc housing come up with this? Is it because Gregor Robertson owns the modular construction company? Because this makes no sense that volunteers are able to come up with better options.
- 4. Neighbourhood:**
Kitsilano
- 5. Full name:**
Logan grenella
- 7. Email:**
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
- 8. Subject classification:**
PH4 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Logan grenella

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Any web links (URLs) in this case have been altered so that they cannot be opened, as a security measure to protect against malicious links. If you believe a link to be safe please replace the "hxxp" at the beginning with "http" and open in a browser window. If you're unsure if the link is safe to open and you need to open it, please contact the Service Desk.

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221806

Case created: 2022-07-25, 10:29:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

1. Subject (address if applicable):

Proposed Rezoning of 2086 and 2098 W.7th Avenue and 2091 W.8th Avenue

2. Position:

Oppose

3. Comments:

My name is Lauren Yaptinchay . I am a Vancouver resident and have been for the past 22 years. I am strongly opposed to this rezoning application.I have concerns about the density of this building. I understand the drastic need for affordable and supportive housing in Vancouver but feel that this location across the street from an elementary school, preschool, toddler playground and a women?s shelter is not an appropriate choice.

I live in Olympic Village, basically sandwiched between Marguerite Ford and Hummingbird Place and I have seen the impact that these developments have had on our neighborhood. The number of emergency vehicles in our neighborhood on a daily basis is staggering. I am concerned what impact this would have on traffic along Arbutus Street as it is already such a busy corridor. With single lane traffic in both directions and no proper driveway, traffic would come to a halt in the case of an emergency and access to the building would be difficult.

Others with more expertise than I have already expressed my shared concerns around the form and design of the building, as well as the supports for residents that need to be in place for such a development to be successful.

I also have children who attend the school and have concerns about the size of this proposed building and its shading effect on the schoolyard where children play. Finally, unless the composition of tenants is different so that families and/ or a recovery model for the development is ensured, it doesn?t matter if the school is Christian, Jewish, independent, private, or public, this shouldn?t be proposed anywhere near a school, especially 18 m from its front doors.

I thank you for your time and consideration. Please, say no to this rezoning application.

4. Neighbourhood:

Mount Pleasant

5. Full name:

Lauren Yaptinchay

7. Email:

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

8. Subject classification:

PH4 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: No Name No Name (ps)

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Any web links (URLs) in this case have been altered so that they cannot be opened, as a security measure to protect against malicious links. If you believe a link to be safe please replace the "hxxp" at the beginning with "http" and open in a browser window. If you're unsure if the link is safe to open and you need to open it, please contact the Service Desk.

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221807

Case created: 2022-07-25, 10:30:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

- 1. Subject (address if applicable):**
Low barrier housing kits
- 2. Position:**
Oppose
- 3. Comments:**
The presentation by kitscoalition was extremely impressive. I 100% agree with their initiative and they have done a much better job at creating a home then tax payer funded bc housing and city planners? Clearly they have done this research where bc housing has not.
- 4. Neighbourhood:**
Fairview
- 5. Full name:**
Brian Carlson
- 7. Email:**
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
- 8. Subject classification:**
PH4 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Brian Carlson

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Alt. Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Any web links (URLs) in this case have been altered so that they cannot be opened, as a security measure to protect against malicious links. If you believe a link to be safe please replace the "hxxp" at the beginning with "http" and open in a browser window. If you're unsure if the link is safe to open and you need to open it, please contact the Service Desk.

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221808

Case created: 2022-07-25, 10:34:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

- 1. Subject (address if applicable):**
8th and Arbutus
- 2. Position:**
Oppose
- 3. Comments:**
Speaking notes requested by Councillor Hardwick.
- 4. Neighbourhood:**
Kitsilano
- 5. Full name:**
Hollis Bromley
- 7. Email:**
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
- 8. Subject classification:**
PH4 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Hollis Bromley

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone: s. 22(1)

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Any web links (URLs) in this case have been altered so that they cannot be opened, as a security measure to protect against malicious links. If you believe a link to be safe please replace the "hxxp" at the beginning with "http" and open in a browser window. If you're unsure if the link is safe to open and you need to open it, please contact the Service Desk.

Many speakers we have heard from have made comments regarding proposed residents of the development. We need to be clear about who will be housed here so that we are clear about the level of supports and services that will be required for any social housing development to be successful.

I suggest that Council does not yet have that clarity.

Level of Care and Supports

In MPA Society's response to RPF, it states that residents will be selected in consultation with BC Housing's Coordinated Access and Assessment (CAA) team based out of Orange Hall and will be assessed using the Vulnerability Assessment Tool (VAT). However, in its response to RFP, MPA was clear that individuals who don't require high-levels of support will be denied housing at this building and instead will be directed to other resources:¹

Through the CAA table, MPA will review the needs of prospective program participants and match them with the services and supports offered at the West 7th site. Individuals that are in need, but don't require high-levels of support, will be diverted to other housing streams offered by MPA like SOLO/SIL or one of MPA's other programs.

This housing is specifically intended for those who require high levels of support.

The use of the VAT is a standard term in BC Housing's Sample Operating Agreement and does not offer any additional level of assurance or commitment that this building will be successfully integrated into this community.²

Even knowing this building is intended for those with high levels of care, there is still no clarification or commitment in this rezoning application, on what that means for this building, and whether this building is even adequately designed to address this number of residents requiring high levels of support.

For example, while the July 21, 2022 Yellow Memo indicates that 10,000 square feet of the proposed development will be set aside for proposed support services, that figure includes the laundry rooms, commercial kitchen and dining rooms. These services are important, yes, but how is it that we still do not know the square footage set aside for actual treatment and consultation rooms to service high needs residents.³

¹ FOI Request: 30-8521 Combined HL Records FINAL_Redacted (1).pdf accessible at: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Q8cJvZq5apOYz9z57M7MN1J2OJUcdJQ1/view?usp=sharing> at page 14 of PDF

² Sample Operating Agreement <https://www.bchousing.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/SHF-Appendix-E-Sample-Operator-Agreement.pdf>

³ <https://council.vancouver.ca/20220628/documents/phea3yellowmemo.pdf>

The Yellow Memo also offers a variety of regulatory means by which Mayor and Council can influence building management, operations and training. This could include requirements in the Housing Agreement and in the lease agreement. But the recommendation of staff is not to implement any of these means to allow the operator greater flexibility.

[Former?] Minister Eby and BC Housing have provided a number of “assurances” that this building will be well supported. However, the sample BC Housing Operating Agreement ties all support services and staffing levels to annual approval of budgets. Annual budgets requiring the approval of BC Housing do not provide any assurances that necessary minimum supports will remain in place for the duration of a 60 year lease. Governments come and go but the building will be in place for 60 years, whether properly funded or not.

Housing Agreement

Yet, Mayor and Council are now urged by staff not to include minimum requirements in the Housing Agreement that could influence building management, operations, and training. The Yellow Memo states:

Should future operational changes be necessary that were not in alignment with the Housing Agreement, the latter would require an amendments to the Housing Agreement pursuant to a Council approved by-law, and this process can be more time-consuming for the City, leasee and operator.

To be clear, this rezoning proposes the exclusive use of this site for a supportive housing building with a minimum of 50% of units rented at the shelter level of income assistance for 60 years. It is difficult to imagine how and fundamental operational changes could be necessary when this is the required exclusive use of the building.

Further, it is difficult to conceive of how baseline requirements for use (such as designating this housing for seniors or for recovery-based programs) or requirements for base-line levels of supports (such as staffing and required in house treatment services), could be in any way detrimental to this rezoning application or the impact this housing will have on the neighborhood.

The Housing Agreement will stay in place. The only way to ensure proper funding remains in place is by ensuring the Housing Agreement contain baseline requirements. Council should not be concerned with making it easier and faster for future for changes to be made in the future given the nature of this proposed building.

Funding

With respect to the issue of funding, we heard the Mayor say today that funding will be lost if this rezoning application is not approved. The funding for this project is provided through a Memorandum of Understanding between the City, CHMC and BC Housing in May 2020:⁴

In January of 2020, Council received a confidential Memorandum from Staff outlining the PMSHI, the general terms of the Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") with British Columbia Housing ("BCH") and potentially Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation ("CMHC") as well as an outline of the type of due diligence being conducted on four city-owned sites that may be suitable for PMSHI.

In May of 2020, Council approved, in camera, the terms of the draft MOU with BCH for PMSHI to design, construct and operate approximately 300 supportive homes with 24/7 staff to provide on-site support services for individuals and families that are experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness on sites owned by the City of Vancouver.

The funding is earmarked for supportive housing in Vancouver. It is clear the Memorandum of Understanding was agreed to in principle before the recommendation to use the Arbutus Site for supportive housing – that recommendation came in July 2020.⁵

While the Memorandum of Understanding is not publicly available, it is referenced in other City documents and was executed in August 2020.⁶

If funding for supportive housing in the City of Vancouver is dependent on the approval of this rezoning application, that is extremely concerning and raises significant questions of procedural fairness. Rezoning entails a rezoning application, community consultation, and a public hearing which requires Mayor and Council to keep an open mind. If Council approved a Memorandum of Understanding securing funding for supportive housing and now uses a loss of funding as a reason to support that rezoning application, that calls into question the integrity of this process.

There is a way to build successful social housing at the Arbutus Site. This rezoning application is not that way. I ask mayor and Council to reject this rezoning application.

⁴ https://council.vancouver.ca/20200721/documents/RTS13939-Incamerarelease-REFM-AdministrativeReport_Redacted.pdf

⁵ PMSH Preliminary Site Approval Recommendation dated July 28, 2020: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Q8cJvZq5apOYz9z57M7MN1J2OJUcdJQ1/view> at page 49

⁶ <https://vancouver.ca/news-calendar/rezoning-for-more-than-100-new-homes-with-supports-in-vancouver-approved-by-council.aspx>

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221820

Case created: 2022-07-25, 11:02:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

- 1. Subject (address if applicable):**
Arbutus & 7th
- 2. Position:**
Oppose
- 3. Comments:**
<https://www.kitsilanocoalition.org/blog/response-to-the-citys-misleading-answers?fbclid=IwAR3pQN63oA8GJKItWJvIkYsOkmcCVBk-Fc6v1cdLQlv0p59s1qayAJ69eJs&fs=e&s=cl>
- 4. Neighbourhood:**
Dunbar-Southlands
- 5. Full name:**
Mark Wallace
- 7. Email:**
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
- 8. Subject classification:**
PH4 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Mark Wallace

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Alt. Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Any web links (URLs) in this case have been altered so that they cannot be opened, as a security measure to protect against malicious links. If you believe a link to be safe please replace the "https" at the beginning with "http" and open in a browser window. If you're unsure if the link is safe to open and you need to open it, please contact the Service Desk.

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221827

Case created: 2022-07-25, 11:35:00 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):***
3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue
2. **Position:***
Oppose
3. **Comments:***
Please see attachment that directly address the gaps in the responses staff provided back to Council and recommendations for questions Councillors should pursue getting answers for.
4. **Full name:***
Charlene Kettlewell
5. **Organization you represent:**
6. **Which neighbourhood do you live in?**
Arbutus Ridge
7. **Email:***
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
99. **Attachments**
1

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Ms CHARLENE KETTLEWELL

Address: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Address2:

Phone: s. 22(1) Personal and Confid

Alt. Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

A RESPONSE TO THE CITY'S MISLEADING ANSWERS TO COUNCIL

Jul 25, 2022 1:06:35 PM

This article is a response to answers the Mayor and Council received from the City of Vancouver's General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability and the General Manager of Arts, Culture, and Community Services, for questions provided to them up until July 4, 2022, during the Public Hearing for the rezoning application for West 7th/8th.

[Read the answers as submitted by City staff](#)

Here are our responses to the inaccuracies, misrepresentations, and omissions provided by the City:

1. What is the amount of floor space dedicated to support services?

City Answer:

The response provided that there would be an aggregate of approximately 10,000 sq. ft. proposed for support services and programs. They include in

this figure offices, the commercial kitchen, communal dining room, laundry rooms, multipurpose rooms, and rooms for private conversation.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

The question that should have been answered is what square footage will be included for clinical services to help the individuals with their well-being when over half of those homeless in the 2020 Homelessness Count reported one or two medical concerns, 60% suffered from addiction and 45% with mental health issues. Also, why did the answer exclude the fact that the facility only provides space for safe injection with no medical services? No clinical services on-site to support addiction and mental health issues, but safe injection.

2. Please clarify: will Council approve the operating agreement – and will that include review of the tenanting agreement?

City Answer:

The operator agreement is an agreement between BC Housing and the operator; Council does not approve it and is not a party. As the landlord, the non-profit operator would enter into individual agreements directly with residents.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

In other words, Council has no say despite the fact that they are party to the development of the site for this purpose with the contribution of land. If the land was zoned for 12-storey residential, it could be valued upward of \$10M.

3. Experience of Reiderman Temp Modular Housing adjacent to Sir Wilfrid Laurier off Cambie and 57th was that about 25% of tenants were from the area (e.g., sleeping by Langara golf course). Is it expected that tenancy will include housing people already in the neighbourhood?

City Answer:

Yes, people from the local community would be prioritized into this housing, as is best practice.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

Is this true? Alison Dunnet said in a response to this question on June 28 in Council that they didn't get as granular in their approach to the location of homeless within Vancouver or specifically for Kitsilano. Also, a tenant at the MPA Larwill Site, a temporary modular building on the new Vancouver Art Gallery site in Downtown Vancouver, has been informed that they will be the new tenants of Arbutus.

Kitsilano homeless are primarily alcohol afflicted and do not wish to live in a building with active drug use and harm reduction. This has been shown by

studies to reduce the likelihood of accessing alcohol use disorder treatment and can create turmoil in the building as mentioned by a speaker who works with Kits homeless.

How would the homeless in Kitsilano become prioritized? Or will tenants at the MPA Larwill site simply be moved over? We believe Vancouver City Council and the community should know.

4. Can Council require that a community advisory committee (CAC) be included in the housing agreement like with Sir Wilfrid Laurier?

City Answer:

Council can require that the project has a CAC as part of the Housing Agreement.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

CACs have been shown to not be enforceable or have any ability to affect change confirmed by Marguerite Ford CAC. Other jurisdictions, such as Nanaimo, Victoria, and Penticton, have established successful metrics like limits on per site unit numbers, and proximity to other developments/schools. Vancouver Council has none of these, thus no ability to define terms of CAC. Hence their limited success at problematic sites.

There has yet to be a presentation of CAC minutes from a comparable site where problems were presented by the community and accountability ensured

all concerns were addressed resulting in a calmed neighbourhood and well-being of tenants. We have several CAC minutes, which show nothing actionable is done at these CACs in regards to community concerns.

5. Some speakers said building will be low barrier with no supports. Will there be supports?

City Answer:

Yes, there would be 24/7 staff support on site, who would support tenants to access medical and mental health care, health and wellness services, life skills training, laundry and meals and other services as needed.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

This question/answer is oversimplified and glosses over the more serious issues of unmet primary medical care. Access to offsite services is not good enough. It was stated in the opening session of the Public Hearing by City of Vancouver Celine Mauboules, that the proposed will not be a medical services model building.

6. One speaker said there will be only 2 staff 24-7. True or not?

City Answer:

The staff level for this site has not been determined.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

The comparison was given in the answer using the language “at some other buildings.” However, no other buildings are as large or complex with a mix of such large vulnerable populations. In Finland, the only country in the EU where homelessness is being reduced, the clinical care ratio is 1:3 and includes in-reach/on-site physicians, nurse practitioners, physiotherapists, and counsellors. Here the proposal is 1:65, and no determination of clinical supports.

7. Marguerite Ford Apartments (MFA) were cited a lot. Are there differences between that project and the one being planned? What is record of MPA as an operator? What, typically, are the requirement to keep the area around the building clean? What, typically, are measures to deal with any possible drug dealing around a building?

City Answer:

MFA has notably been a challenging supportive housing building since opening in 2013. There have been a number of lessons learned by BC Housing, the operator and the City on ensuring supportive housing buildings are designed, operated and managed well. Subsequently, these lessons have been applied to over 20 other purpose-built supportive housing sites which are well integrated into the community.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

How have the lessons been applied and been proactive enough to solve their challenges at MFA? There is still an over 1700% increase in emergency response required in the immediate vicinity in 2022, nearly 9 years later? EY audit of BC Housing cites BC Housing's measure of success is # of units, not outcomes. How is this not the case here? This answer is avoiding a proper response and Council should request direct answers to this question.

8. Can we require a flashing pedestrian controlled traffic light at 7th and Arbutus?

City Answer:

Yes, Council can require a flashing pedestrian controlled traffic light at 7th and Arbutus. Note, social housing developments typically have minimal parking provided on site. This development is no different, and future residents are not anticipated to own cars. As such, the site will generate very few vehicle trips and will have little impact on the existing transportation network.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

This response shows the denial of facts we have seen by BC Housing and the applicant. Given the scale of the building, and the promise of services being brought it, what about service workers/ support that is claimed to be present. What about families, and visitors of the 129 residents?

Given the learnings claimed to have been from Marguerite Ford, what about the 1700% increase in emergency responders? This is a great deal of traffic.

This area does get plenty of traffic accidents which will also impact emergency responders. From the [ICBC crash report website](#), the following crash numbers have been documented between 2017 and 2021:

- *Arbutus St + West Broadway - 172*
- *Arbutus St + West 8th - 21*
- *Arbutus St + West 7th - 9*
- *Arbutus Greenway + West Broadway - 5*

9. Some speakers said the results of At Home/Chez Soi study, as well as literature on the Housing First model, conclude that supportive housing shouldn't exceed certain concentrations. True? If so, what are the suggested numbers?

City Answer:

Long worded answer about the \$110 million provided to study homelessness in various cities across Canada.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

Again, the answer fails to directly answer the question at hand. BC Housing has site criteria they developed for their "Rapid Response to Homelessness" in 2017 before the BC NDP took office, and that figure was clear and in ink at 40-50 units maximum for success. The Executive Director of Coast Mental Health (CMH) has said the "sweet spot" for supportive housing is 50 units. CMH also only has 10% of their 51 units in Dunbar reserved as Low Barrier

units. Dr. Julian Somers has stated no more than 5% of any building should be shelter rate. 84% of those studied preferred scattered site housing.

10. One speaker noted several other BC municipalities have signed agreements with BC Housing for social housing with clear requirements. Can staff provide information verifying the information conveyed:

City Answer:

In Vancouver, there are no Council-adopted land-use policies or restrictions on the locations of housing for very low-income individuals, or those needing supports. In fact, Council's housing policies support delivering social and supportive housing throughout the City in any area zoned for residential uses.

(a) That Victoria Council required that tenants of a project have no history of violence.

City Answer:

Staff have verified that in 2017 Victoria Council included a number of limitations to tenant eligibility for the site at 1002 Vancouver Street, known as Mount Edwards and operated by the Cool Aid Society, through a covenant registered on title as a Housing Agreement. The narrow tenant eligibility

requirements challenged BC Housing to best serve the homeless population of Victoria.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

This last line presents a bias. This site was held up recently as a success story for housing. Also, this site is significantly smaller. See:

<https://www.capitaldaily.ca/news/supportive-housing-mount-edwards-victoria>.

It would behoove Vancouver City Council to not require BC's recently audited and fledgling agency for social housing to have registered covenants and adopt a set of guidelines for school zones. Currently, there are no successes in supportive housing proposals just 18m from a school anywhere in BC that also houses those with addiction (60%) and mental health issues (45%) but provides no clinical support in reach.

11. Several speakers raised the issue of no setbacks of the building. How rare is this and what could be problems generated by no setback?

City Answer:

Condition 1.3(c) in Appendix B requires additional building setbacks on both 7th and 8th Avenues to provide enhanced landscape and an improved pedestrian experience. On Arbutus Street, site constraints, including a narrow site width at the south, have resulted in a narrow setback. Condition 2.4(c) requires the applicant to build a wider sidewalk along Arbutus Street to a

minimum of 10ft., which is consistent with high density areas around the City, which is anticipated by the Broadway Plan at this location next to the transit station.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

The city does not seem to appreciate or care about the narrowness of the streets and that there is a cross-street barrier at West 7th and Arbutus due to the bike lane as well as three school crosswalks and street parking for the pick-up and drop-off of over 500 children ages 2-14. How will an additional 10 feet on Arbutus, will cause Arbutus to be narrower. This will have a significant impact on traffic. No consideration of this has been done clearly.

12. Several speakers spoke to potential traffic issues being exacerbated by this project on this narrow 2-lane street with the nearby transit station, forthcoming bus loop, school children's crossings, emergency vehicles and cyclists. How can these potential problems be mitigated?

City Answer:

Please see Q&A #8.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

We respectfully suggest that Q&A 8 does not answer to all of the above concerns and would expect Council to not accept that either.

13. Will the tenants all be from the Downtown Eastside, as one speaker said?

City Answer:

Priority will be for people in the local neighbourhood around the project site experiencing or at risk of homelessness. Homelessness is a city-wide issue and people experiencing homelessness are in every neighbourhood.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

This answer is not complete. See Q&A #3.

14. One speaker stated that another Vancouver social housing facility (78 unit building across from a school) required no current substance/drug use, and no known history of violence, determined through a “vulnerability assessment tool” used by the operator. Will this tool be used for this project? Can Council request or require similar screens? Please confirm whether a decision has been made that residents will be able to consume alcohol and drugs on site.

City Answer:

The Reiderman Residence did not require abstinence from current substance or drugs use, nor did it require no-history of violence of their tenants. The tenanting process would include the Vulnerability Assessment Tool (VAT), and referrals would be made through the BC Housing Coordinated Access and Assessment table, as is standard practice. VATs are tools to better understand a person's needs to ensure they can be well supported in their housing. This project will be based on a harm reduction approach, which is supported and encouraged by Vancouver Coastal Health. There would be a private space within the building for residents to ensure safe use in the presence of staff; this room would only be for residents and no outside guests. Similar to any other housing in Vancouver, residents are able to make personal choices regarding their use of alcohol or drugs in their homes.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

For clarification, this question seemed to confuse the property with the 78-unit Mt Edwards site in Victoria with the Reiderman Residences. The primary difference between the site in Victoria and Reiderman in Vancouver is that the established practices for the site at Mt Edwards were built in consultation with the community and are not done so in Vancouver. Please see question 10a above.

15. Can Vancouver City Council make requirements on tenanting as Victoria City Council did for a supportive housing project adjacent to a school there (as asked by one speaker)?

City Answer:

Please see Q&A #10.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

This question is very important and should be expanded upon. The site in Victoria is successful, it is rightly sized with a balanced population of affordable housing and supportive housing and its tenancy agreement ensures those living within the building to the best knowledge of all parties, present a danger to themselves or to the children in the immediate vicinity and the diversity in the building provides an opportunity for integration with the community including the school community. This building is considerably smaller also.

<https://www.capitaldaily.ca/news/supportive-housing-mount-edwards-victoria>

16. How will the condition of approval 1.2 (a) to revise the tower massing to reduce shadow impact on surrounding properties by reducing the floorplate to a maximum of c. 6,800 sq. ft. positively impact both the school playgrounds as well as Delamont Park?

City Answer:

As outlined in the Referral Report, the proposed tower does not cast any shadows on Delamont Park between 10 am and 4 pm between the equinoxes.

Further, condition 1.2 (a) in Appendix B of the Referral Report seeks to create a more slender tower and reduce shadowing on the independent school ground. This makes the tower form more inline with the expectations of the Broadway Plan and residential towers across the city. A comparative image depicting the improvement in shadow performance can be found on page 5 of Appendix C in the referral report.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

The sun's rays have tangible benefits for physical well-being. Sun exposure is essential for bone, heart, lung, dental, immune, nerve, and muscular health, as well as for optimal mental health. Ironic a building intended to support the mental health of others would at the same stroke cancel out the benefit for children playing on the school ground, in the preschool and at the toddler park for a good portion of the year. See:

<https://www.verywellmind.com/the-mental-health-benefits-of-sunlight-5089214>

As has been confirmed independently, the shadow studies provided by the city are misleading and inaccurate of the situation aside from very specific cherry-picked times by the city

18. On Thursday, the Province released the [Ernst & Young] review of BC Housing and a key finding was that BC Housing lacks selection criteria for housing operators (no competitive process), specifically the supportive housing stream and decisions

have been undocumented. In light of resident questions on the subject of the housing operations, would it be possible to get the following info:

(a) What was the process for soliciting and selecting an operator for Arbutus?

City Answer:

BC Housing executed a competitive RFP process to select an operator, MPA Society, in December 2020 and will enter into a formal contract with MPA Society subject to approval of the rezoning application.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

An FOI request was opened on this requesting the RFP and all providers' responses. Only 1 single document came back which was MPA's proposal. Upon questioning, it was advised this was all the documentation available. This would imply there was no RFP document and only 1 respondent. MPA

(b) What are the legal implications of the EY findings for the current public hearing, in particular the finding around a lack of rigour and selection/evaluation criteria for supportive housing operators?

City Answer:

Staff can confirm that there are no legal implications generated by that study for this public hearing.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

This could be tested in court, as the aspects to the EY findings align directly with the documented experience for this rezoning. Since this has been pointed out to City, there cannot be a denial this was not known, should there be any issues with the site.

There would be moral implications and duty of care obligations in circumventing or shelving the EY findings for the purposes of passing the rezoning. Former BC Housing Minister, David Eby, admitted supportive sites are over target and housing for women and women-led families in transition homes has been undersupplied, just 10% of BC's target.

REGULATORY TOOLS REGARDING BUILDING MANAGEMENT, OPERATIONS AND TENANTING

Staff have been asked to advise Council of the various regulatory tools available to them to influence building management, operations and tenanting. Council has authority to do so through Housing Agreements, lease terms with BC Housing, and the Director of Planning can require

conditions for the Development Permit (DP).

City Answer:

An Operator Agreement is entered into between BC Housing and the selected housing operator (MPA), and an Operations Management Plan (OMP) is provided by the housing operator (MPA).

The City is not however a party to the Operator Agreement and the OMP is provided to the City, but it is not a contract.

Housing Agreements (s.565.2(1) of the Vancouver Charter) A Housing Agreement (Part 2 of Appendix B of the report) sets out conditions for the use of the land and is registered at the Land Title Office (LTO). It secures minimum affordability levels and covenants to prohibit the stratification and/or separate sale of individual units, or rental for a term of less than one month at a time.

It is within Council's authority to secure operational requirements in the Housing Agreement, but this is not the usual practice.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

Again, this response is completely biased. Why imply it is not usual practice. This proposal is unprecedented. The question was about Council's authority. The answer is simply, "Yes, Council has authority to do this". It feels as though the applicant team wishes to undermine the authority of the Council in this.

Housing Agreements are entered into pursuant to a Council by-law and any change to the conditions of the Housing Agreement would require a subsequent Council by-law enactment, legal administration and LTO registration.

City Answer:

Staff do not recommend including additional types of conditions in the Housing Agreement, in order to enable the operator to be responsive and agile.

Kitsilano Coalition Answer:

Staff seem to overstep in their provision of guidance by often saying things such as “do not recommend” or “this is not usual practice.” In order to bring positive change to a system of housing that has not been demonstrative of success, we respectfully say that Council should only be shown what they have the right to do, not “whether to do it.”

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221830

Case created: 2022-07-25, 11:37:00 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):***
CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue
2. **Position:***
Oppose
3. **Comments:***
See attached chart illustrating technical flaws for this tower that is not in compliance to The Broadway Plan policies.
4. **Full name:***
Sandra Ho
5. **Organization you represent:**
6. **Which neighbourhood do you live in?**
Kitsilano
7. **Email:***
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
99. **Attachments**
1

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Sandra Ho

Address: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address2: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Phone: [Redacted]

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Alt. Phone: [Redacted] Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Arbutus 8th Rezoning Application Technical Flaws & Policy Violations

In Compliance

Not in Compliance

<p>Broadway Plan max floor-to-floor height: 3m (10 ft)</p> <p>Broadway Plan min lot frontage for Kitsilano North – Area A: 150 ft Relaxation to 99 ft</p> <p>Broadway Plan new amendment to solar access policies by Councilor Dominato was supported by Council: New buildings should minimize shadowing impacts on independent school yards, particularly during school hours.</p> <p>Broadway Plan says proposed new development should not create shadow impact on parks and public school yards from spring to fall equinoxes between 10am and 4pm.</p> <p>Delamont park in Broadway Plan is designated to receive solar protection.</p>	<p>Project floor-to-floor height: 3.48m (11.42 ft)</p> <p>Project lot frontage: 75 ft</p> <p>Shadow impact on June 21st 9am (summer solstice) shows almost entire school yard being in shadows. Shadows are not minimized and does not follow the Broadway Plan direction</p> <p>April and May 21st 9am has substantial shadow impacts also.</p> <p>Note: Comparison shadow impact for 6 storey building is generally minimized.</p> <p>Shade enters Delamont park on spring equinox (Mar 20th, 2:15pm)</p> <p>Shade enters the park on Mar 21st, 3pm, staff report is not accurate.</p> <p>Shadow grows very long into the park as it goes into shoulder season Oct 21st, 1:30pm, it covers almost the entire playground.</p> <p>When compared to the applicant's shadow diagram on Oct 21st, 2pm, the staff report shadow diagram is cropped off at the top (north end), it doesn't show the actual shadow impact on the park.</p> <p>When compared to the applicant's</p>
---	--

Arbutus 8th Rezoning Application Technical Flaws & Policy Violations

In Compliance

Not in Compliance

	<p>shadow diagram on Nov 21st, 2pm, the applicant's shadow diagram is also cropped at the top, and in reality the shadow impacts extends well beyond Delamont Park that spans 3 blocks over.</p> <p>The form of development does not meet the criteria, this site is too small to fit the project site.</p> <p>The form of development is not supported by City's own policies.</p>
--	--

Other points:

*ASK COV: WHERE DO THEY HAVE AN EXAMPLE of a built HIGH RISE IN VANCOUVER IN MODULAR? WHERE IS A REFERENCE ENDORSING/PROVING HIGH RISE construction of this type?

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221829

Case created: 2022-07-25, 11:36:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

1. Subject (address if applicable):

Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

2. Position:

Oppose

3. Comments:

I strongly oppose this rezoning application.

I will focus my comments on two aspects.

The first is the physical form of the proposed development.

The height and density of the proposed development is well beyond what is suitable for this site. With modular construction, the height of the building equates to 18 typical stories and is much higher than what is suitable for this neighbourhood. The renderings show that the side setback on Arbutus Street will be two feet from the sidewalk. One may feel comfortable walking on a sidewalk with an 18 storey right next to you if you are downtown Vancouver. But that kind of height on a narrow neighbourhood street, which is not an arterial street, is shocking as I think an earlier speaker said it was hostile.

The memo from city staff to council on July 21st, indicates that the city would expect the applicant to widen the sidewalk to a minimum of 10 feet. The city isn't requiring the applicant to change the building envelope, so this implies that Arbutus will be narrowed. Arbutus at this site is already a narrow road. It is not an arterial road, it is a neighbourhood collector street. Narrowing will further exasperate the unbearable traffic and congestion experienced on Arbutus, which will further intensify once the terminus Arbutus Station is in place along with the buses, and the ride hailing and ride sharing you'll have which is already designated for Arbutus the 8th Avenue.

An appropriate development at this site is what the speaker from Kits Coalition recommended. Had BC Housing consulted, a development permit application would have been submitted as it likely what would have been allowed under current rezoning. If urgency was an issue, this is the route BC Housing would have and should have taken.

The second aspect I will focus is the proposed harm reduction approach. The harm reduction approach this development is taking poses risk to women in recovery at the women's supportive recovery home next door and compromises their own recovery.

There are serious safety concerns for proposed tenants, 500 elementary school students within 20 meters, 1500 students within 3 blocks, a women's recovery house next door, toddler park within 20 meters. BC housing and city staff continue to ignore concerns of the residents of this community. The continuation of this failed model of housing will not be successful and will not help the people that it is suppose to.

The recent approval of application at Knight and King Edward, also referenced as rationale to support this motion is entirely different ? it?s not across the street from an elementary school, it?s across the street from a large residential complex of towers. It is not anywhere near a transit hub of sky train station or bus loop, it is located at the intersection of 2 arterial roads.

I urge you to reject this rezoning application with feedback to BC Housing to go back and offer housing that is suitable to the neighbourhood.

I urge you to reject the

4. Neighbourhood:

\line

5. Full name:

Amy Sidhu

7. **Email:**
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

8. **Subject classification:**
PH4 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Amy Sidhu

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Any web links (URLs) in this case have been altered so that they cannot be opened, as a security measure to protect against malicious links. If you believe a link to be safe please replace the "hxxp" at the beginning with "http" and open in a browser window. If you're unsure if the link is safe to open and you need to open it, please contact the Service Desk.

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221828

Case created: 2022-07-25, 11:36:00 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):***
Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue
- 2. Position:***
Oppose
- 3. Comments:***

I oppose this rezoning application.

13 floors of permanent Modular construction, actually equivalent to 18 floors in height, is too tall. 129 single occupancy units with 50% to 100% housing targeted at the shelter level is not a good fit for this site. There are over 1500 students within 3 blocks, including an elementary school directly across the street, numerous daycares and a women's recovery house next door, and toddler park within 20 meters. The harm reduction approach this development is taking poses risk to women in recovery at the women's supportive recovery home next door and compromises their own recovery. A building to house the homeless can be provided at this location, if it appropriately considers the proximity of the elementary school and park across the street, and implements the right measures. This proposal does not do that as BC Housing has confirmed it will use a harm reduction approach. That approach may be entirely reasonable and suitable for some who suffer from addiction, but it is not compatible with children. The city has a bylaw to prohibits cannabis stores from being within 300 m of schools, yet is not considering appropriate measures when there is an elementary school across the street.

Kits has many supportive group homes to support individuals on a smaller scale and they work in the neighbourhood. This plan goes against BC Housing's guidelines of 40-50 SUPPORTED housing tenants in one building. In addition, the site takes away valuable green space in a neighbourhood that has only one small park that serves the residents of the neighbourhood bound by arterial roads of Burrard, MacDonald, 4th Avenue and Broadway.

The recent approval of application at Knight and King Edward, also referenced as rationale to support this motion is entirely different ? it?s not across the street from an elementary school, it?s across the street from a large residential complex of towers. It is not anywhere near a transit hub of sky train station or bus loop, it is located at the intersection of 2 arterial roads.

I urge you to reject this rezoning application with feedback to BC Housing to go back and offer housing that is suitable to the neighbourhood.
- 4. Full name:***
Kataneh Sherkat
- 5. Organization you represent:**
- 6. Which neighbourhood do you live in?**
Downtown
- 7. Email:***

99. Attachments
0

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Kataneh Sherkat

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Any web links (URLs) in this case have been altered so that they cannot be opened, as a security measure to protect against malicious links. If you believe a link to be safe please replace the "hxxp" at the beginning with "http" and open in a browser window. If you're unsure if the link is safe to open and you need to open it, please contact the Service Desk.

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221831

Case created: 2022-07-25, 11:40:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

1. Subject (address if applicable):

Arbutus and 7th

2. Position:

Oppose

3. Comments:

This is not an issue of west vs east. The Arbutus project is distinguishable from King Edward. The closest school to King Edward site is 700 meters. There is no preschool, elementary school and women's recovery home adjacent to the King Ed site. King Ed site is 16% smaller. King Ed site is First Nations focused. I attended the UDP meetings for both and the King Ed project has much more cultural supports, allows balconies, allows rooftops, whereas the Arbutus site is designed like a pre-trial centre.

4. Neighbourhood:

Kitsilano

5. Full name:

Ana Cikes

7. Email:

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

8. Subject classification:

PH4 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Ana Cikes

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Any web links (URLs) in this case have been altered so that they cannot be opened, as a security measure to protect against malicious links. If you believe a link to be safe please replace the "hxxp" at the beginning with "http" and open in a browser window. If you're unsure if the link is safe to open and you need to open it, please contact the Service Desk.

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221833

Case created: 2022-07-25, 11:48:00 PM

Channel: WEB

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Original Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION

Request Details

1. Subject (address if applicable):

Rezoning: 2086-2098 West 7th Avenue, and 2091 West 8th Avenue

2. Position:

Oppose

3. Comments:

I am a physician with much clinical experience working with people with substance use and mental health issues, including people who live in SROs or have no fixed address. It is an unfortunate reality that many homeless folks have active substance use or mental health issues, and along with that comes behavioural problems. They often need intensive case management and clinical support. Many need recovery-oriented treatment in settings free of substances, but all too often they are just existing under SRO roofs in congregate fashion without treatment. Some examples of what happens in such settings: tenants clashing with one another, damage to property, substance use, threat of or actual violence, other safety risk (e.g. fire), drug dealing.

One can reasonably anticipate a greater chance of or higher risk of behavioural disturbances, with spillover effects into the community, the larger such a population is under a common roof, especially when there are few dedicated staff. Staff at such buildings can only do so much as there are few of them for a large number of people who come and go from the building.

(One can also expect an increase in secondhand smoke in the neighbourhood as smoking is highly prevalent in this population.)

And what support services would be readily available for such people in the vicinity of this proposed project? They wouldn't be close to any health authority clinics that are set up to address the needs that people who are homeless often have.

The neighbourhood in question is vulnerable - most obviously the young children present across the small street, women seeking recovery next door, and seniors.

I am a father of three and I side with the folks who are very concerned about this project in its current form and I am opposed to it.

How do we move forward? Collaborate with the neighbours, Sancta Maria House, and other members of the community. I would envision a smaller scale project with a greater staff to tenant ratio, clinical support that is recovery oriented / in support of abstinence so that people have a chance at wellness, and consultation with police.

4. Neighbourhood:

\line

5. Full name:

Jerome Yang

7. Email:

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

8. Subject classification:

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: JEROME YANG

Address: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address2:

Phone: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Any web links (URLs) in this case have been altered so that they cannot be opened, as a security measure to protect against malicious links. If you believe a link to be safe please replace the "hxxp" at the beginning with "http" and open in a browser window. If you're unsure if the link is safe to open and you need to open it, please contact the Service Desk.

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221836

Case created: 2022-07-25, 11:56:00 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):***
Arbutus and 7th
2. **Position:***
Oppose
3. **Comments:***
Speaker 48 spoke in support comparing this project to Margaret Mitchell. That project is only 52 units. Apples vs oranges
4. **Full name:***
Hank Smith
5. **Organization you represent:**
6. **Which neighbourhood do you live in?**
Grandview-Woodland
7. **Email:***
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
99. **Attachments**
0

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Hank Smith

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Alt. Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -

Public Hearing Correspondence Case

Case number: 101016221837

Case created: 2022-07-25, 11:56:00 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):***
Arbutus and 7th
2. **Position:***
Oppose
3. **Comments:***
Speaker 48 spoke in support comparing this project to Margaret Mitchell. That project is only 52 units. Apples vs oranges
4. **Full name:***
Hank Smith
5. **Organization you represent:**
6. **Which neighbourhood do you live in?**
Grandview-Woodland
7. **Email:***
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
99. **Attachments**
0

Additional Details

Contact Details

Name: Hank Smith

Address: ,

Address2:

Phone:

Alt. Phone:

Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Preferred contact method: Either

Case Notes

Photo

- no picture -