

From: Earl Thomas [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 1, 2020 2:04 PM
To: Clerks <Clerks@burnaby.ca>
Cc: Mayor <Mayor@burnaby.ca>
Subject: June 23, 2020 5977 Wilson Ave.

Rez Ref # 17-32
Bylaw # 1463

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Hello Mayor Hurley,

It is vitally important to address my business concerns of the 5977 Wilson Ave June 23 meeting. By demolishing the building & converting it into a condo exerts extreme pressure on my small business that operates out of 6031 Wilson Ave in Burnaby. My ability to voice & produce vocal auditions will be severely hampered because of the noise of demolition of the building & constructing the new condo over a 2 year period as previously stated when we conversed.

I request **waiving of the required business licence for 2021-2022** as my ability to operate my voice-over business will be severely limited. There will be noise on a continual basis. Please inform when the demolition & construction will take place & the exact hours. Will it take 2 years for this project to complete? Operating a small business already has many challenges & I am doing my best to move towards success. This is a major problem that looks insurmountable & I wish for the City of Burnaby to exercise wisdom towards a solution.

The large sign in front of 5977 Willson Ave does not state 5979 Wilson Ave. Will 5979 be demolished & then a condo constructed on another time frame. Or are they both included in the Planning Dept's project for the June 23 meeting?

Will the public hearing on June 23 @ 5PM allow for myself to voice my personal & business concerns.

I fully realize that the previous administration under past Mayor Corrigan developed this project becoming headed for 3rd reading on June 23. Is there any way that this project could be stopped as the disruption to normal life & my business will create a major INCONVENIENCE & financial challenges.

Best regards,
Earl Thomas "The VOICE"

[REDACTED]

From: Earl Thomas Pollitt [REDACTED]
Sent: June 01, 2020 3:41 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: Re: June 23, 2020 5977 Wilson Ave.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Rez Ref # 17-32
Bylaw # 14163

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Hello Blanka,
Thanks for further info & for forwarding my em to the Planning Department.

Many thanks ,
Earl Thomas

On Jun 1, 2020, at 3:37 PM, Clerks <Clerks@burnaby.ca> wrote:

Hello Mr. Thomas,

Please be advised that the noted rezoning is going to **Public Hearing on 2020 June 23.**

Please click the link provided to access information on how to participate in the virtual public hearing – www.burnaby.ca/publichearings

Meanwhile, if you would like to inquire more details regarding the rezoning application, I can forward your email to the Planning Department or you can reach to them directly at planning@burnaby.ca

If you have any further questions, please contact me at your convenience.

Blanka Zeinabova
Deputy City Clerk
Direct: 604-294-7289

Our Vision: A world-class city committed to creating and sustaining the best quality of life for our entire community.

The contents of this email message are solely the writings, thoughts and/or ideas of the account holder and may not necessarily reflect those of the City of Burnaby. If you have any concerns regarding inappropriate use of this account please e-mail the postmaster@burnaby.ca

2/2

Arriola, Ginger

From: Jason Wong [REDACTED]
Sent: June 01, 2020 4:58 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: Application 17-32

Rez Ref # 17-32
Bylaw # 14163

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email. If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Hello,

This property is an example of low cost housing that should not be redeveloped. If the owner renovated the current units, many low income families would be able to afford to live in a highly desirable area of Burnaby, close to public transportation (Patterson skytrain).

This would be the perfect opportunity for Mayor Hurley to show that he is making good on his promise to provide affordable housing. Why destroy an example of what is really needed, to create what is the problem that got Mayor Corrigan voted out?

Best regards,

Jason W

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, May 30, 2020 4:52 PM
To: Planning <Planning@burnaby.ca>
Subject: Question about rezoning applications for 5977 Wilson (Bosa) and 6075 Wilson Avenue (Anthem)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email. If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Dear City Planning,

Council scheduled two rezoning applications in my direct neighborhood of Central Park East for a June 23 public hearing. Could you please confirm my understanding of how many tenancies the applicant **has notified and spoken to** about their right of first refusal to return?

Rez. #17-32: 5977 Wilson Avenue, Bosa Properties

Bosa's Wilson/Kathleen rezoning surprisingly states very clearly that *all* previous tenancies have been notified. I am surprised because the building is empty for about two years. Can you please confirm that by *notified* the rezoning applicant means that they **spoke to** every single tenancy about their rights of first refusal? I would not consider a mere note to an unconfirmed address sufficient to that end.

It is noted that all previous tenants of the Wilson site, which is currently vacant, have been notified of their right of first refusal of a replacement rental unit. For returning tenants, the affordable rental units are proposed at pre-development rents (adjusted for Residential Tenancy Act increase). For new tenants of the affordable rental units, rents are proposed at 20% below CMHC median market rates, in line with Council's adopted policy. The proposed rental rates help meet the City's housing affordability objectives and allow the applicant to access the full 1.1 FAR density offset available under the RM District on each of the respective Kathleen and Wilson sites.

Rez. #17-28: 6075 Wilson Avenue, Anthem Properties

Anthem Properties does not offer any information about how many tenancies were notified about their right of first refusal to return. Anthem began emptying the building about two years ago, shortly after their first attempt to move the rezoning to a public hearing failed. By now, the building is close to empty, with only very few tenants still living there.

Can I assume that Anthem Properties, too, **has contacted and spoken to** every single tenancy to inform them of their right of first refusal? If not, how many tenancies could they reach?

I am asking because Burnaby council allowed developers institute a culture in Metrotown where they can empty rental buildings years before demolition, with some not even bothering losing beyond \$400,000 in net operating profits a year from rents. Why would developers engage in such appalling practices in the midst of a housing crisis if not with the intent to gain more by avoiding Burnaby's tenant assistance program?

Rez Ref # 17-28; 17-32

Bylaw # 19-42

1/4

I may contact you with more questions about Burnaby's right of first refusal process, which appears to allow displacement under some circumstances, thus not providing the "peace of mind" to existing residents that some on council still tout.

Sincerely,

Reinhard Schauer

5868 Olive Avenue #21
Burnaby, BC V5H 2P4

Arriola, Ginger

From: Lehingrat, Laurie on behalf of Planning
Sent: June 01, 2020 8:58 AM
To: Norton, Mark
Subject: FW: Question about rezoning applications for 5977 Wilson (Bosa) and 6075 Wilson Avenue (Anthem)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, May 30, 2020 8:58 PM
To: Planning <Planning@burnaby.ca>
Subject: RE: Question about rezoning applications for 5977 Wilson (Bosa) and 6075 Wilson Avenue (Anthem)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Dear City Planning,

And while I am on this subject, could you please also clarify for both rezoning applications how many current and former tenancies are eligible for Burnaby's temporary housing relocation program while the buildings are under re-construction. I assume this is zero in the case of Bosa, since the building is empty, and a small number in the case of Anthem, but definite numbers would be helpful so I can address council with less speculation and more facts.

Sincerely,

Reinhard Schauer

5868 Olive Avenue #201
Burnaby, BC V5H 2P4

3/4

Arriola, Ginger

From: Clerks
Sent: June 05, 2020 8:22 AM
To: Arriola, Ginger
Subject: FW: Question about rezoning applications for 5977 Wilson (Bosa) and 6075 Wilson Avenue (Anthem)
Attachments: FW: Question about rezoning applications for 5977 Wilson (Bosa) and 6075 Wilson Avenue (Anthem)

From: Norton, Mark <Mark.Norton@burnaby.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, June 3, 2020 4:31 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Burnaby Renter's Office <rentersoffice@burnaby.ca>; Clerks <Clerks@burnaby.ca>
Subject: RE: Question about rezoning applications for 5977 Wilson (Bosa) and 6075 Wilson Avenue (Anthem)

Hi Reinhard,

Thank you for reaching out to the City regarding the two subject development applications, which are scheduled for Public Hearing on June 23rd. As the planner on file for the 5977 Wilson application (Rezoning Application 17-32, and the associated 19-42 at Kathleen Ave.), I can certainly address your questions pertaining to that application and the associated Kathleen Avenue development application.

In regards to notifying tenants of their first right of refusal; for those tenants at 5977 Wilson who left a forwarding address, a letter was sent by the applicant via registered mail on November 11, 2019 notifying tenants of their right of first refusal for a rental unit at the Kathleen site. Where the applicant had an e-mail on file, but no forwarding address or the letter was returned, an e-mail was sent to the tenant between November and December 2019. However, we recognise, like you, that every reasonable effort should be made to ensure tenants are informed of their right of first refusal. The City's recently expanded housing team are exploring a range of outreach opportunities including social media outreach, which has the potential to reach prior tenants for which provided contact information may no longer be accurate.

Eligible tenants have up until the date of occupancy of the new Kathleen development to exercise their right of first refusal and the City will work closely with the applicant's Tenant Relocation Coordinator to ensure that every effort is made to again reach out to the eligible tenants regarding their rights. Tenants can contact either the applicant or the City's Renter's Office (rentersoffice@burnaby.ca or 604-294-7750) to update their contact information and express their interest in a replacement rental unit.

In regards to your second point, re Burnaby's Temporary Housing Relocation Program; you're correct that the Wilson site is now vacant. The applicant has provided the City with information that demonstrates that all tenants were paid compensation amounts that exceeded the required monetary amounts under the City's Tenant Assistance Policy that was in place at the time that they moved. However, for reference, in circumstances where eligible tenants have not received compensation in line with the current or previous policy, they would be eligible for compensation based on the current adopted policy, which includes top-ups during the period that they are displaced.

Again thank you for your interest and feedback. I trust the above response answers your questions. If you have further questions in relation to these applications, I would be happy to discuss them further with you.

Thanks
Mark Norton

4/4

[REDACTED]

From: Clerks
Sent: June 15, 2020 4:14 PM
To: Arriola, Ginger
Subject: FW: Burnaby Zoning Application no. 17 - 32

From: John W unger [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2020 12:24 PM
To: Clerks <Clerks@burnaby.ca>
Cc: John Unger [REDACTED]
Subject: Burnaby Zoning Application no. 17 - 32

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Dear Burnaby Mayor and Council:

I am writing to formally oppose any rezoning amendment to this Bylaw. Residents in this area are completely unanimous in their opposition to changing any bylaws which would allow any more high rise buildings in our neighbourhood. We are not against development. WE JUST DO NOT WANT ANY MORE HIG RISE BUILDINGS IN OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD. The following reasons are given to support our opposition.

1. This proposal will further erode the existing low cost housing in this area. There is already a shortage of low cost housing in and near Metrotown which is partially evidenced by the visible homelessness. If the existing buildings must be demolished, they should be replaced only by structures with a 3 storey limit, similar to what now exists. Every effort should be made to accommodate low cost housing but not by adding more high rise buildings.
2. The metrotown area already has enough high rise buildings, which has increased the population density to the limit. That fact is evident to all residents who live here.
3. Highrise buildings, especially the ridiculously proposed 44 storey model, will further block the light and view from residents in existing buildings.
4. Vehicle traffic on narrow Wilson avenue and surrounding streets is already at a high capacity. This is also a bus route. The addition of another 500 or so units with the corresponding population increase will greatly exacerbate this congestion.
5. Parking on the surrounding streets is already at a premium. Even with added underground parking spaces the existing street parking will be overflowed.
6. The noise level of the skytrain will be greatly increased again because of the barrier wall caused by new high rise buildings. The reverberation of the almost constant skytrain operational noise will be once again be greatly increased. Since the enhancement of the skytrain to accommodate greater ridership in recent years, Skytrain authorities have promised to mitigate some of the increased noise. To date this has not happened but we are anticipating it will be soon.

7. This area has been a constant construction zone for many years and longtime residents here are completely exhausted with the noise, dust, and general congestion caused by these developments. It is time for council to stop this runaway building by developers and consider the impact on the existing residents. We were hopeful that recent changes in the Mayorship and City Council would result in changes to runaway development. These Bylaw change proposals indicate that perhaps council is still pandering to developers. If so we will work through election to remove those members who are still listening to developers and not the residents who actually live here.

8. If the existing apartments are demolished City Council should consider returning the area to green space. The area is in desperate need of more smaller parks to compensate for the numerous high rise apartments in the area. Not enough attention has been paid to past developments neglect of including more green space.

In recent years developers have purchased nearly all the older apartments in the area with a view to demolishing existing low cost apartments to facilitate building taller and more high rise buildings. Obviously that is where the maximum profit is. Their motivation is nothing more than corporate greed and City Council needs to be alerted to the wish of most area residents based on the impact to our neighbourhood. Enough is enough.

Please say no to these proposed Zoning Bylaw changes.

Yours truly,

John Unger
12E - 6128 Patterson Avenue, Burnaby, BC, V5H4P3

Arriola, Ginger

From: Clerks
Sent: June 15, 2020 4:31 PM
To: Arriola, Ginger
Subject: FW: Burnaby zoning bylaw 1965 , Amendment Bylaw No. 8, 2020 - Bylaw No. 14162 Rez #17-28 PLUS REZ #17-32

The email below, received in Clerks Office, is being forwarded for your information. A generic response has been sent to the sender and the item tracked in the spreadsheet.

City of Burnaby
Corporate Services
Office of the City Clerk
Phone: 604-294-7290
City of Burnaby | Office of the City Clerk
4949 Canada Way | Burnaby, BC V5G 1M2

Rez Ref # 17-28 & 17-32
Bylaw # 14162 & 14163

Our Vision: A world-class city committed to creating and sustaining the best quality of life for our entire community.

The contents of this email message are solely the writings, thoughts and/or ideas of the account holder and may not necessarily reflect those of the City of Burnaby. If you have any concerns regarding inappropriate use of this account please e-mail the postmaster@burnaby.ca

From: Rose Jorgenson-Mills [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2020 1:45 PM
To: Clerks <Clerks@burnaby.ca>
Subject: Burnaby zoning bylaw 1965 , Amendment Bylaw No. 8, 2020 - Bylaw No. 14162 Rez #17-28 PLUS REZ #17-32

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Dear Burnaby Mayor Hurley & Council:

I am writing in regard to the above requested zoning bylaw within the immediate area I live and vehemently oppose the idea of 2 new 44 storey condo buildings plus 1 – 6 storey rental apartment building as well as townhouses adjoining each massive tower.

We presently have towers in this area that exceed the ‘original’ 18-25 storey height. That has gradually increased upwards to near 35 – which is still way more than adequate for the area. Why is it necessary to go to a height of 44? Benefits are primarily realized by two sectors: developers and the Burnaby Tax Dept. Those of us living nearby will lose mountain views, sunlight will be obstructed, noise & dust levels will be constant at least 6 days per week from morning til evening , as well as

street access will be cordoned off and we will be increasingly inconvenienced during the entire construction period – more than likely upwards of 3 years!!!

This area already has numerous towers within a very limited area and as such is currently experiencing extra traffic, major issues with parking availability on the streets and on top of that we have numerous buses using these residential streets from morning til night – daily - to assist folks using the Skytrain to travel to destinations both east and west.

Presently the noise from the Skytrain alone is exasperating...(from 5:00am through to 1:40am – as well as during the night while maintenance is being done on the rails or in the actual stations)..but with more towers now on the north side of the Patterson Skytrain station we can expect even louder noise due to the echoing that will take place as it will be like an enclosed corridor for the train to pass through – between towers. Nobody advertises SKYTRAIN NOISE: INCLUDING SCREECHING!!

I think one of Mayor Hurley's election promises indicated a slowdown of development, but, as time passes, that does not appear to be the case at all.

1. when are the residents of these congested areas going to be considered?
2. when are our living conditions going to be looked at as being important?
3. When are we considered before a developer?
4. WHEN WILL THIS OVER DEVELOPPING/BUILDING CEASE????

THANK YOU FOR CONSIDERING OUR CONCERNS.... SAY **NO TO THESE PROPOSED BYLAW ZONING CHANGES AND YOU WILL HAVE MADE A GREAT NUMBER OF YOUR BURNABY TAXPAYERS HAPPY TO KNOW WE WERE & ARE BEING HEARD!!**

Listed below are 6 of those taxpayers.....

Rosanna Jorgenson-Mills	[REDACTED]	Unit 17A, 6128 Patterson Ave., Burnaby, B.C.
JOAO JOSE RAMOS CORREIA	[REDACTED]	Unit 17C, 6128 Patterson Ave., Burnaby, B.C.
Mary Huitson	[REDACTED]	Unit 27A, 6128 Patterson Ave., Burnaby, B.C.
John Ivica Bartolic	[REDACTED]	Unit 15F, 6128 Patterson Ave., Burnaby, B.C.
C. Pimentel & M. Marino.	[REDACTED]	Unit 15C, 6128 Patterson Ave., B.C.

Al Louie

2003 – 5833 Wilson Ave

Burnaby, BC V5H 4R8

Rez Ref # 17-32
Bylaw # 14163

June 16, 2020

Office of the City Clerk, Mayor and Council

4949 Canada Way

Burnaby, BC V5G 1M2

Re: Rezoning Reference #17-32 / 5977 Wilson Ave (RM3 to RM5)

To the Mayor and Council – Burnaby:

I am opposed to the plan to develop as specified in the proposed Rezoning Reference #17-32 because:

1. Scale – need Gentle Densification; not Brute-force oppressive developments
 - I am for redeveloping poorly maintained rental facilities into better quality homes.
 - The current building was NOT poorly maintained. It housed over 50+ families in affordable large suites with a wonderful grassed play/courtyard for the children.
 - The proposed 42 floor development is totally out of scale for the neighbourhood even after considering the other condos like Jewel south on Wilson.
 - Adding 350+ parking spaces (300+ cars) to the already crowded area is non-sensical when the area is 5 minutes from the Patterson SkyTrain Station. Keep these prime locations around transit hubs for commuters; not “green washed” developments. Look at the Metro-town Station Developments, there are more car owners and users in those new condos than commuters. What is going on?
2. Problematic/Risky arrangement to transfer rental units to Kathleen Street Proposal
 - Depending upon a promise to build replacement rental units at another location is weak.
 - Future promises are marginally better than wishes. There are no guarantees that these will be built. Developers have rationalized delays and cancellations of rental projects because of changing economics, fluctuations in the market, changes in their business, etc. These are all ways they can/will renege on pledges to build rental homes if it doesn't maximize their profits.
 - It is foreseeable that once they have profited from the completion and sale of these 350+ units that they will delay/cancel the project, sell the Kathleen Ave properties, and/or close the BlueSky development corporation to avoid building.
 - The developer has offered the rental homes to the former residences at the Wilson Ave site; but looking at the time lines – 1 year since the last tenant was living in the building, 3 years

to build the Wilson site, and x years for the Kathleen site – we are looking at 5+ years before these former tenants have a home. Who would wait 5+ years for a home? This is insane. The developers know that very few, if any, will accept this offer.

3. Traffic/Congestion on Wilson and Olive Avenues

- Access to the new development's parking is via the lane and through Olive Avenue.
- Olive is also the exclusive car access for the newly built condos/town-houses on Patterson.
- This will aggregate the traffic from these developments with existing pedestrian/vehicular traffic accessing Patterson Station onto residential Olive Avenue.
- What would 300+ extra cars do to the traffic in the area?

4. General on-street design

- Landscaped wide side-walks are visually very attractive much like the new Metro-town developments.
- Water features, concrete blocks, manicured micro lawns, trimmed hedges, strange art work, artistic lighting, and large glass foyers are NOT family friendly. Where do the kids play? Where do the families hang out?
- However, they don't seem to encourage community interactions as witnessed in Metro-town developments where these wide sidewalks and entrance ways are void of people.
- They are as stylish as they are empty.
- Why can't Metro-town be more like Hasting Heights, Commercial Drive, Kerrisdale, Kitsilano areas; rather than a cold and sterile glass, cement, and steel stick forests?

5. Target Unit Buyers

- 150+ single bedroom units that are not suitable for families
- Unfortunately, many of these units are more attractive to investors who exploit short term rentals via Air BnB rather than longer term rentals.
- The COVID-19 pandemic has shown us that many of the newly built units in Burnaby are purchased by investors/speculators for short-term rentals. Is this who we really want to use our land for?

How do we make this redevelopment better for the community and support private sector developers?

1. Focus on Gentle Densification

- Smaller buildings that are more human scale (not 400+ feet towers that kill community).
- 42 floors is not gentle. The other towers around the area are upto 30 floors.
- Reduce the number of parking spaces to emphasize transit rather than vehicular travel.
- Design the street level entrances to be more welcoming and less futuristic.

2. Don't allow density bonuses

- Either the bonuses are not enough or they are not effective.
- Our local public facilities are over-crowded, aging, and under-funded. Where does the money go? Are the developer payments not enough to build/sustain facilities that support the new residents? Isn't that why density bonuses are awarded? (ie: to pay for these community assets)

3. Keep Rentals on the Wilson Site

- Don't transfer the rental units to a "promised" co-development.
- We can't afford to lose affordable units on un-fulfilled promises.

4. Discourage Short Term Rentals

- The daily and weekly rental market has been a factor in driving up the demand for small single bedroom/studio units. This, in turn, has made it very profitable to speculate on land values and cause spiraling out of control rental rates.

Let's all agree to avoid the hollow platitudes of "Creating World Class City", and "Striving for the Best Quality of Life". What does it really mean? Who is really benefiting from these new developments?

We need to encourage the private sector. We need to renew our communities. We don't need excessive profiteering and speculation. We don't need massive developments that cater to one set of clients and ignore the community.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Al Louie

From: Yang Dingjun [REDACTED]
Sent: June 18, 2020 4:46 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: Rez.#17-32

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Dear madam and sie,

I received the notice f public hearing notice of Electronic meeting June23 ,2020.
Thank you.

The Rez.#17-32, applicant Blue Sky Properties Inc.

I think.

The high rise apartment building is not a clever and good plan.

There are possible problems in the future.

1. Traffic congestion nearby in the street and nearby.
2. Possible effect to residents of the 4300,4300,5866,5888 and etc. neighborhood in sunlight and view, except noise of construction effect.
3. The population density will be to high in the block.

My suggestion is 6 levels high building will be proper for The Rez.#17-32, applicant Blue Sky Properties Inc.

Thank you for your good consideration.

Best wishes,

Yours

602-5848 Olive Ave.

Yang, Ding Jun

Rez Ref # 17-32
Bylaw # 14/63

[REDACTED] 17-32
From: Stephen Mayba [REDACTED] Rez Ref #
Sent: June 21, 2020 5:56 PM Bylaw # 14163
To: Clerks
Subject: Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965, Amendment Bylaw No. 9, 2020 – Bylaw No. 14163

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email. If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

To whom it may concern:

I am writing with comments for the public hearing on Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965, Amendment Bylaw No. 9, 2020 – Bylaw No. 14163.

I acknowledge that the population of Burnaby is increasing and, in order for this to happen, it is necessary to increase population density and thus build high-rise apartment buildings.

However, I am greatly concerned about the supply of purpose-built rental housing at all price points. It is not enough to simply replace rental supply unit-for-unit in the new building. If we are building a bigger building, it should very substantially increase the supply of purpose-built rental housing at all price points.

Rental housing at All Price Points does not mean just building social housing at low price points and luxury rentals at very high price points. It is very important to cover mid-range price points as well.

It is also important to consider the housing needs of those currently living in the building. If the current residents are evicted to allow the new building to be constructed, alternative housing must be provided for them at a similar quality and price point to what they have right now while the new building is constructed.

I urge you to mandate that, if this project is approved, a very substantial percentage of it must be purpose built rental, that the new rental housing must cover all price points, and that the housing needs of the current residents of the building be guaranteed.

Thank you very much,

Stephen Mayba
207-5888 Olive Ave
Burnaby, BC V5H 2P4
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Wong, Elaine
Sent: June 21, 2020 9:08 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: Fwd: Rezoning to build high-rise buildings in place of existing mid-rise buildings

For distribution pls, thx!!!

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

Rez Ref # 17-32
Bylaw # 14163

From: Stephen Mayba [REDACTED]
Date: June 21, 2020 at 6:02:51 PM PDT
To: Mayor <Mayor@burnaby.ca>, "Calendino, Attilio Pietro" <AttilioPietro.Calendino@burnaby.ca>, "Dhaliwal, Satvinder" <Satvinder.Dhaliwal@burnaby.ca>, "Johnston, Dan" <Dan.Johnston@burnaby.ca>, "Jordan, Colleen" <Colleen.Jordan@burnaby.ca>, "Keithley, Joe" <Joe.Keithley@burnaby.ca>, "McDonell, Paul" <Paul.McDonell@burnaby.ca>, "Volkow, Nick" <Nick.Volkow@burnaby.ca>, "Wang, James" <James.Wang@burnaby.ca>
Subject: Rezoning to build high-rise buildings in place of existing mid-rise buildings

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email. If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Dear Mayor Hurley and Councillors,

I recently received a card in the mail notifying me of a public hearing on Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965, Amendment Bylaw No. 9, 2020 – Bylaw No. 14163, which intends to knock down a low rise, purpose built rental apartment building in my neighborhood and build a high-rise building in its place. I have submitted written comments on that specific zoning bylaw, but also wanted to make my views about this type of activity in general known to you.

I acknowledge that the population of Burnaby is increasing and, in order for this to happen, it is necessary to increase population density and thus build high-rise apartment buildings.

However, I am greatly concerned about the supply of purpose-built rental housing at all price points. It is not enough to simply replace rental supply unit-for-unit in the new building. If we are building a bigger building, it should very substantially increase the supply of

purpose-built rental housing at all price points.

Rental housing at All Price Points does not mean just building social housing at low price points and luxury rentals at very high price points. It is very important to cover mid-range price points as well.

It is also important to consider the housing needs of those currently living in the building. If the current residents are evicted to allow the new building to be constructed, alternative housing must be provided for them at a similar quality and price point to what they have right now while the new building is constructed.

I urge you to mandate that, if this project is approved, a very substantial percentage of it must be purpose built rental, that the new rental housing must cover all price points, and that the housing needs of the current residents of the building be guaranteed.

Thank you very much,

Stephen Mayba
207-5888 Olive Ave
Burnaby, BC V5H 2P4

Arriola, Ginger

From: Jonalyn K [REDACTED]
Sent: June 20, 2020 5:29 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: RE: June 22nd hearing for Rezoning Applications 1#17-32 and #17-28
Attachments: StrataInsuranceFindingsReport.pdf; Insurance Policy Update.pdf

Rez Ref # 17-28; 17-32
Bylaw # 14/62; 14/63

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

To the Rezoning Decision Makers,

I am adding my comments/concerns to the rezoning applications for #17-32 and #17-28 respectively.

I am **not in favour** of having these properties re-zoned for condensed housing for the reasons listed below:

1. **We are heading into a global recession with the effects of the current global pandemic of Covid-19.** There are currently more than 10 high rise builds going on in the city that are not "sold out". *Who is going to be purchasing these units in the coming years with so many job losses and a recession which goes back to WWII and the Depression in the 30's?*

2. **Skyrocketing Strata building insurance premiums and strata lot owner individual insurance premiums.**

This is the most concerning for anyone who is now thinking of buying a condo and will changing the face of the market unless major changes are made immediately which does not seem it will happen anytime soon due to:

- A. complexity of the situation on the provincial/federal/global levels of market with the insurance companies.
- B. The global pandemic hindering efficiency of work productivity.
- C. Nothing moves fast within the bureaucratic channels with all the red tape to get through, to even out this outrageous disparity. Although the federal government is looking into this, their next "report" is due out this fall. (Attached document).

Case in point:

My husband and I received our new strata building insurance:

The building's water damage premium is also \$1,000,000.00 yes, you read that correctly.

Our new **yearly building premium is \$1,000,060.00**. Therefore we have been informed of a 7% increase in strata fees this year and a special levy for the 2020-2021 and the 2021-2022 years for our 1178 sq ft strata lot in the amount of \$7744.00 EACH year to cover these costs or \$6.58 per square foot. At this time, there are going to be retired seniors in my building and young new families who are not going to be able to afford these increases.

The maximum amount of insurance coverage some of us in the building have been able to find for the water damage premium of \$1,000,000.00 is a maximum of \$250,000.00. This would leave a homeowner on the hook for \$750,000.00 to pay out of pocket for the rest of the premium. Our condo was assessed at \$724,000.00 this year. One water leak to pay for would render the value of our home to **zero**. **This is a very scary thought**. Or we skip paying the premium and pay out of pocket which will still be financially devastating. With my reduced income, we are now going to have to take a loan out of the bank as we cannot afford to pay all this money out in a short period of time. This does not help me save for my retirement as I have no pension with my job.

This does not bode well for the developers and potential buyers, especially the young families and aging baby boomer generation who are already downsizing and will be looking to downsize in the coming 10-15 years. Who is going to want to buy a condo now with these skyrocketing premiums? The City of Burnaby and the developers need to pay attention.

Water leaks are the number one claim. The challenge to get the pendulum to swing in the other direction of curbing potential water leaks is up against:

-Offshore investors who only buy and do not take the time to educate their renters to important responsibilities of certain parts of maintenance such as keeping the silicone seam around the top of the bathtub completely intact and getting it replaced before it starts to break down (this is one of the top scenarios of water leaks in a high rise).

-Renters who "don't care" because "it's someone else's"

-Our multi cultural demographic who do not have English as a first language and also do not take the time/make the effort to understand the rules/bylaws of living in building with a strata community. I was on council the first 6 years at my building and we had home owners always claiming they "didn't know" because they "didn't speak English". We had many fights from homeowners who wanted to claim on the strata's insurance when it was clearly their fault.

-Basic human psychology, "out of sight, out of mind"

Suggestions:

Developers to get involved in the conversation with the insurance brokers and insurance companies in regards to these outrageously unsustainable premiums, contribute ideas and suggestions on how to make this healthy and sustainable for all involved.

If condos are going to be built. There should be water sensors installed in the individual units at the washer/dryer, dishwasher, bathrooms with automatic shut offs.


New language to new buyers into strata buildings to clearly communicate whatever the first language may be of the importance of and responsibility of being part of the community as far as maintenance goes for the "greater good" of all who live in the building and the very negative impacts that get created when one only thinks of themselves and thinks that "strata will pay for it" not connecting the dots they are **part of** the strata.

There is a long way to go and it's time to focus on getting this insurance mess sorted out before more condo builds are approved. At the current trajectory with the outrageous insurance premiums, buying a condo is fast becoming a "bad investment".

I have attached a copy of my new insurance policy update and the letter from the minister of finance.

It would be nice to see the City of Burnaby show some support to it's taxpayers instead of all the developers who have more than filled the city's coffers.

Sincerely,

Jonilyn Greene




BC FINANCIAL
SERVICES AUTHORITY

Honourable Carole James
Minister of Finance and Deputy Premier

Ref. No.: 0616

June 16, 2020

Dear Minister:

RE: BC Strata Property Insurance Market – Interim Findings

BC Financial Services Authority (BCFSA) is pleased to report its interim findings on the strata insurance market in British Columbia (BC). At the direction of the Province, BCFSA, as the financial services regulator, initiated inquiries with the insurance sector this year to determine the cause of market pricing changes. In this report, which provides the first in-depth analysis of the issue throughout BC, we offer our interim findings and observations.

Over the coming weeks, BCFSA will be engaging further with stakeholders to explore and further validate its interim findings including the various causes along with possible regulatory and industry solutions. The final report is expected to be released in the fall of 2020.

Our findings to date indicate the following:

- Premiums have risen on average by approximately 40 per cent across the province over the past year while deductibles have increased up to triple-digits over the same period. (50 per cent in Metro Vancouver)
- Price pressures will continue. Buildings considered to be higher risk are expected to face the most significant increases as well as the possibility of not being able to obtain full, or in rare cases any, insurance coverage.
- Insurers are incurring losses mostly from minor claims (particularly those resulting from water damage) due to poor building maintenance practices and initial construction quality issues.
- Methods used to construct a strata policy also seem to be resulting in higher premiums for some properties, especially for those that are higher risk.
- New building construction, building material changes, and rising replacement costs have put further strain on industry profitability.
- Excessive exposure to earthquake risk in British Columbia has prompted insurers to reduce the amount of strata insurance they offer in the province.
- There is not enough capacity in the strata insurance market to support future expected demand.

Overall, in our opinion, the state of the strata insurance market in BC is “unhealthy”. That is, a market that fails to meet the goals of sustainability, affordability and availability. Our findings also show that all the participants involved in this market have a role to play to return it to a healthy state.

The Strata Insurance Market in British Columbia

Strata insurance in BC is provided by private sector, for-profit insurers, most of whom operate on a global basis. Their size and scope give them the capability to provide insurance for the largest of risks including strata insurance. The number of insurers providing significant capacity (in other words, those that make the market by “offering” strata insurance in BC) is limited to nine or ten companies and are mainly headquartered outside Canada. Other insurers provide limited capacity on a risk by risk basis.

Strata insurance is written on a subscription policy basis. That is, each insurer subscribes to a percentage of the risk that they are prepared to accept on each property. Insurers mostly work with specialized insurance brokers who understand strata insurance and the needs of strata corporations.

There are three main brokers in the strata insurance market in BC. These brokers have developed their own special programs aimed at strata insurance. The brokers obtain most of their business from strata property managers acting on behalf of the strata corporations. If a broker is unable to fully insure a property with the insurers it normally works with, it may seek out coverage from speciality providers. Insurers are not obligated to provide strata insurance.

In BC, strata insurance generates approximately \$300 million in premiums and covers well in excess of \$100 billion of insured property value. It is mandatory insurance under the *Strata Property Act* (SPA) and must provide full replacement value of the common property and common assets of the strata corporation. ~~The insurance does not cover the individual strata units which owners need to cover under an individual policy.~~ Earthquake coverage is not required under the SPA, but it is often included in strata property coverage. Strata corporations that choose not to purchase earthquake coverage are still covered for fire damage following an earthquake. ~~An estimated 1.5 million residents live in strata properties in BC and properties can range from under \$1 million to over \$200 million in insured value.~~

~~Strata insurance can impact housing affordability for both homeowners and renters and the cost of individual homeowners’ condominium insurance. Lack of availability can place both at risk in the event of a loss.~~

BCFSA is the regulatory agency responsible for overseeing private sector insurance companies who operate in the province. BCFSA works to protect consumers by ensuring insurers are solvent, they engage in appropriate business practices, and monitor the suitability of insurers in the province. ~~Rates in the private sector insurance market are determined by the insurers and are not rate regulated.~~ BCFSA works with other regulators involved in the insurance market in BC and in Canada.

Insurance regulation in Canada is a shared responsibility:

- Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions (OSFI) is the federal regulator for solvency and sets capital requirements for most insurers in the strata insurance market;

- The Insurance Council of BC (Insurance Council) regulates insurance agents, brokers and adjusters in the province;
- And, Canadian Council of Insurance Regulators (CCIR) is an association of provincial insurance company regulators from across Canada. The members work together on common issues.

Strata Insurance Inquiries

In February 2020, at the request of the Province, BCFSa initiated inquiries under section 213 of the *Financial Institutions Act*. Working with the three major brokers and with the larger insurers in the strata insurance market, inquiries were aimed at obtaining data and other information regarding the pricing increases and the lack of availability. Detailed information on this specific market is not normally collected as part of regulatory filings. The data calls were representative sample based, designed to draw broad market observations of the strata insurance industry in BC.

Strata Insurance Increases

BCFSa's interim findings indicate an average increase of 40 per cent year-over-year to strata insurance premiums province-wide and a 50 per cent increase in Metro Vancouver.

BCFSa's findings show a majority (54 per cent) of strata properties experienced a premium increase of less than 30 per cent compared to premiums the previous year. 31 per cent of strata properties captured by our data call saw increases in the 30 – 50 per cent range, 9 per cent of properties faced year-over-year increases of 50 – 100 per cent, and 6 per cent of properties saw strata insurance premium increases in excess of 100 per cent compared to the previous year.

Strata Insurance Losses

BCFSa's interim findings indicate a convergence of local and global factors that are driving up the cost of strata insurance in British Columbia. The data that has been gathered provides a picture of increasing strata insurance costs and an interim view of the many complex and underlying factors at play on a provincial, national and global level, from rising property values to earthquake risk.

Data suggests that insurers have struggled with sustaining profitability in the strata insurance market due to losses from mostly minor claims. A key metric of profitability is the combined ratio which measures how much an insurer pays out for losses and expenses in relation to the premium it earned. A combined ratio of 100 per cent or above represents a loss for insurers, a combined ratio of less than 100 per cent represents a profit. The average reported combined ratio was just over 100 per cent in 2019, close to 100 per cent in 2018 and over 100 per cent for 2017. Insurers have adjusted premiums and deductibles in an attempt to return to a profitability. Insurers are also being more selective in the risks they write. Given the insurers operate nationally and most globally, if they do not believe they can achieve profitability in the strata insurance market in BC, they may exit the market completely, making it much harder or impossible to obtain this insurance for British Columbians.

A key driver of those losses is water damage from plumbing leaks and failures. This accounted for approximately 46 per cent of the total claim costs since 2017 (56 per cent alone in 2018). The average

amount paid per water claim is relatively minor, approximately \$3,350 after the deductible. The number of water damage claims peaked in 2018 at over 11,000 separate claims, accounting for about 70 per cent of total direct claims. The data gathered suggests that strata insurance has been used to fill the gaps where proper, ongoing maintenance practices have not been implemented.

Insurers have also focused on new buildings as being of higher risk. The data sample indicated average claims cost for buildings less than five-years-old was \$18,000 compared to \$10,000 for all ages. This may be a result of strata insurers absorbing costs that could be covered under the new home warranty programs. Claims are being directed to strata insurance, in part due to uncertainty as to whether the new home warranty will cover the loss.

It is often unclear whether the cause of the loss was from a construction defect or poor maintenance. Industry raised questions regarding lack of clarity over what forms part of an individual strata unit, and the uncertainty that new home warranty covers consequential damage due to poor construction. Strata insurers are now appearing to be more reluctant to insure new buildings less than five-years-old. Other buildings being heavily scrutinized include those that are less fire resistant, older buildings, and buildings that have poor maintenance records.

Strata Insurance Capacity

Another fundamental issue identified is the lack of capacity (or the supply of the insurance) to serve the market adequately. It is quite possible that capacity will contract further rather than increase.

Insurers cannot provide capacity without reinsurance support. That is, their capital alone is not sufficient for the amount of risk insurers are exposed to in BC. The excess capital of the insurers we sampled is approximately \$2.5 billion compared to the over \$100 billion of strata property value they insure. Insurers manage this risk by purchasing reinsurance, whereby other companies purchase portions of an insurer's risk portfolio. The insurers sampled are currently ceding approximately 96 per cent of their Canadian earthquake risk to reinsurers. Insurers typically buy reinsurance at the corporate level for their overall risks. Reinsurance costs have been increasing globally and are likely to increase further due to the global increase in the frequency and amount of losses from catastrophic events and from new earthquake risk research.

Global reinsurers have identified BC as a high-risk market and the costs for reinsurance is affecting corporate decisions on where to allocate their capital. Choices made by insurers on capital allocation and market participation are being made on a global basis and often by head offices outside Canada. There is pressure to reduce the exposure to BC earthquake risk and improve profitability. Without solutions that reduce insurers' exposure to earthquake risk, there will not be enough capacity to support demand.

Method to Construct Strata Policies

While the above noted factors provide justification for some strata insurance premium increases, BCFSAs has also identified a concern around a method used to construct strata policies that it wants to further

explore. In a contract involving a number of insurers each insuring a portion of risk, standardized terms that apply to all participating insurers are needed in order for that contract to work. To create this standardization of terms, a method known as *Best Terms Pricing* is used by industry.

When each insurer quotes on a strata property, it sets out the amount of risk it is prepared to accept (participation percentage) and a rate charge (price per insured dollar). The quotes from all the insurers involved form the basis of the insurance premium paid by strata homeowners. The quotes are conditional quotes, based on all the insurers receiving the same terms. Instead of the premium being set by the quote of each insurer, or by an average of all quotes, under *Best Terms Pricing* the final price is set by the highest rate quoted by any of the insurers on the policy.

The method of determining prices is used across the country for strata and some other types of commercial insurance. However, its impact seems to be compounded in a market where capacity is scarce, and insurers are highly selective on risk. This can lead to an increase in the spread between average bids and the highest bids, which results in higher prices. This pricing method is believed to be a factor in why a number of the properties in BC have experienced significant premium increases. As part of its upcoming engagement with stakeholders, BCFSa will be exploring *Best Terms Pricing* to better understand its impacts not only on pricing (positive and negative) but also on capacity in BC.

Conclusion – Unhealthy Market

A healthy market is one that meets the goals of sustainability, affordability and availability. It is a market where consumers' needs are met by products and innovation made readily available and affordably priced and where customers are treated fairly. The supply of insurance is stable and sustainable.

The current unhealthy state of the BC strata insurance market is not fulfilling the needs of British Columbians, nor is it profitable for the insurance industry. All participants involved in this market have a role to play to return it to a healthy state. BCFSa intends to undertake further consultations with stakeholders in the market to look at what can be done to improve the overall state of the market.

BCFSa looks forward to providing its final report in the fall of 2020.

Regards,

Blair Morrison
Chief Executive Officer

cc: The Honourable Selina Robinson,
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

March 26, 2020

**NOTICE TO ALL OWNERS & RESIDENTS,
STRATA PLAN BCS 1058, THE PRESIDIA**

STRATA CORPORATION INSURANCE POLICY-UPDATE

It is important to report that the strata corporation's insurance policy for BCS 1058, terms have been received from BFL Canada and accepted by Strata Council as of March 25, 2020.

Due to the claim's history, and the value of BCS 1058, the premiums are higher than anticipated. There was no other option for the Strata Council but to accept the terms; in accordance with the *Strata Property Act* Section 149 (4), the strata corporation must insure the property on the basis of full replacement value.

149. Property insurance required for strata corporation

- (4) The property insurance must
- (a) be on the basis of full replacement value, and
- (b) insure against major perils, as set out in the regulations, and any other perils specified in the bylaws.

The renewal terms accepted is \$1,000,060.00, which at this time the Strata Council will finance the premium with BFL Canada at 0% and payments will be paid through the Contingency Reserve Fund.

The strata corporation's insurance deductibles have changed and are now:

Lock & Key	\$2,500
Sewer Backup	\$1,000,000
Water Damage	\$1,000,000
Earthquake (Annual Aggregate)	15% As Per Limit of Liability
Flood (Annual Aggregate)	\$250,000 As Per Limit of Liability

Once the COVID-19 has passed and Government has removed restrictions for social gatherings, an Annual General Meeting will be called to approve the 2020-2021 operating budget and finalize the insurance payments.

All owners should be purchasing their own personal homeowner's insurance! One of the coverages included in a condominium unit owner's policy is deductible assessment coverage, which covers a responsible unit owner for the deductible amount when the strata corporation assess it back following a loss. Most strata unit owner insurance policies include some form of deductible assessment coverage, but each owner should check with their personal insurance representative to ensure that they have an appropriate limit of coverage for this potential exposure. Care should be taken to ensure that your strata corporation bylaws properly allow the deductible to be charged back to responsible unit owners following a claim.

[REDACTED]

From: Clerks
Sent: June 23, 2020 8:49 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: public hearing 6705 & 6731 Wilson Avenue

Rez Ref # 17-28
Bylaw # 17-32
14/62 & 14/63

From: Chi Ying [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 9:33 PM
To: Clerks <Clerks@burnaby.ca>
Subject: public hearing 6705 & 6731 Wilson Avenue

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Hello

I have the following questions to the city and the developers and builders:

Hot water issues are frequent in high rises due to mechanical and parts problems as well as huge usage daily by hundreds of residents. How you would resolve this long-standing problem by considering alternatives such as installing tankless hot water heater?

Water damage is very frequent in high rises leading to big hikes of insurance premium for owners and for strata as well as tense neighbour relationship and inconvenience and financial losses. One of the factors is the builders and developers neglect to build barriers between floors when there are openings for sewage and pipelines as well as barriers between the common walls of different apartment units. How would you prevent and reduce water damage?

Break in incidents are very frequent in high risers. Strata has to pay for new security features for parking gates, for locker rooms, for building entrances. Would you complete the building and areas with up to date strong security, not just the minimum?

Pets are common. Please designate dog parks in this part of the city.

Prostitution and drug trafficking and short term accommodations and smoking are persistent issues in high risers particularly those new buildings with no rental restrictions. How would you prevent these issues so residents can have peace and safety in their homes.

Please submit these concerns to the public hearing on June 23, 2020.

Kind regards
Chi Ying

Al Louie

2003 – 5833 Wilson Ave

Burnaby, BC V5H 4R8

June 23, 2020

Office of the City Clerk, Mayor and Council

4949 Canada Way

Burnaby, BC V5G 1M2

Rez Ref #

Bylaw #

17-28, 17-32, 19-42
14162, 14163, 14170

Re: Addressing Condo Insurance Cost Increases in New Condos Rezoning Reference #17-28, #17-32, #17-42

To the Mayor and Council – Burnaby:

As a condo owner and resident of Burnaby, I am concerned that the rush to build large out-of-scale condo towers in Burnaby will NOT be the solution for affordable quality housing (rather new development seems to be causing land speculation and housing price increases). Affordability = purchase price + operational/maintenance costs.

Let's talk about operational and maintenance costs:

1. Larger developments = more costly operational and maintenance costs

Logically, one would think that spreading the cost of ops/maintenance over greater number of people would be less costly.

Reality, costs are higher per unit to fix "normal" problems like plumbing and windows in high-rises. The "higher you go, the higher the costs".

2. Initial Monthly Strata fees don't appear to reflect reality

Low initial monthly strata fees are very attractive incentive for purchasing a unit. Do they accurately reflect the longer term monthly strata fees?

3. Strata Insurance Increases

The Wednesday June 11, 2020 the Globe And Mail article titled "Report Examines BCs condo insurance conundrum" – Frances Bula writes

"Condo owners faced with skyrocketing insurance premiums for their buildings and massive deductible costs are stuck in an "unhealthy" insurance market that is likely to get worse, a report by the government oversight agency says"

"...average of 50 percent increase in insurance premiums over the past year... Deductibles have risen to more than \$100,000 in many cases.."

1/2

"... insurers are incurring losses mostly from minor claims ... due to poor building maintenance practises and initial construction quality issues..."

"Mr. Gioventu [Condominium Home Owners Association of BC] said ... 'it's the larger buildings with more units that have had the biggest problems... It's overwhelmingly the number with 50 units or more that had the significant increases.'"

Have these developers considered addressing the factors that might affect insurance coverage: water damage due to piping (do the units have individual shut-offs; moisture sensors; facilities that may contribute to future water problems ie pools), exterior rain membrane (floor to ceiling windows are problematic), etc.

Before the start of any construction, this is the best time when these things should be addressed. Do larger developments really make more sense than smaller simpler developments that fit the neighbourhood better and are less costly to maintain.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Al Louie



Reinhard Schauer
5868 Olive Avenue #201
Burnaby, BC V5H 2P4

June 23, 2020

City of Burnaby
Office of the City Clerk
4949 Canada Way
Burnaby, BC V5G 1M2

Rez Ref # 17-32
Bylaw # 1462
19-42
14164

Opposition to Metrotown Rezoning Applications #19-42 (Kathleen Av) and #17-32 (Wilson Av)

Dear council:

I wish to express my opposition to the following related Metrotown rezoning applications in Central Park East:

- Rez #17-32; 5977 Wilson Avenue; 42-Storey Strata High-Rise Apartment Building with Townhouses
- Rez #19-42; 5970, 5986, and 5994 Kathleen Avenue; 34-Storey Rental High-Rise Apartment Building

On demand of neighborhood residents, Councillor Keithley and Urban Planner Johannes Schumann organized a neighborhood meeting on June 16, 2020, allowing people to comment on these two intertwined rezoning applications on Kathleen and Wilson. I want to thank both to hear out raw emotions at times. I encourage other councillors to make this difficult journey to Metrotown from time to time as it will put their decision into a concrete context.

The number of issues brought forward were too many to be covered here in detail. I trust both representatives of the city have accumulated their own notes. In general, the main concerns revolved around a lack of prior neighborhood consultation and the loss of livability due to the ultra-densification of the area. Some of the issues I heard include:

- a) a homeowner whose land directly borders the subject site reported that she was hardly consulted about the planned development.
- b) participants were shocked to hear about the city's larger plan to redevelop that stretch of land on Kathleen with four high-rise buildings, each likely with 300 units or more; some deplored the lack of a comprehensive, holistic areal plan that should be offered to the public as part of a rezoning application;

- c) the 42-storey tower on 5977 Wilson Avenue and the planned 34 high-rise towers on Kathleen Avenue are not in line with the envisioned character of Central Park East, which the Metrotown Plan describes as follows: “... *the scale of development should be softened leading to Central Park to respect the neighbourhoods park-side nature. ... Future high-density multi-family developments east of Central Park are intended to have a tranquil parklike neighbourhood character.*”
- d) the existing pocket parks on Kathleen with 100-year-old cedars will be sacrificed to accommodate the proposed density;
- e) the high density of the envisioned development does not allow for sufficient green space between the street and the building; apparently green space will be provided only for tenants on the 3rd floor;
- f) the high number of minimum sized 1-bedrooms at a ratio of 44% is excessive, invoking livability concerns; those units are typically populated by more than 1 person, making physical distancing and work-from-home scenarios impossible;
- g) the density offset deal appears bad; city does not offer a publicly available analysis that the value generated from the density offset, the ownership of the non-market units, and associated grants is in line with the cost of the development;
- h) the existing rental building on 5977 Wilson Avenue has been empty for about two years; due to this strategy of emptying rental buildings long before the adoption of a rezoning, in practice hardly anyone will be able to take advantage of aspects of Burnaby’s Tenant Assistance Policy;
- i) a council member’s lobbying effort at a recent council meeting to “reciprocate” for the developer’s patience and to move the rezoning forward “reasonably well” was called out as inappropriate; some people questioned the intent of moving forward with a controversial rezoning during these challenging times of physical distancing, especially in the absence of prior intense consultation with the neighborhood.

In my opinion, the City of Burnaby’s process of public hearings is insufficient for citizens to be heard effectively on matters of housing, which became glaringly clear in this case. The City’s continued practice of bundling multiple rezoning applications in the same town center into a single public hearing further complicates communication. For a variety of reasons, Burnaby residents need an independent, trusted entity with both the knowledge and the background to present concerns on matters of housing to city staff and council. Councillor Keithley ran on an election platform that included an *Independent Housing Ombudsperson Office*. I believe such an office would be of great value to improve communication to that effect.

Sincerely,

Reinhard Schauer

Burnaby City Council Public Hearing Tuesday, 2020 June 23 at 5PM Electronically.

The following proposed amendments to "Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965".

3. Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965, Amendment Bylaw No. 9, 2020 - Bylaw No. 14163

Rez. #17-32

5977 Wilson Avenue

From: RM3 Multiple Family Residential District

To: CD Comprehensive Development District (based on the RM5s Multiple Family Residential District, RM5r Multiple Family Residential District and Metrotown Downtown Plan as guidelines and in accordance with the development plan entitled "5977 Wilson Avenue" prepared by Gensler Architects, CDA Inc., and PSF Studio Landscape Architecture)

Purpose: to permit the construction of a high-rise apartment building with townhouses oriented towards Wilson Avenue and a proposed public east-west neighbourhood linkage.

Applicant: Blue Sky Properties Inc.

Why is there NO,

Sustainable Density is Affordable: 5 - 8 Storey. 60 - 96 units/acre.

Arthur Erickson lay a 55 storey high-rise horizontally: Law Courts Seven Storey Oasis. Gothenburg, Sweden, the "World's Most Sustainable Destination", with up to: 80% five (5) to eight (8) storey apartments / condos. Up to 20% single family houses. Based on TOD: Transit Oriented Design. Density supports Electric Transit. Less crime.

Mid-rise is defined by both its construction in concrete and its electric safety elevator required for buildings over six storeys high.

Seven and Eight storey Residential buildings are Mid-rise buildings.

Five, Six storey low-rise and Seven, Eight storey mid-rise have Sustainable Density that is Affordable for TOD Transit Oriented Design with Electric Transit.

proposed for this Amendment Bylaw?

Regards,
G. Pettipas
436 - 7th Street
New Westminster, BC

3/3

Dear Burnaby Mayor Mike Hurley and Council: Open Letter.

Sustainable Density is Affordable: 5 - 8 Storey. 60 - 98 units/acre.

Arthur Erickson lay a 55 storey high-rise horizontally: Law Courts Seven Storey Oasis. Gothenburg, Sweden, the "World's Most Sustainable Destination", with up to:

80% five (5) to eight (8) storey apartments / condos. Up to 20% single family houses.

Based on TOD: Transit Oriented Design. Density supports Electric Transit. Less crime.

Why does Burnaby say it is "Building Sustainable Neighbourhoods for everyone" when elementary school Math proves exactly the opposite? It looks worse than Pruett-Igoe.

~40% **SUBSIDY** unsustainable Single Family houses, up to 85% of Burnaby housing.

~10-30% **SUBSIDY** unsustainable 3 storey apartment/condo/townhouse housing ~15%.

~40%+ **SUBSIDY** 2017 Chicago Study shows unsustainable high-rise "**high density living worse for environment than suburban sprawl**". TAD: Transit Adjacent Design. Density Too High or low for Transit reduces service. Increases cars, crime, and poverty.

SUBSIDY: City of Niagara On The Lake: "For every **dollar** the city receives in **Single Family house** property Tax assessment it **costs** the city **\$1.40** to **service**." J. Diamond, architect

1,000 people on 39 acre sprawl, 10 single family houses per acre, is NOT Sustainable.

Up to 85% of Metro Vancouver is Unsustainable 10 Single Family houses per acre or less; up to 15% is unsustainable three storey wood frame apartment/condo/townhouse.

1. Burnaby: Prop. Tax: 3.1804% + \$1,275 avg. Utility rate: \$1 million **house**: \$33,079.

SUBSIDY: \$33,079. x 40% = **\$13,231**. Paid by every Taxpayer / Renter in Canada.

SUBSIDY: City of Chicago, USA: 2017: Sustainable Housing Study. "**Living in a high-rise tower in the city is much less environmentally sustainable than moving to a house in the suburbs and adding to the urban sprawl**", a shocking new study has found. The three-year US study shows that apartment dwellers consume more energy, spend more of their time travelling and use their cars more.

The study, *Downtown High-Rise vs Suburban Low-Rise Living*, minutely examined the lifestyles, movements and energy bills and usage of 249 households living in high-rise towers in the city of Chicago. At the same time, it collected the equivalent data for 273 households residing in houses in the suburb of Oak Park, 11 kilometres from the CBD (commercial business district), and compared the two. Most of the houses in the study were large, wooden-framed and, on average, 98 years old."

High-rises consume **27%** more energy to operate, use **49%** more energy to construct per sq. m or **72%** more per person, High-rise residents spend **11%** more time travelling, own more cars, and travel **9%** further than people in suburbs. City water use 37% less.

2. Burnaby: Prop. Tax: 3.1804% + \$355 avg. Utility rate: \$1 million **condo**: \$32,159.

SUBSIDY: \$32,159. x 40% = **\$12,863**, needs REVIEW, since Roads, Sewers, and Transit will ALL be Paid by every Taxpayer / Renter in Canada. "Only the City water connection fee is paid by those profiting from High-rise construction." Jack Diamond, architect

SUBSIDY: It costs **\$26.6** million for eight (8) Skytrain cars to service one 45+ storey High-Rise, or over \$2 Billion for two High-Rises at each of the Expo / Millennium Line Stations. But, Skytrain can't carry that many people even at full track capacity. The \$2+ Billion **SUBSIDY** does not include DIEsel buses to get everywhere else.

Dear Burnaby Mayor Mike Hurley and Council: Open Letter.

Sustainable Density is Affordable: 5 - 8 Storey. 60 - 96 units/acre.

Arthur Erickson lay a 55 storey high-rise horizontally: Law Courts Seven Storey Oasis. Gothenburg, Sweden, the "World's Most Sustainable Destination", with up to: 80% five (5) to eight (8) storey apartments / condos. Up to 20% single family houses. Based on TOD: Transit Oriented Design. Density supports Electric Transit. Less crime.

Mid-rise is defined by both its construction in concrete and its electric safety elevator required for buildings over six storeys high.

Seven and Eight storey Residential buildings are Mid-rise buildings.

Five, Six storey low-rise and Seven, Eight storey mid-rise have Sustainable Density that is Affordable for TOD Transit Oriented Design with Electric Transit.

Low-rise is defined by both its construction in wood and its hydraulic elevator limit of six storeys.

SUBSIDY Low-rise with four (4) floors or less does not have Sustainable Density but at "30 units per acre at market rate you can afford (bus) Transit". Jack Diamond, architect

SUBSIDY: City of Niagara On The Lake: "For every **dollar** the city receives in **Single Family house** property Tax assessment it **costs** the city **\$1.40** to **service**." J. Diamond, architect

SUBSIDY Single Family houses, 39 acre suburban sprawl for 360 houses, 10 units per acre is too low for Transit, and costs about 40% more for City to service than the City receives in Property Taxes.

High-rise is defined (Skyscraper Museum of NY) as a building over 75 feet, 22.9m high. Nine (9) storey Residential building and higher.

High-rise term famously made by New York architect Cass Gilbert "a high-rise is a building that makes the land pay".

Arriola, Ginger

From: Richard Cordner <richard@geekazoid.net>
Sent: June 23, 2020 3:22 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965 Amendment No 9 Rez#17-32

Rez Ref # 17-32

Bylaw # 14163

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Thank you for notifying us of the Public Hearing regarding this construction site.

These are the questions I have for the council regarding this project:

Intro/Context

I have resided in Burnaby since 2009. I have been displaced once already from my apartment on Dunblane Ave. This construction project is a source of great anxiety for me and my neighbors.

While there are major issues around displacement of renters and the gentrification of our neighborhood, I want to focus on the specific harm this construction will have on me and how Burnaby can mitigate this impact.

- 1. These large structures bring extended periods of construction which includes noise and dust and exhaust fumes from diesel concrete trucks. What are the specific timelines that these major disturbances will be occurring?**
- 2. How is the city measuring and monitoring the impacts to air quality and noise pollution from this project? This problem is exacerbated by Covid19. Has that been factored in to the timeline of the project? How is the city going to help us manage these fumes and dust and keep them out of our homes? I've investigated filtering the air entering our suite but there are hard costs to this and maintenance.**
- 3. There will inevitably be direct and indirect costs as well as a negative impact to the peaceful enjoyment that residents in adjacent buildings will experience. How is this large capital investment project going to compensate neighboring renters for this disturbance?**

My last question is rhetorical, but it is the major concern on my mind, when am I going to lose my home to demoviction for the second time in Burnaby?

Thank-you,
Richard Cordner 5888 Olive Ave