

From: David Sanguinetti "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2017 4:26 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Comments re. Public Hearing for 3681 Victoria Dr. & 1915 Stainsbury

Dear Council,

We are writing regarding the application for a development at 3681 Victoria and 1915 Stainsbury. As a general rule, we are supportive of increasing the rental stock in Vancouver, and from an aesthetic perspective we expect that the proposed development will be a reasonable fit with its location. That being said we have two concerns with specific aspects of it:

1) Space in local schools. This development is in the English and French catchments of Lord Selkirk School. Even before the recent reduction in maximum class sizes, Lord Selkirk was full and had to eliminate its computer room in order to add an extra classroom. Since the reduction in maximum class sizes, Selkirk has been turning away students for kindergarten in both English and French, forcing families to send their children to schools in other catchment areas. As a result, these children are being driven to school instead of being able to walk. When we brought this up with city planners at the open houses regarding this development, they were unaware of the problem: there is apparently no channel for communication between the school board's planning team and the city's, or if there is it isn't being used. The obvious irony here is that there are schools in East Vancouver that are so underutilized that they have been threatened with closure, yet the city is encouraging development of family-friendly apartments in the catchment of a school that is over-crowded. It is also rather unfortunate that the city is creating a situation that will force parents to drive their children to school, at the same time as it is working towards its "Greenest City 2020" goals.

2) Ability to work where you live. One of the best ways to reduce traffic congestion and create a green city is for people to be able to work close to where they live. This development will take away industrial (i.e. working) space and not add any other work space in its stead. In the initial iterations of the development there was a small number of live-work spaces included in the proposal, but they have since been reduced. In the immediate neighbourhood (one block away on Commercial St.), there are a growing number of artisans setting up shop. It would be in keeping with the neighbourhood to add additional space for more artisans & craftspeople, as well as live-work space for others who are in need of such space. This would at least somewhat reduce the number of people who are commuting out of the neighbourhood and increase the number who live near where they work.

In summary, we believe that the location in question is not suitable for family-oriented rental stock due to the lack of available space in the local school. If the industrial work location is going to be lost, it would be appropriate to add other work space, whether artisans' workshops, live-work spaces, or both, and add rental housing appropriate for individuals and couples rather than families with children.

Sincerely,

David and Valerie Sanguinetti

From: Ryan Lermittle "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential)"
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2017 4:54 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Public Hearing 11/14/17 - REZONING: 3681 Victoria Drive and 1915 Stainsbury Avenue

Council,

We do support increased housing and density in Vancouver.

The concerns we have with this development is how it will affect the laneway that is used by The Works, The Porter, the proposed development, and a number of businesses along Commercial St.

The proposed development and subsequent laneway change is concerning for the following reasons:

- The turning radius with no buffer from the lane to our parkade would be almost a 180 blind turn/corner making it difficult for cars of any size to do that turn safely.
- It would pose a safety risk for residents using the parkade exit to be entering the lane at such a blind spot as cars go much faster than they should in a confined alley space.
- The demo of the Danica building will expose our NE side. We are asking for the developer to build a fence that will provide security and safety to our residents, especially with a substantial grade change in play.
- In the laneway, cars regularly park too close to sidewalk ramps making it difficult for people with strollers, wheelchairs, and anyone with mobility challenges to navigate the walk to Trout Lake Park. Additionally, trucks from businesses along Commercial st block the alleyway on Porter St. Increasing the amount of cars with the proposed development will further intensify the problem. We ask for increased bylaw enforcement to remove vehicles that create an unsafe roadway situation.

Thank you for your consideration as you analyze this proposed development.

Sincerely,
Ryan & Tracy Lermittle

--
Current Projects:

DAD - raising the next generation of adventurous gentlemen

Umbrella Property Services - carbon neutral cleaning systems

Light Knights - reducing seasonal lighting energy use by 90%

Creek 2 Peak - a quad crushing adventure race

New Hope Society - supporting refugee claimants through housing, employment, and community



From: Shelagh Kitney "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential)"
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2017 8:09 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 3681 Victoria Drive & 1915 Stainsbury Ave - Nov 14 2017

Hello City of Vancouver Council,

I am a resident and owner at "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential)" next to the proposed development at 3681 Victoria Drive and 1915 Stainsbury Avenue.

After reviewing the Revised Rezoning Application on the website I would like to make my comments for the public hearing on November 14th.

My main concern is with the relocation of the lane connecting to Stainsbury Ave, for 2 reasons in particular.

The first is that a pedestrian gate that provides an entry/exit between our complex and the laneway is immediately next to the current building at 1915 Stainsbury and beside that gate is the vehicle entry/exit for our parking garage.

I am very concerned about how close both of those exits are to the corner of the existing laneway and the laneway proposed in the plans. Primarily about the sightlines and blindspot that would be created with the proposed laneway changes. These exits are used regularly by many of the residents at "The Works", including some of the very young children in our complex, on foot, in cars, on bicycles and scooters and it's hard to imagine that any of them would be seen well enough by cars that would be driving in the laneway in the direction from Stainsbury Ave to Porter Ave.

Also, when exiting the parking garage, I am not certain, even with my relatively small car, that I would be able to safely make the right hand turn from my parking garage towards Stainsbury Ave, as I currently do, due to what looks like a very tight turning radius and being unable to view cars or pedestrians using the lane that I can see in the proposed plans. Or for that matter, enter our garage when driving in from Stainsbury Ave. Forcing, in a way, our residents to always use the Porter Street laneway to access the street. It is currently not a good option as parking in the laneway, deliveries to local businesses, and 2 buildings on Victoria diversion that have their parking garage entry/exits on that laneway, make this a very congested route with sometimes very poor visibility.

Also the laneway is heavily used by pedestrians, as the quickest way to Victoria drive for access to Trout Lake Community Centre, John Hendry Park and the #20 Bus. Not only from residents of our complex but from residents of neighboring streets and even groups of kids from local schools and childcare centers.

My other concern is also in regards to the proposed change for the laneway.

A portion of the courtyard as well as the stairs leading down to our parking garage and pedestrian access to the laneway are directly beside the existing building at 1915 Stainsbury. With the building down and a laneway in it's place, we would be left with a completely open space directly onto the lane.

Our complex is full of young kids who play all over the courtyard, including on the stairs. In place of the wall for 1915 Stainsbury, we would definitely need a strong, durable fence with enough height to ensure the security of our complex as well as the safety of any residents using that area.

Sincerely,







Castro, Maria

From: Paul Bennett "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential)"
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2017 11:26 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: re: REZONING: 3681 Victoria Drive and 1915 Stainsbury Avenue

Dear City of Vancouver Councillors,

I am writing to provide conditional support for this rezoning project at 3681 Victoria Drive. There is a desperate need for additional rental housing to be built ASAP, but purely market based housing is not what is most needed.. Vancouver already has a flood of condos turned into high-end market based rental housing that most people working in the city can't afford. The last thing this city needs is more luxury, market based rental housing. Even though I strongly urge the city to lower the per-unit rental cap's for the Rental 100 program, I would only support this project if it meets those minimum requirements. I also urge the city to amend the clause to the Rental 100 program that allows rental units to be lifted to market rates after the first tenant vacates, as this is NOT truly secured fixed rate rental housing.

Sincerely,
Paul Bennett
East Van renter