

**Kennett, Bonnie**

---

**From:** Su Craik s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 12, 2018 4:05 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 1837 - 1857 E11th Ave and 2631 - 2685 Victoria Dr

This email is to provide my comments with regards to the amendments to the zoning for the above properties.

I am the home owner of s.22(1) Personal and Confidential and have been for over 15 years. I was not opposed to the original plan for a 5 or 6 storey building on this site as it would not be too imposing or create too much of a shadow. I am totally opposed to the proposed change to an 11 storey building. This height is just too high as it will be totally out of character with the low rises and single homes in this neighbourhood. Parking is already an issue on E11th due to the number of non-residents who park on the street while visiting the businesses on Commercial Drive. A building this size will attract more cars of visitors to the residents of the building. I grow weary of The City of Vancouver's acquiesce to developer's requests for higher density over above the initial community plans.

Regards,  
Susan Craik

**Kennett, Bonnie**

---

**From:** R C s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 13, 2018 3:27 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** 1837-1857 E 11 Av and 2631-2685 Victoria Drive

Sirs:

Please keep the RM-4 the zoning for the following reasons:

1. The block abuts Commercial Drive, which has customer parking in front and in lanes. Yet the 'Drive' is languishing with empty shops. The placement of even more shops, with even less parking, is not rational.
2. The intersection of 10th Av and Victoria is already a danger zone with heavy vehicles/pedestrians/bikes. Adding shops and residential traffic for 138 apartments is asking for even more mess.
3. The residential area is very close to Broadway, which is zoned for this kind of development. Looking east from Victoria, there is massive undeveloped, properly zoned property. Why is it left empty to encourage not-needed shops in the residential area?
4. The setback of greenspace for a residential-only apartment is much more organic and welcoming to the new residents, who might actually enjoy a little garden area of their own (I know of no young parent who wishes to have their tots play on a rooftop) and to the neighbours, who have to deal with overcrowded streets. Please do not further destroy this oasis of residential neighbours.

Building is too big:

There are 14 families being evicted to build this. That ratio is 1000% increase in density now, not 20% increase over the next 20 years. Surely the developers can make oodles of cash with a building half the size, with a residential setback.

Sincerely,

R. Coates

s.22(1) Personal and  
Confidential