

**From:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**To:** [s. 22\(1\) Personal and Confidential](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Cohousing East 33 Ave.  
**Date:** Friday, March 08, 2013 3:36:31 PM  
**Attachments:** [Cohousing E33 \[1\].pdf](#)

---

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website ([http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting\\_schedule.cfm](http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm)).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit [vancouver.ca/publichearings](http://vancouver.ca/publichearings).

Thank you.

---

**From:** George Grant [s. 22\(1\) Personal and Confidential](#)  
**Sent:** Friday, March 08, 2013 3:31 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Cohousing East 33 Ave.

To Mayor & Council

With regard to Proposed Rezoning of 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33 Ave.

Please see the attached PDF file

George Grant



## COMMENT SHEET IN ADVANCE OF PUBLIC HEARING MARCH 12, 2013

Proposed Rezoning for 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

Community Open House - Thursday, March 7, 2013

You may submit your comments:

- via this comment sheet, which will be distributed to Council in advance of the March 12, 2013 Public Hearing.
- by email to: [mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca), or
- by mail to: City of Vancouver  
City Clerk's Office  
453 West 12th Avenue, 3rd Floor  
Vancouver, BC  
V5Y 1V4.

To help us summarize your comments, please provide your address:

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ POSTAL CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

1. Have you attended any previous sessions for the Cedar Cottage Cohousing application?

yes       no

2. Please provide your comments on the revised design and massing presented today.

Please See page 2

---



---



---



---



---



---

I write as a private citizen and long time Vancouver City resident. This proposal will not affect me directly as I live several blocks from the site.

(I am the Chair of the VFK CityPlan Implementation Committee but our group has not had time to properly assess this project).

I am not against the Cohousing concept, but am concerned that this rezoning proposal breaks a covenant between the City and current property owners. Actions by the City should ensure that the fortunes one group is not put at risk to satisfy the desires and aspirations of a second group.

My reasons for not supporting this proposal are:

1. Zoning is (was) intended to protect property owners from spot re-development
2. Proposed building is out of all proportion to surrounding homes
3. Institutional in appearance...like a gated community...focus is inward
4. Façade not very aesthetically pleasing
5. No CAC's forthcoming, although density increases (FSR) by about 57%
6. No information as to the impact on property taxes could be found in the documents searched
7. Effect on land values of adjacent properties not identified nor apparently considered
8. No data to support the rationale of affordability
9. The display panels at the open house and the renderings on the city web site differ
10. The number of dwelling units change often...open house indicated 31(?) units with 58 bedrooms

I urge council to reject this proposal.

George Grant

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



**From:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**To:** [s. 22\(1\) Personal and Confidential](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Vancouver Cohousing - revised proposal follow up and comment sheets  
**Date:** Friday, March 08, 2013 2:52:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [Vancouver Cohousing revised proposal.docx](#)

---

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website ([http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting\\_schedule.cfm](http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm)).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit [vancouver.ca/publichearings](http://vancouver.ca/publichearings).

Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Robert Graziotto [s. 22\(1\) Personal and Confidential](#)  
**Sent:** Friday, March 08, 2013 11:52 AM  
**To:** Mawani, Farhad  
**Subject:** Vancouver Cohousing - revised proposal follow up and comment sheets

Hi Farhad,

It was great to finally meet you last night at the meeting. Per our conversation, find attached both Angelo and Anna Spinelli's comment card. Additionally, I assisted them in drafting a formal letter for council to consider.

If possible, would you be available for a quick call either this afternoon or perhaps Tuesday morning prior to the council meeting for a few short questions.

Thanks in advance,

--  
Rob Graziotto

[s. 22\(1\) Personal and Confidential](#)



## Angelo & Anna Spinelli

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

City of Vancouver Planning Department  
C/o Farhad Mawani – Rezoning Planner  
453 W 12<sup>th</sup> Ave.,  
Vancouver B.C., V5Y 1V4

Re: Vancouver Cohousing Rezoning Application

Dear Farhad, Mayor and City Councilors,

After attending the March 7th regarding the rezoning application, we found that the revised proposal still does not adequately address the main concerns of us as homeowners and the neighboring properties.

The revised proposal continues to have a height that is not only completely out of character with existing properties, but will significantly impact the views and eliminate the sunlight on our property.

The images depicted in the proposal are not accurate and are misleading. The setback in the written proposal states a 20' setback. The existing properties are set back at 45'. This crucial point will not only cause the project to look out of place, it will impose significant additional shadowing on our property at all times of day throughout the year.

The building design and specifically the height, is still completely out of character with existing structures and will look out of place. There is not a single building within proximity to this location that is of this size and scope. The design would not only look completely out of place, but will be a negative impact on the surrounding properties from an aesthetic standpoint.

We feel the developer and potential owners are not addressing the main concerns we have as existing homeowners and are only making insignificant changes in hopes of getting the application approved.

While we are not against a redevelopment of the property in question, we feel that the height and setback concerns need to be addressed prior to an approval.

Regards,

---

Angelo Spinelli

## COMMENT SHEET IN ADVANCE OF PUBLIC HEARING MARCH 12, 2013

Proposed Rezoning for 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

Community Open House - Thursday, March 7, 2013

You may submit your comments:

- via this comment sheet, which will be distributed to Council in advance of the March 12, 2013 Public Hearing.
- by email to: [mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca), or
- by mail to: City of Vancouver  
City Clerk's Office  
453 West 12th Avenue, 3rd Floor  
Vancouver, BC  
V5Y 1V4.

To help us summarize your comments, please provide your address:

ADDRESS:

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

POSTAL CODE:

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

1. Have you attended any previous sessions for the Cedar Cottage Cohousing application?

yes       no

2. Please provide your comments on the revised design and massing presented today.

1. The current proposed image has no continuity with existing structures on the street. All of the drawings are not scaled accurately. The size, setback and height of the building will significantly impact not only our view, but also the sunlight and shading of our property.

*additional questions and comment space on reverse*

## COMMENT SHEET IN ADVANCE OF PUBLIC HEARING MARCH 12, 2013

Proposed Rezoning for 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

Community Open House - Thursday, March 7, 2013

You may submit your comments:

- via this comment sheet, which will be distributed to Council in advance of the March 12, 2013 Public Hearing.
- by email to: [mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncil@vancouver.ca), or
- by mail to: City of Vancouver  
City Clerk's Office  
453 West 12th Avenue, 3rd Floor  
Vancouver, BC  
V5Y 1V4.

To help us summarize your comments, please provide your address:

ADDRESS: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential \_\_\_\_\_ POSTAL CODE: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential \_\_\_\_\_

1. Have you attended any previous sessions for the Cedar Cottage Cohousing application?

yes       no

2. Please provide your comments on the revised design and massing presented today.

The revised plan still does not address the the final design to fit with the existing buildings on the street. The overall size and specifically the height are of great concern. The proposed height is almost double the height of existing homes. This will impact the views for all neighboring properties. Additionally, there appears to be no allowance for

*additional questions and comment space on reverse*

any visitor parking. The street does not allow for

**From:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**To:** s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Rezoning for 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33rd Avenue  
**Date:** Friday, March 08, 2013 12:03:02 PM  
**Attachments:** [Letter to Council.docx](#)  
**Importance:** High

---

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website ([http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting\\_schedule.cfm](http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm)).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit [vancouver.ca/publichearings](http://vancouver.ca/publichearings).

Thank you.

---

**From:** Kathy Husar s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Friday, March 08, 2013 11:41 AM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; Mawani, Farhad  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed Rezoning for 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33rd Avenue  
**Importance:** High

Attention Mayor and City Council:

In direct response to the community session held at Kensington Community Centre last evening (Thursday March 7th, 2013) in conjunction with the Proposed Rezoning for 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33rd Avenue attached, please find a letter that I have drafted that addresses some of the concerns that I have.

If this can be added into the discussion that will occur at the public hearing scheduled for Tuesday March 12th, 2013, it would be appreciated.

If there are any issues opening the attached, question or concerns regarding any of the content contained within: please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Regards a Concerned Citizen,

Kathy Husar

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



# RE: Proposed Rezoning for 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

NAME: Kathy Husar

ADDRESS: [REDACTED]

S.  
22(1)  
6

EMAIL ADDRESS: [REDACTED]

Mayor and Council Members:

To begin, I would like to express my disappointment with the City of Vancouver for allowing the latest 'proposal/site rendition/revision' from the Co-Housing Society (believe that this one is revision #3) to be provided for community review a mere three business days before the planned public hearing is scheduled. In doing so, the ability to properly analyze the rendering and amass opinions, potential objections and concerns is quite limited.

---

*"Design development to reduce the massing to achieve a building form that is more compatible with the existing single family context"*

*Excerpt from the ~ Summary and Recommendations ~ provided by the City of Vancouver to the developer/Co-Housing Society*

Based on the legal understanding that within an RS1 zoned neighborhood, the overall elevation of a house can tower a maximum of 35 feet (yet for COMPATIBILITY this would be based on the typical structural design already present within the neighborhood which consists of **valley and peaked roofs**) the latest rendition of the plans provided show a structure whose mass does not mirror that of the neighboring properties. There is neither peaks nor valleys within the roofing and instead the structure is but a obstructive MASS that creates a wall like appearance stretched over three properties. How this can be seen to be a building that conforms to the existing single family context is unknown.

Additionally, the co-housing society has bombarded the neighborhood with leaflets professing potential benefits that their 'community' would provide but, when entrances are hidden within the structure instead of facing 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue like a traditional home (neighboring homes have entries located at the front) there is no open feel/welcoming feel to the property. It is as though they are creating a CLOSED OFF entity that is not a part of the already existent community and not open to welcoming others beyond those who live within the compound

To sum up the latest rendition presented based on the aforementioned recommendation; it is **contradictory** to the current makeup of the neighboring homes and does not have the ability of meshing into the surrounding vs standing out like a sore thumb!

---

*"Form of Development/Location*

*Subject to urban design performance (including consideration of shadow analysis, view impacts, frontage length, building massing, setbacks, etc.) and demonstration of a degree of community support, projects that would be considered are:*

- *Within approximately 100 meters of an arterial street (i.e. 1.5 blocks), ground-oriented forms up to a maximum of 3.5 storey's, which is generally sufficient height to include small house/duplexes/traditional row houses, stacked townhomes and courtyard row houses"*

*Excerpt(s) from the ~ Interim Rezoning Policy on Increasing Affordable Housing Choices Across Vancouver's Neighborhoods ~ City of Vancouver – October 3rd, 2012*

# RE: Proposed Rezoning for 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

NAME: Kathy Husar

ADDRESS: [REDACTED]

s.  
22(1)

EMAIL ADDRESS: [REDACTED]

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

As the presentation of the latest rendition to the proposal occurred a mere three business days before an already set 'Public Hearing' there seem to be several considerations that seem to have not been addressed by the submission group/developer that are in direct contradiction to the current City of Vancouver - Interim Rezoning Policy. As well, the latest plans presented do not comply with the aforementioned City of Vancouver policy for some of the following reasons:

- 1) Shadow analyses – were these conducted on the neighboring properties based on the latest rendition **as these were not presented to community review**
- 2) Based on the latest rendition, nowhere are structures presented that mirror 'small house / duplexes / traditional row houses, stacked townhomes and courtyard row houses' – the Co-Housing structure is but **one large mass** that spans three side-by-side properties. Who wants to look at a large continual blockage vs. the current and accepted norm of single family dwelling with ample space between which reflect that which is already in place
- 3) The frontage **impacts views** currently enjoyed by those already within the neighborhood.
  - o As a sidebar: when my husband and I decided to purchase our home, one of the key features (for which we paid a premium) of our home was the fact that we could see the North Shore mountains from the house without obstruction. How is it fair that someone attempting to move into the neighborhood would have the right to take these away from those of us already settled there? Will they be paying each of us the decrease in value to our homes based on a mountain view being obstructed?
- 4) Community Support – speaking with direct neighbors and subsequently further networks of neighboring properties, thus far, I have been unable to find support for this project. Does public opinion of the people currently residing within the neighborhood not matter? Is it not us that is directly impacted by such decisions? When each of us bought our homes, we purchased based on our dwelling existing within an RS1 zone – I cannot seem to find any support for rezoning to a CD1 area as this would interrupt the tight community feel already in place.

In summation, this project just doesn't seem to be the right fit for the identified East 33<sup>rd</sup> properties. It does not look like anything already in existence (no attempts by the developer to try and amalgamate to existing neighborhood appearance), obstructs cherished views held by current home owners within the direct vicinity of the proposed development and was sprung upon the neighborhood at the final hour projecting the feel that the developer is trying to sneak something past that is not desired.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding any of the information contained within this document, please feel free to contact me directly.

Cheers,

Kathy

**From:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**To:** [lillian.c](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Comment Sheet in Advance of Public Hearing March 12, 2013  
**Date:** Monday, March 11, 2013 2:19:58 PM

---

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website ([http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting\\_schedule.cfm](http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm)).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit [vancouver.ca/publichearings](http://vancouver.ca/publichearings).

Thank you.

**From:** lillian.c s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Monday, March 11, 2013 1:37 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Comment Sheet in Advance of Public Hearing March 12, 2013

To Whom It May Concern,

RE: Comment Sheet in Advance of Public Hearing March 12, 2013  
Proposed Rezoning for 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33rd Avenue

I was in attendance at the Community Open House on Thursday March 7, 2013 at Kensington Community Centre for the CoHousing Development proposal on E. 33rd Ave. I hope it is acceptable that I send my comments via email rather than on the yellow form. I will provide all the information requested on the form below:

Address: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
Postal Code: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

1. Have you attended any previous session for the Cedar Cottage Cohousing application?  
Yes
2. Please provide your comments on the revised design and massing presented today.

The revised massing is more acceptable than the original. However, the concept of co-housing still does not address some of the major concerns from the neighborhood. Although it has been described to us that this community-based

housing is for a group of like-minded people who wishes to live together to share common spaces and duties and maintain an active eye on the neighborhood, how will this be maintained once the original owners sell their units? Over time will this multi home strata not be just like any other multi homes? Can it be guaranteed that all owners will hold the same philosophy as the original group that developed this project? For example, if in the future a small family grows out of their 2-3 bed suite, they have the option to sell to two groups: 1) a couple that appears to be interested in the cohousing lifestyle but only offers 80% of asking price or 2) a couple that is indifferent to the cohousing lifestyle but offers 100% of asking price. Who will the current owner sell to? This is just a generic example but I hope it illustrates a bigger picture concern. Even if an owner does believe in this concept, what if he/she finds that it becomes unsuitable to them? Is it possible to assume that 30 groups of people will continue to want to share this property together under the same vision and will newcomers follow the same for the as long as this property stands? Another concern that needs to be addressed is that will it be a no rental strata?

The cohousing group has emphasized the sustainability visions to the neighborhood. "A multi-generational, sustainable community", "energy efficient", "senior friendly". How does the design reflect this? Are the units designed to meet handicapped and/or accessible requirements? Are there elevators for access to higher levels and the parkade? The City of Vancouver has a big mandate for sustainable developments. Will this development demonstrate that it can be a leader of its kind and perhaps to gain further acceptance in the neighborhood by building to LEED Platinum or even Living Building standards? If the City can promote this level of sustainable building, hopefully it will set the bar for all other buildings throughout Vancouver and even the rest of Metro Vancouver.

With the addition of approximately 30 families in an area that used to house 3 families, how will the development affect the sanitary and storm requirements in the surrounding area? Will there be measures from the City to have required offsite civil works (storm, sanitary, electrical upgrades) as part of the developer's responsibility and cost?

3. Overall, do you support the form of the cohousing project proposed for this site? If the concerns above are addressed, then maybe.

Thank you for addressing the concerns above and the concerns of all other neighbours. The decision to allow multi family housing in this neighborhood will change the landscape of our area forever, so we definitely appreciate the efforts of the City and the owners to address our opinions and concerns.

Regards,

Lillian



**From:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**To:** [Rod Raglin](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed rezoning at 1729, 1733, 1735 East 33rd Avenue  
**Date:** Friday, March 08, 2013 10:24:23 AM

---

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website ([http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting\\_schedule.cfm](http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm)).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit [vancouver.ca/publichearings](http://vancouver.ca/publichearings).

Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Rod Raglin s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Friday, March 08, 2013 1:28 AM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Re: Proposed rezoning at 1729, 1733, 1735 East 33rd Avenue

On March 7, 2013, I viewed the new development plans for the proposed rezoning application at 1733, 1735, 1739.

I found nothing in the new plans to change my mind it is still too high, too massive, and just not the right fit for our neighbourhood. I do not want to see it proceed.

I am not against co-housing, but I am against a huge monstrosity that will impact negatively on me and my community.

As a resident, I feel my concerns were never considered by the developer or city planning, and to approve this would be a travesty in the community consultation process.

Chandra Raglin

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

**From:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**To:** [Rod Raglin](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed rezoning at 1729, 1733, 1735 East 33rd Avenue  
**Date:** Friday, March 08, 2013 10:23:51 AM

---

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website ([http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting\\_schedule.cfm](http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm)).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit [vancouver.ca/publichearings](http://vancouver.ca/publichearings).

Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

From: Rod Raglin s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
Sent: Friday, March 08, 2013 12:46 AM  
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
Subject: Re: Proposed rezoning at 1729, 1733, 1735 East 33rd Avenue

I have just returned from the fourth information meeting (March 7, 2013) where I had the opportunity to view the fourth revised plan for the proposed rezoning of 1729, 1733, 1735 East 33rd Avenue.

It's hard to believe, but it is worse than any of the previous plans.

In an attempt(?) to address the issues of height and mass the developer and city planning staff have brought the majority of the density to the front of the site and done away with the peaked roof line. I am now presented with two huge, flat roofed buildings reminiscent of 1960-era apartments squat, ugly boxes. One of my neighbours said it reminded her of the Skeena Projects, the notorious subsidized housing development near Boundary and Broadway.

Though I don't have an issue with co-housing, the problem appears to be that the developer is not prepared to make any compromise in their lifestyle philosophy to accommodate the concerns of the neighbourhood.

Thus we have only two units opening out toward 33rd Avenue (obliquely) and the rest of the one hundred foot frontage is a wall with small windows. No welcoming entrances, no porches, no small yards. The rest of the units open into the development presumably so the residents will have the opportunity to co-mingle with one another.

Clustered around this internal space is the package of 1800 sq. ft. of amenities, unchanged from

previous designs. The developer apparently is not prepared to sacrifice any of these amenities to make the project more conducive to the neighbourhood. Where most developers that want extra density offer amenities to the community, this developer feels the community should grant them extra density to facilitate their amenities.

In an effort to address some design issues city planners and the developer have opened up the middle of the project. This may alleviate some concerns (shadows and invasion of privacy) for a few neighbours but makes it worse for others (the blocking of views).

This goes to the heart of what is wrong with this rezoning application the project is inappropriate for a single family residential neighbourhood. No matter which neighbour I spoke to, they all had issues, some the same, some different depending on where they live. The turnout at this meeting was again large and overwhelmingly against rezoning, and this proposal specifically.

As someone that has been involved in community development for a long time I find the developers attitude incomprehensible. At the very beginning of this process they should have brought in all the stakeholders and opened the lines of communication. Instead, they ignored the concerns of local residents, increasing the number of units from 27 to 29, then 31 and now approximately 29<sup>1</sup>, whatever that means. All this in face of growing opposition.

For me, the developer and city planners have lost all credibility. The only way to salvage this debacle of urban planning and community relations is to kill this proposal and go back to the beginning.

Rod Raglin

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

**From:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**To:** [Rod Raglin](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Cedar Cottage Co-housing proposal not affordable housing  
**Date:** Monday, March 11, 2013 10:21:51 AM

---

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website ([http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting\\_schedule.cfm](http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm)).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit [vancouver.ca/publichearings](http://vancouver.ca/publichearings).

Thank you.

---

**From:** Rod Raglin s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 10, 2013 7:17 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Cedar Cottage Co-housing proposal not affordable housing

**Cedar Cottage Co-housing proposal not affordable housing.**

A quick internet search turns up 74 listings for 2 bedroom, 2 bathroom condos, about 900 to 1,000 sq. ft., in East Vancouver for \$450,000 or less.

Indeed, just four blocks away (at Victoria Drive and 37th) from the proposed rezoning site, there's a 968 sq ft. unit for \$430,800.

Co-housing quotes on their website a similar, 875 sq. ft. unit will sell for about \$480,000.

The **proposed rezoning of 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33rd Avenue**, is not about affordable housing. This rezoning is about lifestyle.

I live in a great neighbourhood. Co-housing will not make it better, and the invasiveness of a their 31-unit condominium development, inappropriately designed to accommodate their communal lifestyle will have a huge negative impact on me and my neighbours.

The question that needs to be answered is why the Mayor and Council are endorsing a specific lifestyle at the expense of the lifestyle of the existing neighbourhood?

Or, to put it another way, why should an existing neighbourhood, that is functioning very well, be forced to change and make these sacrifices to accommodate some group's lifestyle?

Rod Raglin  
s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



**From:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**To:** [Simon](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Proposed Rezoning at 1729-1735 East 33rd Avenue  
**Date:** Friday, March 08, 2013 10:53:51 AM

---

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website ([http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting\\_schedule.cfm](http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm)).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit [vancouver.ca/publichearings](http://vancouver.ca/publichearings).

Thank you.

---

**From:** Simon s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Friday, March 08, 2013 10:49 AM  
**To:** Mawani, Farhad; Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Proposed Rezoning at 1729-1735 East 33rd Avenue

I am writing to express my objections to the proposed rezoning at 1729-1735 East 33rd Avenue. I am a 10 year resident of the Kensington neighbourhood and am raising my children here. This neighbourhood is my home.

My main objection to the rezoning is the location of the proposed 31 unit multi-family development in an otherwise single family area. There are no other multifamily buildings of this magnitude on this stretch of 33rd Avenue and in my opinion, the proposed rezoning does not enhance or improve the area.

This would be a great development if it were located in an area with some mixed use such as along Victoria Drive. Even the Knight Street corridor would be a better location for new multi-family zoning. But 33rd Avenue is not mixed use and is not a major artery. It is a secondary artery at best and the existing development is strictly single family type homes. Please maintain this character and reject the rezoning application.

I am a supporter of densification and creation of more affordable housing if it is done well and is responsible. Cohousing sounds like a promising approach for creating livable and more affordable multifamily development. However, this development does not match the type of development that exists on this stretch of 33rd Avenue. Once you approve one multi-family development then more are going to follow and the character of the neighborhood will be changed.

In principle I like the idea of increased densification and slightly higher allowable building

heights along major transportation corridors. However, I do not consider 33rd Avenue a primary corridor. Knight Street is a primary corridor in this part of the city and Victoria Drive has a long history as a transportation corridor and mixed use and commercial development. This development would fit very well on Victoria Drive and maybe even on Knight Street.

In reviewing some of the material contained in the rezoning application and reports I want to point out that contrary to the statements in the Rezoning Rationale that the 1998 KCC Community Vision provides for new types of housing in the neighbourhood, the Vision document states there is not support for this type of new housing on arterial locations rather it should be encouraged in clusters at major intersections (Section 21.5). I think that would be a wise approach to rezoning, to build out from existing mixed use areas along major corridors. Don't start in the middle of single family neighbourhood and then try to expand from there.

Best Regards,

**Simon Robinson**

S. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

**From:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**To:** s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Subject:** FW: REZONING AT 1929,1933 AND 1735 EAST 33RD AVENUE  
**Date:** Friday, March 08, 2013 10:01:50 AM  
**Attachments:** [COMMENTS FOR REZONING AT 19291933 AND 1735 EAST 33RD AVENUE.eml.msg](#)  
[REVISED Rezoning Application - 1729 1733 and 1735 East 33rd Avenue.eml.msg](#)

---

Thank you for your comments.

All public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received not more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list for that public hearing will be distributed to members of Council for their consideration. The public comments must include the name of the writer.

In addition, these public comments will also be posted on the City's website ([http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting\\_schedule.cfm](http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/councilmeetings/meeting_schedule.cfm)).

Please note that your contact information will be removed from the comments, with the exception of the writer's name. Comments received after the start of the public hearing should not exceed 1500 words.

Public comments submitted for the public hearing that are received more than 15 minutes after the close of the speakers list, will not be distributed until after Council has made a decision regarding the public hearing application and the related bylaw is enacted, if applicable.

For more information regarding Public Hearings, please visit [vancouver.ca/publichearings](http://vancouver.ca/publichearings).

Thank you.

---

**From:** Paul Yuen s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 07, 2013 8:18 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Cc:** Mawani, Farhad  
**Subject:** REZONING AT 1929,1933 AND 1735 EAST 33RD AVENUE

**Hello:**

**Just went to the 3rd Open House for the above project.**

**The revised design is not really improved. It is ugly, unclear, confusing and absolutely not suitable for this neighbourhood.**

**The height and the length of the development is the main concern. Too many units and will have at least 80 to 100 extra people moving to this area.**

**Increased traffic and parking problems on 33rd Ave. and the lanes will be another concern.**

**Enclosed are my 2 previous comments of this development.**

**Hope the mayor and the city council address to the issues and concerns of the existing residents.**

**The development is a good idea but not fitted to this neighbourhood with so many residents against it.**

**I strongly oppose and do not support the cohousing project proposed for this site.**

**Regards,  
Paul**

**From:** [Paul Yuen](#)  
**To:** [Mawani, Farhad](#)  
**Subject:** COMMENTS FOR REZONING AT 1929,1933 AND 1735 EAST 33RD AVENUE  
**Attachments:** [20120917065819862.pdf](#)

---

Hello:

Talk to you last Saturday (09/15/12) at the open house regarding the rezoning, I enclosed the blank comments form and the letter from Cedar Cottage Cohousing.

The following is my comments:

**COMMENTS FOR REZONING AT 1929,1933 AND 1735 EAST 33RD AVENUE**

1) The letter that sent to the neighbourhood regarding the open house by Cedar Cottage Cohousing is only mentioned for ONE property at 1735 E. 33rd Avenue.

The open house display shows 3 properties. Is this company trying to hide something from the open public and trying to slide by the City of Vancouver?

The Company is giving out wrong information and trying to mislead everybody.

This is unfair to all the people living in this neighbourhood.

This is a act trying to cheat not only the people of this neighbourhood but also the City of Vancouver.

2) This area is a very nice neighbourhood with single family housing.

Cohousing is not suitable for this area.

3) The concept that is proposed for this site does not belong to this neighbourhood.

The location is in the middle of the block and bisect the neighbourhood.

With the height and the length of the design, it looks like a "Berlin Wall" in the block.

4) The traffic on E 33rs Ave. is getting congested in recent years particularly during rush hours.

Cars are using lanes and E 32nd Ave to get through this congestion.

The block in front of the above 3 properties are always parked with cars. This making it difficult for drivers to come out from the lanes, Commerical Street and

Argyle Street.

With this proposal of 27 units, there will be an increase of at least 50 cars. The proposal only has 27 parking spaces.

The remaining cars will be parked on E 33rd or illegally parked in the lanes. This is additional traffic and cars parked in this area.

5) The proposed design does not fit in this neighbourhood. The development has too many units and will have at least 100 people more living in this area.

6) This proposal will create nightmare for this neighbourhood with additional traffic on the roads and the lanes, more parked cars and more population.

The design will be a "eyesore" of the neighbourhood.



I cannot trust Cedar Cottage Cohousing on the whole proposal. They hide/lie on a simple notice letter. They can also hide/lie on this development.

SO, I STRONGLY OPPOSED THE REZONING OF THE PROPERTY.

Regards,

Paul.

## COMMENT SHEET

### Proposed Rezoning for 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

Community Open House - Saturday, September 15, 2012

Cedar Cottage Cohousing Company has applied to the City of Vancouver to rezone 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33rd Avenue from RS-1 (Single Family) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. The proposal is for a three-storey multi-family residential development that will operate as a cohousing community. The project will consist of 27 strata-titled units and a common amenity space. The proposed floor space ratio (FSR) is 0.98, with a floor area of 2 682 m<sup>2</sup> (28,873 sq. ft.), and a maximum height of 11.5 m (37.7 ft.).

To help us summarize your comments, please provide your postal code: \_\_\_\_\_

1. What do you feel makes this neighbourhood a great place to live?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

2. What do you think about the cohousing concept that is proposed for this site?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

3. How do you feel about a cohousing community at this location?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

4. How do you feel about the design proposed for the Cedar Cottage Cohousing development?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

5. Additional comments?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

*For more information or to submit comments regarding this proposal online or by mail:*

Website: [vancouver.ca/rezapps](http://vancouver.ca/rezapps)

Contact: Farhad Mawani, Rezoning Planner  
e-mail: [farhad.mawani@vancouver.ca](mailto:farhad.mawani@vancouver.ca)  
tel: 604.871.6689  
fax: 604.873.7060

City of Vancouver  
Planning Department, Rezoning Centre  
453 West 12th Avenue  
Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

Cedar Cottage Cohousing

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Dear Neighbour,

**We'd like to meet you!**

We're Cedar Cottage Cohousing, and since we're new to the neighbourhood, we're hosting an open house to introduce ourselves. In the near future, we're going to be managing the property at 1735 E 33rd Ave, and look forward to hearing from you with any concerns you may have.

Our long-term goal is to become your new neighbours, as we hope to build our homes here. We look forward to being great, highly active neighbours, organizing and participating in neighbourhood-wide activities.

One step toward realizing our dream of living at E 33rd Ave is rezoning the property so that we can build our sustainable, community-oriented homes. We would like to invite you to come give us your feedback on the building we've been working hard to design as a community, and to answer any questions you may have about cohousing in general, or our design in particular. As a community, we're committed to being engaged members of the neighbourhood, and we'd love to hear from you.

**Please come to our on-site open house!**

**Who: Cedar Cottage Cohousing Community and you!**

**What: On-Site Open House**

**When: September 15 & September 22, 2012**

**Drop in from 10:00am to 12:00pm**

**Where: 1735 E 33rd Ave.**

**From:** [Paul Yuen](#)  
**To:** [Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office](#)  
**Subject:** REVISED Rezoning Application - 1729, 1733 and 1735 East 33rd Avenue

---

**I am really surprise about this revised application.**

an increase from 27 residential units to 31 units

an increase in floor space ratio (FSR) from 0.98 to 1.11

an increase in height from 11.5 m (37.7 ft.) to 12.1 m (39.8 ft.)

an increase in floor area from 2 693.6 m<sup>2</sup> (28,994 sq. ft.) to 3 042.3 m<sup>2</sup>

**The applicant does not follow the key aspects that the Urban Design Panel's recommendation (Oct. 24/2012) that need improvement to reduce the height and density.**

**The applicant goes in the opposite direction to increase the density (number of units), the height and the floor area!!**

**The applicant gave out false information during the Information Sessions hosted in Sept. 2012.**

**The applicant's is invading the quiet neighbourhood without considering the existing residents.**

**The Urban Design Panel and the city councillors should consider the concern of the existing residents that are living in this neighbourhood.**

**The main issues are the density, height, shadowing, increased traffic and parking problems.**

**Also, this development is on the mid-block site within the existing family area.**

**This is also divided the block into 2 halves and destroying the good neighbourhood.**

**This type of developement is not suitable for this area.**

**I strongly oppose and do not support the cohousing project proposed for this site.**