From: <u>Correspondence Group, City Clerk"s Office</u>

To: s. 22(1) Personal and

Subject: FW: Comment on 1729-1733-1735 East 33rd Ave

Date: Friday, March 08, 2013 2:49:35 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).

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.

Thank you.

From: Joseph Jones 5. 22(1) Personal and Confidentia

Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2013 10:23 PM

To: Mawani, Farhad

Subject: Comment on 1729-1733-1735 East 33rd Ave

Comment on 1729-1733-1735 East 33rd Ave

Address: 2220 Wenonah Street / Postal Code: V5N 2Z6 aka Easy walking distance

- 1. Attended previous sessions? No
- 2. Revised design and massing.

Due to living at a distance of some blocks, I have no direct personal concerns with the proposal.

A single and immediately apparent difficulty with the present configuration is the continuous building wall that extends along the entire east side of the assembled property. There needs to be a midpoint separation opening toward the courtyard area of at least fifteen feet. This might best be achieved by adding the lost square footage to the second storey of the building at the north end of the property. Without making requirement for this change now, residents in the future, given new developments on either side, may well find themselves undergoing expense and disruption to reconfigure for this access. Apart from neighborliness, the additional site permeability would increase the options for egress in the event of disaster or emergency social incident – a clear enhancement of safety both for those in the project and for immediate neighbors.

3. Overall support. Neither yes nor no.