

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 24, 2013 5:20 PM  
**To:** Kaye Wong  
**Subject:** RE: Notice of Public Hearing - Rezoning of 7249 Cypress Street

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:** Kaye Wong s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 24, 2013 5:12 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** Notice of Public Hearing - Rezoning of 7249 Cypress Street

### PREAMBLE

We are the homeowners of s.22(1) Personal and Confidential to the north of 7249 Cypress Street. The purpose of this note is to provide our comments with respect to the rezoning application of 7249 Cypress Street.

To start, we wish to restate our position provided to the Airey Group and Farhad Mawani (formerly with the City of Vancouver) in a December 16, 2012 email:

“Having not received any further correspondence further to my note immediately below, we just wanted to ensure that both the Airey Group and the City of Vancouver are aware that we are not supportive of the proposed development as presented at the November 14<sup>th</sup> Open House.

The conceptual development plan at the Open House was the 3<sup>rd</sup> proposal iteration that we have seen. Without access to any plans or drawings, to our frustration, our recollection is that there has been a progressive increase in the number of units, as well as height and width of buildings, with each iteration.

While we had earlier indicated that we were supportive in principle of higher density, this proposal goes far beyond what we believe is reasonable. Our little bungalow would be dwarfed by such a massive development next door. That development would be totally out of scale with the rest of our block.”

The foregoing remains our current opinion.

## SPECIFIC CONCERNS

### 1. General

Overall, in terms of footprint, floor space ratio, number of units, and size and scale of the proposed development are totally out of the current character of our street. To paraphrase the expression “putting lipstick on a pig”, we are of the view that while the the architectural treatment and landscaping would result in an improvement, we equate this to “putting lipstick on an elephant”. With such an out of proportion development, you can put lipstick on the elephant, put a ribbon on its tail, and spray it with perfume, but it is still an elephant!

### 2. Number of Units

Currently there is a single family home whereas the proposed development is for a total of seven units. We are mystified how a seven-fold increase in density of units can be considerable reasonable.

Rather than shoehorning in the maximum number of units, we would argue than the increased density shift should be much more moderated.

We note that page 4 of the Policy Report states “Direction 15.5 ‘Allow some Traditional Rowhouses’ in the ARKS Community Vision supports the type of housing proposed in the rezoning application”. However, this statement seems inconsistent with the “Not Approved (Uncertain)” conclusion in Direction 15.5.

### 3. Is Commercial Development Allowed

Two areas of the ARKS Community Vision appear to be applicable to rezoning from single family residential. Neither section 16.5 on page 40 (allow new housing types on or near arterial roads) nor Housing Demonstration Projects listed in Table 2.1 on page 70 indicate that commercial units are permissible; only housing types or forms are mentioned.

Have we missed a section within the Community Vision that allows residential zoning to be converted to zoning that supports commercial development?

#### 4. Parking

At times, and increasingly so, we have difficulty in being able to park in front of our home due to other cars such as customers/employees from the commercial development at Shannon Station across 57<sup>th</sup> Ave., as well as when there are functions at St. Faiths Church.

We acknowledge that 10 underground parking spots for the rowhouses are included in the proposal. However, if I were living in one of the rowhouses and was running in and out often during the day, I would be using street parking rather than driving into the underground parking each time. Also, there does not appear to be any consideration of parking for the commercial unit or apartment above. We would expect that these factors would definitely increase street parking pressures in the area.

While page 8 of the Policy Report states that “Engineering Services staff have reviewed the proposed development and expect it to have little or no impact on traffic or street parking in the area”, there is no substantiation provided for this statement.

Phil and Kaye Wong

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 25, 2013 10:04 AM  
**To:** Hoe Guan Lee  
**Subject:** RE: 7249 Cypress Street Development Proposal

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:** Hoe Guan Lee **s.22(1) Personal and Confidential**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 24, 2013 5:31 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Subject:** 7249 Cypress Street Development Proposal

Mr. Mayor and Council Members,

I am Hoe Guan Lee, and have lived **s.22(1) Personal and Confidential** for the past 15 years.

Shannon Mews in the same area was re-developed a few years ago; a row of shops at street level topped by a single row of condominiums, altogether a pleasing development that added to the charm of living in this place. It was built on a larger piece of land with a significant frontage on West 57th Avenue.

The proposal for 7249 Cypress Street is of another order. On a smaller and narrow pie shaped piece of land, at the confluence of three roads, what is proposed is 35 feet up to the ridge line, seven units, and 11000 square feet in total of floor area. I suspect the floor area exceeds the land area. If allowed, it will have major impacts in terms of noise, traffic, pollution, and pressure on street parking. The last will be made worse if the commercial unit is successful. It will immeasurably and fundamentally change the neighbourhood.

This application for rezoning and redevelopment is to aim for the max: maximise everything, most importantly for profit.

I agree that land is tight for Vancouver, and accept that some redevelopment is needed to meet increasing housing needs. Therefore, I suggest that a more appropriate plan is perhaps two, or at most three, residential units; a lower ridge line for the roof; if well designed, it can add to and enhance the area, and should garner support. As it stands, I know of not one single neighbour that supports this plan.

Respectfully,  
Hoe Guan Lee