

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2014 10:24 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: 20 May 2014 Public Hearing on 3120-3184 Knight Street

From: Joseph Jones s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2014 9:18 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office; Robertson, Gregor; Affleck, George; Ball, Elizabeth; Carr, Adriane; Deal, Heather; Jang, Kerry; Louie, Raymond; Meggs, Geoff; Reimer, Andrea; Tang, Tony; Stevenson, Tim
Subject: 20 May 2014 Public Hearing on 3120-3184 Knight Street

To Mayor and Council –

Re: 20 May 2014 Public Hearing on 3120-3184 Knight Street

I would make an effort to speak in person to Council at the public hearing on 3120-3184 Knight Street, but this will not be possible due to being out of town.

I have been a resident of Cedar Cottage for over thirty years, so this is my local area.

I attended open houses on 5 November 2013 and 11 February 2014, and submitted comment, which seems to have been ignored.

Here are my three primary concerns:

The project **violates the Interim Rezoning Policy condition of adjacency to shopping** (maximum 500 meter walking distance). I have measured what would be the normal and favored level sidewalk walking distance to the extreme edge of the supposed shopping area (which it is not) with a rod, and the distance is about 650 meters.

Cedar Cottage has been abused by a "neighbourhood centre" planning process that was never completed. After a quickie mass rezoning of 1600 single-family properties around Kingsway and Knight, **the shopping area planning just never happened**, and the City of Vancouver no longer even considers Kingsway and Knight to be active planning, according to the web site. In the wake of that neglect, one-off density dumping is attacking all of East Vancouver, without corresponding amenity. Much of this is happening in and around the Kingsway and Knight and Norquay neighbourhood centres. All take, no give turns a neighborhood into a wasteland.

In the name of affordable housing, **the project seeks to eliminate existing more spacious affordable older apartments** in order to replace them with smaller, more expensive new construction. This is ridiculous. The project would be more acceptable if it were creating apartments where none already existed.

Elaboration on details related to these comments can be found at

<http://eyeonnorquay.wordpress.com/2014/02/12/3120-3184-knight-street/>

<http://eyeonnorquay.wordpress.com/2013/08/22/kingsway-knight/>

Please ensure that these comments appear in the record for the public hearing on 3120-3184 Knight Street.

Sincerely,

Joseph Jones

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2014 10:04 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Public Hearing on May 20, 2014, item #1 for 3120 - 3184 Knight Street Revised Rezoning Proposal

From: CCAN § 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2014 11:38 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Hearing on May 20, 2014, item #1 for 3120 - 3184 Knight Street Revised Rezoning Proposal

May 15, 2014

Dear Mayor and Council

Re: 3120 - 3184 Knight Street Revised Rezoning Proposal

On behalf of The Cedar Cottage Areas Neighbours (CCAN) community group we wish to express our opposition to the revised proposal to rezone 3120 - 3184 Knight Street.

CCAN was created to monitor new developments in our neighbourhood. We host monthly meetings at a neighbourhood church hall and we have joined the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods.

The future of Cedar Cottage is very important to the members of CCAN; we are passionate about preserving the livability and character of our neighbourhood. Early on we expressed our wish to be part of the process. We hoped that through collaboration with the City we would see the construction of housing that respects the needs of our community while providing affordable housing for families that is more innovative and suitable for our neighbourhood than the current proposed design.

City staff led us to believe that we were going to be involved in this process from the early stages. In an email staff said this about the Open House process, *"This approach is now the Department's standard practice which has been in place for some time, a process enhancement that was made in response to a desire for the kind of early, collaborative community involvement your group is seeking."* 80% of the Open House participants did not approve of this project. There is no point to early involvement if it is not collaborative and does not resolve the community's concerns.

We request that this rezoning project not be approved.

Vancouver City Council has stated that rental housing approved through the new City rental policies will ensure projects are sensitive to the neighbourhood context and that the guidelines for density will be respected. For example, *Council Report of May 15, 2012:*

2b. Negotiated stream: additional density requested through rezoning

The STIR pilot program provided insight into the viability of various types of rental projects (e.g. woodframe and concrete) and the corresponding form of development appropriate at different locations. The form of development was a community concern in several projects. Based on these lessons, general guidelines regarding additional density have been developed (see Appendix B for more information). The purpose is twofold: to ensure projects are sensitive to the neighbourhood context; and to provide more clarity for applicants, staff, and the public.

We believe the proposal for 15th and Knight runs counter to this commitment. A five storey apartment block is not “sensitive to the neighbourhood context” in a neighbourhood of 2 - 2½ storey houses and 3 storey apartments. Five storeys is too high for the area. It does not “provide more clarity for the public” if a density of 2.08 FSR is approved when the guideline in the Policy for density in RT zones (Appendix B) is 1.45 FSR.

The May 15th Council report also states on Page 7 that, “*More specifically, proposals will be considered in projects on sites that do not have existing rental housing.*” In addition, Recommendation #3 in October 2, 2012 Mayor’s Task Force states the need to, “*protect the existing affordable market rental stock and explore opportunities to repair and renew it.*”

We agree that the existing affordable market rental stock should be protected. This project however will destroy hard to find moderately priced family size rental units only to replace them with much smaller, more expensive units. As such, this project will not foster affordability.

Our group is also concerned that this application violates this key section of the Interim Rezoning Policy:

“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 metres of an arterial street (i.e. 1.5 blocks), ground-oriented forms up to a maximum of 3.5 storeys, which is generally sufficient height to include small house/duplexes, traditional row houses, stacked townhouses and courtyard row houses;*
- *Fronting on arterials that are well served by transit and within close proximity (i.e. a five minute walk or 500 metres) of identified neighbourhood centres and local shopping areas, mid-rise forms up to a maximum of 6 storeys. See Arterial Map, next page.”*

The project violates the Policy in two ways:

1. The application for Knight and 15th no longer fronts on an arterial. Due to Urban Design concerns it now fronts on East 15th Avenue. That makes it eligible for 3.5 storeys, not 6, and,
2. The project is not within 500 m or a 5 minute walk of a defined shopping area*

*The Kensington Cedar Cottage Vision identifies the shopping area boundary to be at Commercial and 14th. The distance along the sidewalk from this site to Commercial and 14th is 540 m and an 8 minute walk.

Therefore this site fails two key criteria for development stipulated in the City’s Interim Rezoning Policy, (above) it is more than 500 m and a 5 minute walk from a local shopping area, and does not front on an arterial.

Also, the KCC Vision says that the neighbourhood north of 16th is a duplex zone. The Vision also recommended row houses, four or six-plexes & duplexes around the Knight and Kingsway shopping area.

The KCC Vision rezoning policy also says,

2.2 Additional Planning Required Before Rezoning

The KCC Community Vision directions listed below require additional planning study before rezoning occurs. For some directions, the study would cover a portion of KCC others might be citywide in scope. The types of things that would be studied could include the size, height, location and design of development; traffic and parking; parks and green space; service needs; development contributions to costs; phasing and so forth. Planning studies would be initiated by the City, but might be undertaken by City staff, consultants, community members, or a combination. In all cases, there would be community consultation throughout the study.

If there was an additional planning study for this rezoning it did not include community consultation in Cedar Cottage.

For all these reasons we request that this application be rejected as proposed.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our concerns.

Yours sincerely,

Bryan Edward; Bonita Rumelili; Megan Ashbury; Jerry Lowe

CCAN Knight and 15th Project Committee

And on behalf of the members of CCAN

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2014 3:07 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Public Hearing May 20 2014 for 3120 to 3184 Knight Street first item on agenda

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Grace MacKenzie s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2014 2:38 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Hearing May 20 2014 for 3120 to 3184 Knight Street first item on agenda

Dear Mayor and Council

I am opposed to the rezoning project at 3120 - 3184 Knight Street.

My family has owned a house on East 18th for 72 years and we feel we will be very adversely affected by this project. We will be affected by traffic and street parking created by this overly dense project. With 51 units in the project the community services will be overly stressed and the developer is paying no DLC's to help alleviate this problem.

City staff said that all the secured market rental housing policies were inter-connected.

1. The project is too dense at 2.08 FSR; it should be no more than 1.45 FSR. This density is stated as i.e. 1.45 FSR for RT zones in the Rental Incentive Guidelines. It says i.e. not e.g.; this means 'that is' not 'for example'! If the applicant is not required to pay DCL's and is allowed to build units of only 320 or 450 sq through this policy then why is he not required to follow the 1.45 FSR in this policy?
2. The proposed density will put further stress on services such as schools, community centres and public transit. This density represents more than an incentive, it is a windfall for the developer.
3. The Mayor's Task Force, recommendation 3, says to retain affordable housing by repairing it.
4. The project will replace very affordable family size housing with much more expensive, MUCH smaller suites. I believe this kind of project spells the end of affordable family rental housing in Vancouver. If you earn a modest income and have a family or are planning to have one, this project shows that there is no place for you in Vancouver. You are being sacrificed on the altar of creating density.
5. The project does not fall in line with the IRP criteria. The project should be no more than 3.5 storeys because it now fronts on East 15th which is not an arterial. The IRP says that only projects fronting on arterials can receive up to 6 storeys. If the project does not front on an arterial and is 100 meters from an arterial it can be up to 3.5 storeys consisting of ground-oriented housing.

6. 5 storeys and 2.08 FSR does not fit the character of the neighbourhood of 2 to 3 storey buildings with densities of 0.60 to 0.75 FSR. The form of the building is too massive for the site because there is too much density on the site.
7. The City Engineering Department must do its own traffic study before the project is allowed to go forward. A study commissioned by the applicant cannot be considered objective. The applicant study failed to even mention that the building parking is accessible from only one direction off Knight Street. This means that traffic related to this building will need to drive through the neighbourhood to gain access to the projects parking lot.
8. Street parking is already a problem here and this project is getting a 20-spot relief on parking.
9. This kind of spot rezoning lacks integration with the existing community Vision. The Kensington Cedar Cottage Vision says that there will be no spot rezonings without a planning study which includes consultation with the community. The only kind of spot rezoning that is allowed without a planning study would be for non-market housing. The planning study has not been done. *The* study could include the size, height, location and design of development; traffic and parking; parks and green space; service needs; development contributions to costs; and phasing. If this study had been done then the problems with this project could have been discussed and resolved through community consultation.

Yours sincerely
Grace MacKenzie

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2014 3:07 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Public Hearing May 20 2014 for 3120 to 3184 Knight Street

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: grnmac s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2014 2:52 PM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Public Hearing May 20 2014 for 3120 to 3184 Knight Street

Dear Mayor and Council

I am opposed to the rezoning project at 3120 - 3184 Knight Street. I agree with my daughter and son-in-law regarding the problems with this project as listed below.

Our family has owned a house on East 18th for 72 years and we feel we will be very adversely affected by this project. We will be affected by traffic and street parking created by this overly dense project. With 51 units in the project the community services will be overly stressed and the developer is paying no DLC's to help alleviate this problem.

City staff said that all the secured market rental housing policies were inter-connected.

1. The project is too dense at 2.08 FSR; it should be no more than 1.45 FSR. This density is stated as i.e. 1.45 FSR for RT zones in the Rental Incentive Guidelines. It says i.e. not e.g.; this means 'that is' not 'for example'! If the applicant is not required to pay DCL's and is allowed to build units of only 320 or 450 sq through this policy then why is he not required to follow the 1.45 FSR in this policy?
2. The proposed density will put further stress on services such as schools, community centres and public transit. This density represents more than an incentive, it is a windfall for the developer.
3. The Mayor's Task Force, recommendation 3, says to retain affordable housing by repairing it.
4. The project will replace very affordable family size housing with much more expensive, MUCH smaller suites. I believe this kind of project spells the end of affordable family rental housing in Vancouver. If you earn a modest income and have a family or are planning to have one, this project shows that there is no place for you in Vancouver. You are being sacrificed on the altar of creating density.
5. The project does not fall in line with the IRP criteria. The project should be no more than 3.5 storeys because it now fronts on East 15th which is not an arterial. The IRP says that only projects fronting on arterials can receive up to 6 storeys. If the project does not front on an arterial and is 100 meters from an arterial it can be up to 3.5 storeys consisting of ground-oriented housing.

6. 5 storeys and 2.08 FSR does not fit the character of the neighbourhood of 2 to 3 storey buildings with densities of 0.60 to 0.75 FSR. The form of the building is too massive for the site because there is too much density on the site.
7. The City Engineering Department must do its own traffic study before the project is allowed to go forward. A study commissioned by the applicant cannot be considered objective. The applicant study failed to even mention that the building parking is accessible from only one direction off Knight Street. This means that traffic related to this building will need to drive through the neighbourhood to gain access to the projects parking lot.
8. Street parking is already a problem here and this project is getting excessive relief on providing parking spaces on site.
9. This kind of spot rezoning lacks integration with the existing community Vision. The Kensington Cedar Cottage Vision says that there will be no spot rezonings without a planning study which includes consultation with the community. The only kind of spot rezoning that is allowed without a planning study would be for non-market housing. The planning study has not been done. The study could include the size, height, location and design of development; traffic and parking; parks and green space; service needs; development contributions to costs; and phasing. If this study had been done then the problems with this project could have been discussed and resolved through community consultation.

Yours sincerely
Norbert MacKenzie