

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

July 6, 2018

Mayor and Council  
City of Vancouver.  
453 W 12th Ave,  
Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

E-mail: [publichearing@vancouver.ca](mailto:publichearing@vancouver.ca)

Re: Agenda Item 3; Rezoning; 2109 West 35<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Vancouver; July 10, 2018

Dear Mayor and Council:

The West 35<sup>th</sup> development application in its present form is not in the public interest.

Public safety is a basic risk. In my view, an obvious defect in the West 35<sup>th</sup> application is its failure to adequately address that risk. I and my neighbors are concerned that while the developers promoted benefits of housing densification they failed to adequately address public safety.

Residents repeatedly have emphasized public safety risk inherent in densification at the Arbutus/35<sup>th</sup> traffic choke point. The developer and transportation consultant made a 20% lower estimate of peak traffic flow – one indicator of safety risk - below the City's 2015 monitored account for the same Arbutus/33<sup>rd</sup> location.

We now ask whether the city's planning staff believe that clearing a few sight lines and erecting a few signposts constitutes sufficient risk management.

I and many neighbors do not oppose infill development and densification among several short-term solutions to housing issues. However, there is clear opposition to any evaluation process which fails to adequately address public safety. Community consultation and evidence-based planning are devalued by such omissions.

Should the city plan to embark on a program of massive densification, our voting citizens are entitled to rely upon a planning process that addresses public safety as well as minutiae of development control. In my view, the project requires further professional review.

Yours truly,

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Koy Wares, P.Eng., FEC.

## Burke, Teresita

---

**From:** annerowles <[REDACTED] "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential">  
**Sent:** Friday, July 06, 2018 4:24 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Rezoning Hearing 2109 W 35th Ave on July 10 2018  
**Attachments:** Submissions to Council 2109 West 35 Ave.docx

Attached are our submissions for the Public Hearing on July 10, 2018 for the rezoning of 2109 West 35th Ave.

Anne Rowles  
Afton H. Cayford

## **SUBMISSIONS TO THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL ON PROPOSED RE-ZONING OF 2109 WEST 35<sup>TH</sup> AVE. AT ARBUTUS STREET FROM RS-5 TO CD-1 (COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT)**

The proposed rezoning of the site at Arbutus and 35<sup>th</sup> Ave. to permit development of a three-storey residential building with 12 for-profit “affordable” rental units was brought forward by the owner-developer under the umbrella of an experimental project by the City to permit a maximum of 20 rezoning applications to be considered under the “Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy”.

The owner-developer, Tamanna Concept Ltd., had previously successfully applied for laneway housing on the site, which made sense in the location, but abandoned that project, had the house on the property removed, and is now pursuing a poorly designed development under the guise of “affordable” for-profit rentals. The rezoning application, if approved, would permit 12 rental units: 6 one-bedroom units and 6 three-bedroom units with initial rents shown at \$1,900 and \$3,700 but adjustable upward upon completion of construction and occupancy.

The City needs affordable rental accommodation but the proposed development, as designed, could not realistically add to such a pool. Any assertion that the rents are “affordable”, if viewed from the perspective of prospective tenants rather than a developer, is nonsensical. Nathalie Baker will be making submissions on our behalf and on behalf of others on that issue.

The design and location of the proposed development does not comply with the City of Vancouver’s Policies to which reference is made in the Policy Report to Council recommending approval of the rezoning to CD-1, subject to Conditions (“Report to Council”). Those policies include the “High-Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines (1992)” the “Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy”.

### **The proposed development is unsuitable as housing for families with children**

The Report to Council has the following heading under “Policy Context”:

**High-Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines** – The intent of the guidelines is to address key issues of site, building and unit design to achieve liveable objectives for families with children. The guidelines provide direction on project planning, project design, unit design, and amenity areas.

In fact, the design of the proposed development falls woefully short of meeting liveable objectives for families with children and is singularly unsuitable for children.

### **Lack of Amenities**

The proposed development fails to comply with the essence of relevant parts of the Guidelines. The most conspicuous design failure is the lack of any amenities in the proposed development.

- (i) There is no outside play area of any kind provided in the plans for the proposed development and the Conditions for Approval in Appendix B of the Report to Council do not require any to be added.
- (ii) The roof enclosures shown on the plans are too small to accommodate play areas for children.
- (iii) The proposed development plans show no facility or space of any kind that would give children an area to play together.
- (iv) There is no provision in the development plans to provide for any common space or facility for families or others to interact.

In short, there is nothing in the proposed development plans to support outdoor or indoor amenities for use by families with children or others and the Conditions for Approval in the Report to Council do not require any changes to provide for them.

### **Safety**

- (v) Arbutus Street is a heavily trafficked artery with two lanes going in both directions. A curve in the street limits visibility. A combination of drivers racing southbound up the hill on the curve with poor visibility, often with wet road conditions, has resulted in a continuous pattern of spectacular and deadly spin-out crashes onto sidewalks on both the east and west side. For small children, this section of Arbutus Street at West 35<sup>th</sup> Ave in particular poses a serious safety hazard.
- (vi) The plans for the proposed development shows a small fence around the project. Without constant supervision of young children, or a dedicated and secure area in which to play, it is questionable whether the fence would stop young children from venturing out into areas where there are safety hazards from traffic such as West 35<sup>th</sup> Ave, the laneway to the underground parking, and particularly, Arbutus Street.

### **Proposed development is not suitable for people with disabilities restricting mobility**

The proposed development is also unsuitable for those with disabilities restricting their mobility. As potential rental accommodation for seniors or for those with family or friends with mobility problems, the development is poorly designed:

- (i) There are no elevators in the plans despite the location of a number of the units in the three-story building.
- (ii) The roof enclosures are only accessible by using stairs.
- (iii) The outside stairs and walkways as shown on the plans, regardless of whether they are modified as required by the Conditions in Appendix B of the Report to Council, would be hazardous for anyone when covered with snow or coated with frost or ice and that would be particularly so for physically disabled persons.
- (iv) In times of multiple days of snow, the proposed project design places an enormous burden on the tenants to perform daily snow removal on the sidewalks adjacent to the property on Arbutus Street and West 35<sup>th</sup> Ave as well as from the outside access stairs to the elevated units in order to maintain Canada Post and other front door delivery services. Vancouver by-laws provide:

*REMOVAL OF SNOW OR ICE FROM SIDEWALK*

*76. The owner or occupier of any parcel of real property shall, not later than 10:00 a.m. every day, remove snow and ice from any sidewalk adjacent to such parcel for a distance that coincides with the parcel's property line and for the full width of the sidewalk.*

*76A. If an owner or occupier of any parcel of real property fails to remove snow and ice, as required by section 76, the City Engineer may authorize the removal by another person and the costs of such removal shall be at the expense of the owner or occupier as the case may be, and the city may recover such expense by action in a court of competent jurisdiction.*

- (v) The handicapped parking space shown on the north side of the plans is not wide enough to allow a handicapped driver (or any driver) to get out of a vehicle because it faces west and is next to the wall of the building. As well, to turn a vehicle around in the area of the handicapped parking space would be difficult if not impossible because it would cross the lane entrance for the underground parking. The App. B Conditions in the Report to Council do not provide any suggested or required solution for the handicapped parking space shown on the plans. See Condition #22(vii)

**The Proposed Development does not comply with requirements in the “Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy”**

The Kerrisdale shopping area which the Report to Council shows as beginning at West 37<sup>th</sup> Ave and Arbutus (there re-named West Boulevard) does not include

any full-sized grocery stores and there aren't any on West 41<sup>st</sup> Ave between Maple and Larch Streets or on any of the adjoining streets.

The closest grocery stores to the proposed development are at Arbutus and 16<sup>th</sup> Ave. (City Market) and a store about to open at West Boulevard and West 49<sup>th</sup> Ave. (Save On Foods). The Safeway store in the former Arbutus Village Mall, now only accessible off Nanton Ave., is at present less well-stocked than a convenience store. It is hemmed in by on-going extensive, slow-moving construction work with a far-off re-opening date. In any event, as a result of the slope on Arbutus Ridge, the Safeway store, assuming it re-opens as such, is not walkable from 2109 West 35<sup>th</sup> Ave.

The Report to Council fails to consider or mention the fact that there are no full-sized grocery stores within the walkable vicinity of Arbutus and West 35<sup>th</sup> Ave., the location of the proposed re-zoning.

## Summary

In summary, we are not opposed to an increase in rental accommodation in our neighbourhood. We are opposed to the re-zoning in order to accommodate the proposed 12-unit apartment building which would not add to the affordable rental housing in the City and is so badly designed that it would not be suitable for families with children nor for persons with physical disabilities limiting their mobility.

The proposed three-storey development at 2109 West 35<sup>th</sup> which the Report to Council supports puts the 2129 West 35<sup>th</sup> Ave property in shadow and robs both it and the property at 2126 West 34<sup>th</sup> Ave. of privacy. Both the livability and any future development of either of those contiguous properties would be problematic if the development at 2109 West 35<sup>th</sup> Ave proceeds in its present design form.

The building proposed, which will have the appearance of a tenement, is incompatible in design with the housing on either the east or west side of Arbutus Street between West 33rd and West 36<sup>th</sup> Ave and on any of the side streets in the vicinity. A more compatible alternative for the 2109 West 35<sup>th</sup> Ave site would have been a house with laneway housing.

Overall, a much better approach to planning aimed at increasing affordable housing in the area would be to consider proposals for the development not of the single site at 2109 West 35<sup>th</sup> Ave, with its obvious limitations and adverse impacts on adjacent properties, but of both lots on the north side of West 35<sup>th</sup> Ave and the property at 2126 West 34<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Afton H. Cayford

Anne Rowles

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential



## Dragnea, Irina

---

**From:** John Morrison s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Monday, July 09, 2018 2:06 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Rezoning Application for 2109 W 35th Ave

I live and own a home in the area of this application address and strongly disagree with it on a number of levels.

Firstly it is multi family project surrounded by single family homes and zoning.

Secondly its density is far greater than allowed in adjacent single family properties. Even if it had the same floor area as existing zoning its density and occupancy would far exceed single family use: 12 units vs 1!!! 12 cars vs 3!!

Thirdly its massing and architecture is not compatible with surrounding homes or the neighbourhood.

Fourthly its height and bulk is far greater than allowed under existing zoning and in the neighbourhood.

Fifthly its occupancy and parking is far in excess of current zoning and neighbourhood.

I am astounded that this project, given its complete lack of positive attributes, is even being remotely considered by the City and cannot state strongly enough how totally opposed to it I am as is every neighbour I have spoken to.

John Morrison