

Burke, Teresita

From: Louise Dawson s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2019 8:48 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 2715 West 12th Avenue

Building that many rental housing units in that small space on a busy street is a mistake. If you still do it, there should be a pedestrian light for crossing 12th Ave. at Stephen St. As for having only 2 car parking spaces and 19 bicycle spaces, it is a noble idea but totally impracticable where on-street parking is already a problem. Note that a similar project at 1805 Larch St. is planning for 56 underground car parking spaces and 113 bike parking spaces for 50 living units. Please scale down the whole project.

Louise T. Dawson

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Burke, Teresita

From: Hans Dpge s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Saturday, March 23, 2019 6:58 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Rezoning Application for 2715 West 12th Avenue

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Dear Sirs,

I attended the open house several months ago and am familiar with this development and re-zoning application.

The "14 for-profit rental housing units " need to be under \$1600/ mo. to be considered " affordable ".

Will they be rented for less than \$1600.?

The lack of parking is a disgrace.

2 car share spots for 14 units. Really ?

What are the numbers of vehicles currently , in the surrounding area? Per household ?

You as council should have this information for comparison.

Even if only every other unit had a vehicle , that would be a minimum of 7 cars in front of this development , not to mention visiting guests , or additional vehicles for the unit renters.

Are you going to forbid vehicles ownership / usage to the renters?

Do you demand the renters must use bicycles?

This vehicle issue is more disturbing than the density , to which most neighbours would not object.

Put more resident parking spots on the property , less bicycle spots, (who is going to leave a bicycle worth \$300 or more outside in Vancouver) out in the open ,and let the car share spots be on the street , where most are parked currently.

I would expect 7 parking spots on site , for these residents.

Thank you for receiving my comments.

Hans Doge

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Burke, Teresita

From: Simone Avram s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2019 10:02 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Re: Proposed development of 2715 West 12th Ave. Hearing April 2

Further to my previous comments.....

The city has bylaws dictating required fsr, front yard and backyard setbacks as well as height restrictions and a requirement for a property to provide one parking stall per unit in residential areas.

Do these bylaws not apply for this application? If not, why not?

This lot can easily be developed within those bylaw guidelines.

Thank you for hearing my comments.
Simone Avram

On Thu, Mar 21, 2019, 11:11 AM Simone Avram, s.22(1) Personal and Confidential wrote:
This application is **not** suitable for this location for the following reasons...

1... There are not adequate parking spots provided....

Since such a building is intended to be a for profit rental building on a west side lot that is far from any Skytrain hub, the rents will be high. It will therefore attract occupants with money. Occupants with money who do not live at a Skytrain hub will most likely have one to 2 vehicles.

This will amount to potentially 30 more vehicles parking on the neighboring streets and put a strain on all existing nearby residents who currently occupy the street parking .

it may be logical to build 14 units at a Skytrain hub where it is practical to have carless tenants but this is not nor is it scheduled to be a Skytrain hub.

2..a likely 2 to 3 occupants per unit results in over 40 new pedestrians potentially crossing 12th ave at Stevens where there is no traffic signal.

3..There are also no street curbs on Stevens street next to the property and no visible street drainage system on that street either.

4..there is a hazardous street corner where 12th going eastward from macdonald meets the 10th ave diversion and the southwest corner of Stevens. This hazard will be amplified by such a huge increase in density and it will increase odds of car and pedestrian accidents at that junction.

5..I am against any increase in building heights from the existing standard for this neighborhood.

6..this large increase in density will also put a strain on garbage and recycling management on this small lot.

Sincerely
Simone Avram

Swanston, Denise

From: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 10:47 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Proposed multifamily development at the corner of Stephens Street and the Kitsilano Diversion

Following is a note I sent to Michelle Yip in November, 2017, as well as Michelle's response. The note expressed my concerns regarding the proposed redevelopment at 2715 west 12th Avenue.

I wish to again stress the concern I have for the safety of any children, in particular, who may be living at this proposed location.

Vehicles enter that crossing area from SIX possible points (your "post card" map shows only five, however there are indeed six), requiring any pedestrian trying to cross at Stephens to be particularly observant and aware of the potential dangers.

I would be pleased to speak personally with anyone at COV regarding these issues, as well as at the public hearing. If anyone at the COV would prefer to actually visit the site, I would be more than happy to personally guide them around the area to illustrate first-hand the dangers.

Please register me to speak at the public hearing.

By the way, that site is a five minute walk from two major transit routes served well by bus. On Broadway there are the #9, #14 and #99 buses. On Macdonald there is the #2 bus. Any residents currently living in the area already own a bike if they wish to cycle. They will not be using any of the proposed 19 bikes. As for any new residents, they will use transit, if needed. Adding 19 bikes will only remove two street parking spots that exist today. I am sure the proposal suggests only "2 car share parking spaces" and 19 bikes is so they don't have to incur the costs related to providing a more reasonable number of underground parking spaces.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter,

John

From: Yip, Michelle <Michelle.Yip@vancouver.ca>
Sent: December 1, 2017 2:38 PM
To: John McDonald s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Subject: RE: Proposed multifamily development at the corner of Stephens Street and the Kitsilano Diversion

Hi John,

I don't know if I ever followed up on this email; I had it flagged. At the very least, I want to acknowledge that it was received and thank you for sending in your comments. I will definitely be speaking to the Transportation group regarding the safety concerns here. This has been a comment made by several residents.

This application is still under review. When it goes forward to Council, surrounding residents will be notified again by postcard, as well as, email if they had selected so.

Thanks again,
Michelle

Michelle Yip, AICP
Vancouver – Midtown | Planning Division
Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability | City of Vancouver
604.873.7727

From: John McDonald s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, November 02, 2017 2:23 PM
To: Yip, Michelle
Subject: Proposed multifamily development at the corner of Stephens Street and the Kitsilano Diversion

Hello Michelle,

I left you a voice message a short time ago wherein I outlined a couple of reasons why I am against the proposed development. As mentioned, I was unable to attend the public information session a couple of weeks ago due to a prior commitment, so my comments are based largely upon the development permit application sign at the existing church.

To summarize, my reasons (in no particular order) are as follows:

- This area currently consists of single family homes, and the development as proposed will set an unfortunate precedent, leading to a negative change to the desirability and livability of the area. Look what has happened to the Oak, Cambie, 41st and King Edward corridors. Entire neighbourhoods have been ravaged and destroyed by the combined factors of COV misguided priorities (densification *at all costs*), as well as the greed of real estate salespeople and developers.
- To suggest that two shared parking spots will be adequate for those living in fifteen units is silly. And wrong. This will result in more street parking and congestion in the neighbourhood.
- The intersection of Stephens and Kits Diversion is a dangerous one. I have lived in the neighbourhood since 1983 and have crossed it (literally) hundreds, if not thousands of times. It is a very wide street crossing. There is no light or even a painted crosswalk there. I have contacted the COV twice in the past requesting at least a crosswalk, however my request has fallen on deaf ears. The problem: vehicles on the Diversion will rarely stop to allow pedestrians to cross. Many times I have been stranded part way across the street while the vehicles whiz past me. Many times I have heard horns honking at pedestrians, tires squealing and people yelling. I even witnessed a fist fight between a pedestrian and a vehicle driver.
- The access to 12th Ave from the Diversion has a “No Entry” sign for those travelling west. The sign doesn’t stop some cars from entering it anyway, using it as a shortcut. Coming the other way on 12th, heading east, the vehicles often use it as a “merge” instead of a “stop”. I have almost been hit, both as a pedestrian and while driving, by vehicles being driven as described. I have reported this type of activity to the COV on more than one occasion, suggesting a reworking of the 12th Ave entry. I was basically “patted on the head” and told that that would not be happening. Maybe if a cyclist was hit there it would become a priority. Sorry, but it’s true!
- I understand there may be a play area for children as part of the development. With the volume of traffic on the Diversion, and under the conditions I have described above, this may very well result in a tragedy.

Please contact me if you wish to discuss further. Thank you.

John McDonald
s.22(1)
)
Perso