

Swanston, Denise

From: George W [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2019 7:07 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: 668-692 W. 54th Ave.

I own [REDACTED] and my daughter lives there. The proposed change location is almost directly opposite us and closely affects us. We both support the change from RS-1 to RM-8A zoning. Actually this change should be totally along 54th all the way between Cambie and Oak Streets but should not spread North or South of 54 so as not to disrupt the single family dwelling neighborhood adjacent on the vertical axis.

Fifty Forth Avenue is already a significant throughway for parents and students of the School and as such is an excellent candidate for more dense family-oriented development. The City needs much more housing for families and this street already has high traffic due to the proximity of Churchill school so townhouse development for families is a good idea here. However, please add the creation of sidewalks along 54th as a requirement for building as it is a bit dangerous for all the kids walking to and from school in the mornings and afternoons. We don't mind higher density mid-towers on the corners of 54th and Cambie & 54th & Oak, but the area on 54th between Cambie and Oak seems to be a prime location for townhouses or small low-rise apartments.

We only ask that the negative naysayers not be given much due because of their "not in my backyard" mindset and that traffic control along 54th be carefully reviewed for efficiency. Ingress and egress to any development by autos should remain by alleyway and not directly into 54th.

We are more directly impacted as a very close neighbor of the proposed change location and hope our support will be given greater weight than any vocal naysayers that are not directly on 54th Avenue.

Also note that the area is hilly nearby and bicycle transport on the North-South axis is difficult due to the hilly terrain descending to the shoreline on Marine Drive and ascending northwards to QE park (the highest point in Vancouver) so one should be mindful of the continued need for autos and therefore there should be generous parking required on-site the property so as to not overwhelm the public street parking. Do not minimize parking requirements because townhouse family-centric development requires more autos and the topography of the area makes bicycle use a bit more problematic.

We welcome further development on this street as we think the proximity to a school and the already busy traffic on this street makes the street an excellent candidate for higher density.

P. Wong