

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** Julian Cooper "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 21, 2020 5:15 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Tues Jan 21 Public Hearing on development at 1956-1990 Stainsbury Avenue

**City of Vancouver Cybersecurity WARNING:** This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

---

Hi there,

I'm a resident "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential", Vancouver and i have several concerns about the proposed amendments to the by law and the development as a whole.

First of all, our area is seeing an unprecedented increase in the density with the two new rental developments at Stainsbury and Victoria and at 18th and Commercial St. (both over 100 units). I understand the need to build more units (and i refuse to call them affordable because they are not) but it seems the location and proposed developments give little consideration to our existing community. Does anywhere else in Vancouver have so many for rental buildings in such close proximity? Are zoning and development by laws being amended on west side Vancouver neighbourhoods like Dunbar, Kerrisdale, Point Grey, Kits etc?

Second, this new development has only 30 parking spots for 80 units? Are you kidding me? I understand as a city we need to do our part to promote green living and alternative modes of transportation. The reality is that most families have at least one car (as does my family) and some people have no other options. Having only 30 parking stalls for 80 units will do little to actually promote the environment/alternative modes of transit and is short-sighted, poor planning as it will negatively impact parking and living for all people in the community. Cars shares are leaving, uber and Lyft have been stalled by the NDP. There's is not even a paved sidewalk on stainsbury between porter and commercial street (beside maxime bakery). Obviously, the council has a mandate to achieve a certain number new housing units by x date (whatever was promised in Kennedy's platform) but this is being done with very little foresight and current residents will bear the brunt of this unprecedented, quick-fix development.

The City of Portland approved a zero parking structure thinking that because it was in a transit-oriented neighbourhood people without cars would be attracted to it. It was a total flop as residents and businesses felt the pressure of the extra parking in the community. What they found was many people did utilize transit, biking, and car shares for commuting, but still owned at least one car, which they used To enjoy recreational outings like skiing, mountain biking, grocery shopping with or shuttling kids to activities.

For comparison, the Porter building has 88 stalls plus 21 visitor stalls for 200 units and they are all full, with a lot of their residents parking on the street. THIS AFFECTS OUR COMMUNITY, not the communities of the people that the development company plants to stand up (usually employees in pointy, shiny shoes) and voice support for the project.

We have 50 units and over 60 stalls - and a wait list for more parking in our complex for further comparison.

The new Strand development beside us will have approximately 107 spaces for 153 units and 196 bike spaces.

I do not support this development as proposed and strongly suggest it is either not built all together or plans are amended to include adequate parking.

Concerned citizen,  
Julian

**Choi, Rowena**

---

**From:** Larry Benge "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 21, 2020 4:31 PM  
**To:** Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office  
**Cc:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** Re: Item 3. Rezoning Application - 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury Avenue  
**Attachments:** CVN Letter to Council-1956-1990 Stainsbury 01.21.20.pdf

This issue is Item 3 on Agenda of Public Hearing tonight, and should be included in letters of opposition. If this is only possible through the email you indicated, then here is the attached Letter to be included.

Thanks,

Thanks,  
Larry A. Benge, Co-chair  
Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

[Redacted content]

- > Importance: High
- >
- > Please see attached letter.
- >
- > Thanks,
- > Larry A. Bengé, Co-chair
- > Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods



# COALITION OF VANCOUVER NEIGHBOURHOODS

<http://coalitionvan.org>

January 20, 2020

City of Vancouver Council

Dear Mayor Kennedy Stewart and Councillors,

**RE: Item 3. Rezoning Application - 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury Avenue Public Hearing Jan 21,2020**

<https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1956-1990Stainsbury/index.htm>

The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods (CVN) **opposes** this rezoning application. We are concerned that many issues have been raised by the local community group Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours (CCAN), including such as the following:

- the local community have had to absorb many spot rezonings that are unsupported
- these types of rezoning projects render moot the effectiveness of the years-down-the-road mirage of a City-wide Plan
- this would be a blockbuster setting a precedent for additional large buildings in the middle of a quiet residential area.
- the building height is overbearing to the houses next to it; 18 m (59.2 feet) tall is equivalent to a 6 storey building
- the density doesn't conform to 1.5 FSR in the [Stainsbury triangle](#) as on the North side so why allow 2.59 FSR on the South side in an RS 1 zone (small detached homes area)
- only 34 parking stalls for 80 units in an area already overburdened with on-street parking problems area schools are already overcrowded; the community centre is too crowded with no space for small children; and with the waiver of CACs as a bonus to developer, no money to change this situation!
- there is nothing that staff can point to indicating general support for this in the 'community plan' as there was no household survey
- the large mature street trees will be destroyed; trees are a significant part of local heritage and a community amenity
- There have already been 3 projects of this type in this immediate neighbourhood approved in the last 5 years, this will be the 4th. The policy of limiting developments with inadequate parking to a minimum of 10 blocks apart has been totally disregarded.

Density and affordable housing are good. This design, on this site, is not. The Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods joins the Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours in recommending that this application be rejected.

Sincerely,

Larry Benge, Co-Chair

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Dorothy Barkley, Co-Chair

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

On behalf of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

## Member Groups of the Coalition of Vancouver Neighbourhoods

Arbutus Ridge Community Association  
Arbutus Ridge/ Kerrisdale/ Shaughnessy Visions  
Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours  
Downtown Eastside Neighbourhood Council  
Dunbar Residents Association  
Fairview/South Granville Action Committee  
False Creek Residents Association  
Grandview Woodland Area Council  
Granville-Burrard Residents & Business Assoc.  
Greater Yaletown Community Association  
Joyce Area Residents  
Kitsilano-Arbutus Residents Association  
Kits Point Residents Association

Marpole Residents Coalition  
Norquay Residents  
NW Point Grey Home Owners Association  
Oakridge Langara Area Residents  
Residents Association Mount Pleasant  
Riley Park/South Cambie Visions  
Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Association  
Strathcona Residents Association  
Upper Kitsilano Residents Association  
West End Neighbours Society  
West Kitsilano Residents Association  
West Point Grey Residents Association

## Choi, Rowena

---

**From:** ruth cherry "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 21, 2020 4:24 PM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Hearing - Rezoning Application for 1956-1990 Stainsbury -- Item 3 Jan 21 2020

**City of Vancouver Cybersecurity WARNING:** This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

---

Dear Mayor Stewart and City Councillors

**RE:** Item 3. Rezoning Application - 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury Avenue Public Hearing Jan 21, 2020

Following are some issues with this current Stainsbury project

- the building height is overbearing to the houses next to it; 18 m (59.2 feet) tall is equivalent to a 6 storey building
- the density doesn't conform to 1.5 FSR in the [Stainsbury triangle](#) as on the North side so why allow 2.59 FSR on the South side in an RS 1 zone (small detached homes area)
- there is a lack of parking, 80 units and 34 parking spaces - this area is already overcrowded with street parking
- there is not enough ground level green space available to the public view, all setbacks are not large enough
- the construction itself may well destroy the foundations and create a water damming effect on surrounding properties as happened with the project at Commercial Dr and E 18th; with no help from City building inspector as it becomes a P. ENG problem -- private litigation
- the schools in the area are overcrowded
- the community centre is too crowded; no space for little kids
- the large mature trees will be destroyed; we consider trees part of our heritage and a community amenity
- there is too much traffic in the area now because of new developments
- Cedar Cottage has been overburdened with this type of building that does not provide adequate parking. There have already been 3 projects of this type in this immediate neighbourhood approved in the last 5 years, this will be the 4th. The policy, for rentals with reduced parking and overbearingly tall, was supposed to limit projects to a minimum of ten blocks apart so the neighbourhood would not be unduly disrupted and to maintain neighbourhood character. That's gone out the window.
- the rental building at Knight and 15th is on AirBNB; this project may end up on AirBNB too
- the Knight and 15th rental building has had a FOR RENT sign posted outside ever since it was built two years ago

- there was inadequate to *no* consultation with the neighbourhoods across Vancouver to allow such zoning changes in RS zones ---- THIS IS ABSOLUTELY OUTRAGEOUS BEHAVIOUR BY THE CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT!!!! People buy into a neighbourhood expecting certain building attributes.
- there is yet another one of these 6 storey projects being proposed at 1405 East 15th and 3047-3071 Madams St
- spread these types of buildings across Vancouver if you must have them; STOP dumping them in Cedar Cottage
- this type of project takes years to construct, that is years of noise and dust and disruption

Yours truly,

Ruth Cherry