

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** António João Correia s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 16, 2020 9:23 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 1956-1990 1956-1990 Stainsbury Avenue Public Hearing

**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.

---

In reference to the construction on 1956-1990 Stainsbury Ave., I would like to register mine and my family's opposition to this project the way it was submitted

1. Destruction of healthy and monumental Shore Pine, Large Norway Spruce and Alder trees is not acceptable.
2. As a resident and homeowner on s.22(1) Personal and Confidential myself and my family will be negatively impacted if this project is approved as submitted.
3. When we bought our family residence it was the legitimate expectation that our property would be protected against all interferences against our privacy and quality of live. That's why we saved and worked to be able to purchase a house in a single family zoning area. We love to live here and we don't want to sell!
4. Building a 5th floor condo building behind your bedroom, kitchen and patio where you have meals with your family family is not acceptable. And currently against the law (zoning) in the area.
5. It violates our privacy and discriminates against our ownership rights.
6. It will created a barrier between the sun and my house, only with the modest laneway separating. Shadowing for ever my house where I and my family lives.
7. The density of this project behind my house is abusive and creates a terrible pressure on myself and family.
8. The City decision should be balanced. Between mine and my neighbors rights as homeowners(privacy, quality of live, noises, shadows,etc), and not only the for profit developer with all the obvious financial power and ability to influence the city.
9. It cannot be against one part, the weaker link, the working family that owns a house. We want to continue to live in East Vancouver. This is our city, this is our neighborhood!
10. Previously the city told us that in the portion of this side of Stainsbury would not authorize more than 2 or 3 floors. This was and is a balance position. Even when the buildings on East 18th and Victoria Drive, and the one on Victoria Drive and Stainsbury were approved it was said that it was not a precedent (and on the portion of Victoria Drive it makes sense higher density, not against the houses on Beatrice St.).
11. We would not oppose 2 or 3 floors maximum but preferably all for low income families and affordable(not only the ridiculous 20%).
12. All the recent buildings approved for rentals in this neighbourhood have, as you know, prohibitive rents, sometimes \$3,000.00 per month. This only helps speculation on what this project is a good example.
13. I spoke with several of my neighbors and all are against this project the way is submitted.

I would like to thank for your attention to this matter hoping the city is able to accept a balanced solution.

Sincerely,

Antonio Correia

Hildebrandt, Tina

---

From: Peter MacLean  
Sent: Saturday, January 11, 2020 1:25 PM  
To: Public Hearing  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed zoning change for 1956-1990 Stainsbury Avenue

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

**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 Sirs and Madams

I have received your notice of the public meeting on the above scheduled for Jan 21, 2020, and I wish to make known to you my opposition to this proposal.

The area north of Stainsbury fronting Victoria Dr and Commercial streets, was for many years occupied by commercial business and light industry and zoned as such. In the last ten years or so, the existing buildings were razed and new 5 or 6 Story apartment buildings took their place. Finally, when the old Dales factory was razed, construction was started on that area with the new apartment buildings facing Victoria Drive and Stainsbury St. So that whole area encircled by Stainsbury, Victoria, and Commercial has no been pretty well filled up with 5 - 6 story apartments. So far so good!

Now I understand that the city is entertaining another rental apartment zoning change southward across Stainsbury into Single Family Dwelling Area, which I fear will be the "thin edge of the Wedge" in extending CD-1 zoning further south along the west side of Victoria Dr. Already another realty company is working toward a zoning change application to change the 4200 - 4300 block of Victoria from RS-1A to CD-1. This would, if accepted, involve the razing of 15 single family dwellings as far north as Brewers Park. (Rather nice of them to leave us the park, eh?)

Now I am aware of the City's MIRHPP and I suppose we all must make some sacrifices, but it seems to me that this area is doing more than its share when you look at the blocks of new apartments in the Stainsbury, Victoria and Commercial Dr. area. And within a mile or so of this area the City has approved two zoning changes for the 2500 block Renfrew and the 2600 block Renfrew. In addition, on Jan.23 Council will hold a public hearing on rezoning 2209-2249 East Broadway for an apartment building.

In view of the above, I would urge Council to reject the Stainsbury proposal and let that area remain zoned as RS-1A..

P.J. MacLean

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

## Hildebrandt, Tina

---

**From:** Louise Chivers s.22(1) Personal and Confidential  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 08, 2020 9:42 AM  
**To:** Public Hearing  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] 1956-1990 Stainsbury

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.

---

I live a block from this proposed development and am a member of the City's Residential Advisory Committee. I'm a renter and am in support of increasing Vancouver's rental housing. However this development troubles me. The area has two large rental developments being constructed currently (within a block) and parking is already hard to find. It is too much new rental in one small area. Surely it is better to spread the development out a bit, especially as you are already changing bylaws. This appears to be bad city planning and may have many adverse consequences- local schools and community centres are already burst. No parking etc etc Yours truly Louise Chivers

Sent from my iPhone