

Choi, Rowena

From: Dylan Groven "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 2:02 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSED: Rezoning Application - 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.

Hi,

I am writing in response to the proposed development at 1956-1990 Stainsbury Avenue.

First and foremost, I and my family recognize the need for more housing for families, so I am not - in principal - opposed to densification.

However there has started to be some concern among residents in the planning aspect of recent additions to the neighbourhood. As the development has continued, the city has been understandably focused on increasing it's rental market to help balance out the cost of housing in our city. But these rental developments come with some hidden costs to our neighbourhood that we were made aware of at the information meeting for this development last year.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Because of the focus on rentals, **the city has given developments of this nature a pass on the money that a building of this size usually has to apply to neighbourhood infrastructure.** DCLs and CACs are what gets waived as incentives for developers to build rental housing instead of strata/owned properties. These charges pay a lot of neighbourhood improvements including:

- Libraries
- Childcare facilities
- Community centres
- Transportation services
- Cultural facilities
- Neighbourhood house

So 500 units are being added to our area, with no money is going to elements of the neighbourhood that are part of what is making it so appealing to developers. If this is in fact the case, I would like to know how the city will be making up for that as the increased population will naturally require more money for surrounding parks.

For example, Brewers Park, two blocks north of both the Strand and [1956 Stainsbury Ave.](#), has been waiting for it's improvement for approx. 4 years now, with neighbourhood input and a lot of promises from the parks board around the start to it's already planned and approved improvements. How does a park, which

had a violent attack happen because of it's decrepit state last year, get looked over year after year when all this multi-million development is going in so close by?

TRAFFIC

The traffic on 22nd Ave has always been an issue as it serves as a connection between Victoria and Clark and is often used as a shortcut. Speed bumps have made a difference, but if we continue to add population without any infrastructure or thought towards how we will manage our growing density, it's an increased risk for our children walking to school and the neighbouring parks. Traffic is only going to get worse with the addition of these units.

PARKING

We are being led to believe that something on the order of 50% of the units being built won't have parking stalls on property. This is patently insane. Sure the long-term trend is that our city is moving to become more pedestrian and transit friendly, but these are units built ostensibly for families, and the need for at least one car for families is still high. There needs to be 70%+ coverage with 1 parking stall per unit at least.

SCHOOL & COMMUNITY

There's an issue here as the support for this building is coming from the attractive balance we have in this neighbourhood.

I'd like to quote one of the supporting letters:

"Finally, I would like to add that the amenities of the neighbourhood, all within walking distance, including the schools (Lord Selkirk Elementary and Gladstone Secondary), Trout Lake Community Center and the lovely park it is situated on, the stores on Commercial Drive, and many more, should be equally accessible to homeowners and tenants. It would make a great neighbourhood for couples and families to rent, grow, and thrive in, and would be a step in the right direction in addressing the issue of limited rental housing that many of us face in Vancouver."

Naming the vary amenities that are at risk of over-subscription is to me an indicator that marketing is taking the place of real long term planning.

- **Our schools are already bursting with a lottery system for entrance**, so these families are more than likely not going to be going to them.
- **Our community centre programs are now very challenging to register for**, creating less opportunity for the community to participate.

There does not seem to be a coordinated planning approach to integrate these developments with additional infrastructure investments, and as such we as a tight-nit community are opposed to the project proceeding as designed.

BR
Dylan

--

Dylan Groven
"s. 22(1) Personal and
Confidential"

Choi, Rowena

From: Hamilton, Emily "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 1:23 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OPPOSED: REZONING: 1956-1990 Stainsbury Avenue

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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 I am writing in response to the recent application of development for a 6 (18 m) story building, **of which I am opposed in it's current application.**

I have been living in the neighbourhood for six months and have lived in Vancouver for 10 years as a visitor to some of the things that the neighbourhood offers. It has been exciting to watch the development in the area...and I'm especially excited about the commercial opportunities and growth on Commercial Street.

I am concerned, however, with the infrastructure planning aspect of recent additions to the neighbourhood. As the development has continued, the city has been understandably focused on increasing the rental market to help balance out the cost of housing in our city. But these rental developments come with some hidden costs to our neighbourhood that we were made aware of at the information meeting for this development last year.

Because of the focus on rentals, the city has given developments of this nature a pass on the money that a building of this size usually has to apply to neighbourhood infrastructure. DCLs and CACs are what gets waived as incentives for developers to build rental housing instead of strata/owned properties. These charges pay a lot of neighbourhood improvements including:

- Libraries
- Childcare facilities
- Community centres
- Transportation services
- Cultural facilities
- Neighbourhood house

So 500 units are being added to our area, with no money is going to elements of the neighbourhood that are part of what is making it so appealing to developers. If this is in fact the case, I would like to know how the city will be making up for that as the increased population will naturally require more money for surrounding parks.

For example, Brewers Park, two blocks north of both the Strand and 1956 Stainsbury Ave., has been waiting for it's improvement for approx. 4 years now, with neighbourhood input and a lot of promises from the parks board around the start to it's already planned and approved improvements. How does a park, which had a violent attack happen because of it's decrepit state last year, get looked over year after year when all this multi-million development is going in so close by?

The traffic on 22nd Ave has always been an issue as it serves as a connection between Victoria and Clark and is often used as a shortcut. My young children have almost been hit by cars multiple times...cars driving too fast who don't recognize that they are in a residential area...somebody's home. With the addition of multiple large apartment developments we need to have stronger traffic calming strategies. The neighbourhood east of Victoria and Venebles is an excellent example of what we need. In that neighbourhood there are no shortcuts, which means those residents feel safe on their streets.

Parking is a growing issue. With many townhouse/condo developments and now rental units that are being built with not enough parking for each unit, we are facing a crisis. I am already aware of residents who need to park blocks from their houses on some weekends. How will these new buildings, specifically the proposed unit on Stainsbury avenue (with 30 parking spots for 80 units) contribute to this issue. Why is it that developers are not forced to provide a minimum of 1 parking spot per unit? Why should those of us living in the neighbourhood pay a price for their poor planning? There has already been a dramatic increase in parking, just from the construction staff. What happens when all those units are populated and the streets become overridden with cars, before the proposed building even breaks ground?!

I'd like to quote one of the supporting letters:

"Finally, I would like to add that the amenities of the neighbourhood, all within walking distance, including the schools (Lord Selkirk Elementary and Gladstone Secondary), Trout Lake Community Center and the lovely park it is situated on, the stores on Commercial Drive, and many more, should be equally accessible to homeowners and tenants. It would make a great neighbourhood for couples and families to rent, grow, and thrive in, and would be a step in the right direction in addressing the issue of limited rental housing that many of us face in Vancouver."

There's an issue here as the support for this building is coming from the attractive balance we have in this neighbourhood. Naming the vary amenities that are at risk of over-subscription is to me an indicator that marketing is taking the place of real long term planning.

- Our schools are already bursting with a lottery system for entrance, so these families are more than likely not going to be going to them. I live almost directly across the street from Lord Selkirk school and I am anxiously waiting to hear if my son, who starts kindergarten this year will even get into the school. It is extremely stressful and not appropriate. I am someone who moved to this neighbourhood so that my children could attend a great school that offers French Immersion. It is highly unlikely that we will get into the French program...let alone get into the school itself! This marketing stance is unacceptable for families with young children who want to live in a neighbourhood for a long-term to benefit their children. Instead false marketing and overpopulating a neighbourhood without enough infrastructure to support the people who live there creates stress and disappointment for residents.
- Additionally the neighbourhood houses and after-school care are overprescribed. There are many stories of families who simply don't get into any of the programs and are desperately seeking care for their children outside of school hours. Already there is a need to put children on waitlists over a year in advance. How will adding 80 more units (on top of the current multi-dweller buildings that are already being built or approved in our small neighbourhood) contribute to this issue? The same situation with daycare is true, which is a city-wide crisis that creates increasing stress and uncertainty for new parents.
- Our community centre programs are now very challenging to register for, creating less opportunity for the community to participate.


Please, please I urge the council to make an effort and give us a long term plan. Before you approve this building, tell us what you will do to ensure there is infrastructure to support the residents who would live there? Give us a long term plan for the existing buildings that have been approved. It is not right that I am afraid to let my children play on the sidewalk because of cars rushing by between Victoria and Clark. It is not right that I need to wait 2-3 minutes to pull my car out onto my own street due to the intense amount of traffic already. What will this look like if this development is approved (on top of the two developments underway on Victoria and the high rise being planned at Kingsway and Dunsmuir)?

Density in the outlying areas of Vancouver makes sense but requires thoughtful and thorough planning so that the balance that everyone wants to move here for is maintained.

Please consider these important elements as our neighbourhood needs to be protected as it grows.

Emily Hamilton, MA, PMP

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

A large rectangular area of the document is redacted with a solid grey fill, obscuring the text underneath.

Choi, Rowena

From: jarrod tiffin "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 11:11 AM
To: Public Hearing; jilly tiffin
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fw: 1956-1990 Stainsbury ave.

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.

To whom it may concern. I sent my comments in May as opposed to this development but see on the web page that it has not been included. Please include mine for tonights hearing.

Thank you

Jarrold Tiffin

From: jarrod tiffin
Sent: Monday, May 6, 2019 7:20 PM
To: "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Subject: 1956-1990 Stainsbury ave.

Hello Mr. Chee Chan,

My name is Jarrod Tiffin and I live at "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" just behind the proposed development.

I appreciate what goes into the design of buildings and know that it is impossible to please everyone on all parts. I am not a stranger to developments as I am involved in some my self with partners with a company called PortLiving. So the need for housing is not lost on me.

I am writing to you to express my concerns for parts of this project that concern me and I am hoping to make them known or have answers to them at your open house.

1- the height of this building seems about 1 story to tall to me. When looking at the elevations in relation to the existing homes on the south side of Stainsbury it dwarfs the existing homes and doesn't blend in as well as it could due to its height. It stands out. I understand that on the north side of Stainsbury the new building being constructed now is taller 6 story's, how ever I feel a 4 story building blends the visual line from the new building to this development to the existing 2 story homes much smoother. At the moment is seems like a wall.

2- The lane behind. At the moment the lane is a twisted broken road with alot of pot holes and dirt. By increasing the amount of traffic to this building from behind (even with the one direction sign proposed) this lane will become destroyed. Is there plans to fix all 3 entrances to this lane and the road surface? 34 cars seems little but it is 34 more then the normal use now and this is without another exit from it which is being taken to build this development. At the current time the city green trucks and garbage trucks can barely get thru and cause damage to fences and plants. I feel that this will become a problem and in its current state, a

increase in damage to homes and vehicles is needed to be looked at. That said if the lane was to be resurfaced and improved with signage and having the city keep an eye on the lane way parking and green bin and waste bins being identified as bad storage by some homes then it may be workable. Another concern is parking. The building doesn't have enough parking and the overflow will end up on the streets and lanes as it always does. Our area now is struggling to park a car. We often see people from 2 blocks away parking in front of our house. There is a lot of young mothers and elderly in the neighbourhood who cannot be dealing with walking with bags of groceries for blocks on end because of poor planning for a new building that skimmed on the parking.

3- With all the other buildings for families being built in the area and the ones that have already been built I am concerned about the school catchments. I live "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential". My 5 year old twins started kindergarten this year and attend this school. That said we almost were not accepted due to the lack of spaces available. How can the city just add units for families without addressing this school issue. People live in areas that they can have their kids go to the school in their area where they can make friends with the neighbourhood kids. This is counterproductive to that family idealism. I understand that we need more affordable housing but without the infrastructure to support the new families and the existing families, then this is not a well thought out plan.

As I stated before I am pro development but it seems to me this development 80 units, with the also proposed 69 units at 3560/3570 Hull St/ 2070-2090 East 20th, the 152 units at the Victoria across the street. This is 301 new units or families. Combine this with The Porter, the new development at 18th and Victoria, the existing 5 story buildings and developments beside the Victoria and all along Commercial St. The area is now becoming overloaded. It has the starting of a new kind of "projects" or transient neighbourhoods.

I hope this all makes some sense and that going forward. In closing I feel that a 4 storey building will give the city some more rental units, lower the impact of people, and be a nice transition from the 6 story Victoria, to this development (ideally 4 story's) to the existing 2 story homes. A gentle slope with an improved lane.

Thanks for your time and feel free to get in touch if you feel the need.

Jarrold Tiffin

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Choi, Rowena

From: Leckovic, Katrina
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 10:50 AM
To: CC Meeting Coordinators - DL
Subject: FW: Item 3. Rezoning Application - 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury Avenue
Attachments: CVN Letter to Council-1956-1990 Stainsbury 01.21.20.pdf

Importance: High

FYA

Katrina Leckovic
City Clerk
Office of the City Clerk | City of Vancouver
604.873.7998

-----Original Message-----

From: Swanson, Jean
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 10:45 AM
To: Leckovic, Katrina
Subject: FW: Item 3. Rezoning Application - 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury Avenue
Importance: High

-----Original Message-----

From: "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 10:24 AM
To: Stewart, Kennedy; Bligh, Rebecca; Boyle, Christine; Carr, Adriane; De Genova, Melissa; Dominato, Lisa; Fry, Pete; Hardwick, Colleen; Kirby-Yung, Sarah; Swanson, Jean; Wiebe, Michael
Cc: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Item 3. Rezoning Application - 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury Avenue
Importance: High

Please see attached letter.

Thanks,
Larry A. Benge, 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: Dorothy D. Barkley "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 10:02 AM
To: Public Hearing; Carr, Adriane; Boyle, Christine; Hardwick, Colleen; De Genova, Melissa; Swanson, Jean; Stewart, Kennedy; Dominato, Lisa; Wiebe, Michael; Fry, Pete; Bligh, Rebecca; Kirby-Yung, Sarah
Cc: Johnston, Sadhu; Kelley, Gil
Subject: Grandview Woodland Area Council OPPOSES the rezoning project at 1956 -1990 Stainsbur
Attachments: 01 - Stainsbury Project.pdf

Attn: Mayor Kennedy Stewart and City Councillors:

RE: Item 3. Rezoning Application - 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury Avenue Public Hearing Jan 21,2020
<https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1956-1990 Stainsbury/index.htm>

Grandview Woodland Area Council opposes the rezoning project at 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury.

Through our experience in dealing with rental projects over the last five years in our neighbourhood, eg. at 1st and Clark, Grant Street, and a proposed Boffo project at Commercial and Venables, we acknowledge, that this rezoning is already a “fait accompli”.

RE: Item 3. Rezoning Application - 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury Avenue Public Hearing Jan 21,2020 <https://rezoning.vancouver.ca/applications/1956-1990Stainsbury/index.htm>

Grandview Woodland Area Council opposes the rezoning project at 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury.

. So, providing our view as a neighbouring community is a statement of optimism in the face of the evidence being provided by the City and its Planning department.

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 too short

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

area schools are already overcrowded

the community centre is too crowded with no space for small children

the large mature street trees will be destroyed; trees are a significant part of local heritage and a community amenity

there is too much traffic in the area now because of new developments

Grandview Woodland as well as Cedar Cottage have 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 has been totally discarded.

the rental building at Knight and 15th is listed on AirBNB; this project may also end up on AirBNB which does nothing to increase affordable housing for the local population, and runs counter to the need to provide affordable housing.

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 invest their lifetime earnings to buy into a community expecting certain neighbourhood attributes to remain reliably.

there is yet another 6 storey project being proposed at 1405 East 15th and again at 3047- 3071 Madams Street

if the City insists on 5-6 storey buildings in residential neighbourhoods, in all fairness distribute them equally across Vancouver; and not primarily in East Vancouver

this type of project takes years to construct, that is years of noise and dust and disruption in a single family residential neighbourhood.

Yours truly,

Dorothy D. Barkley, *Past Chair On behalf of*

Grandview Woodland Area Council (GWAC)

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

CC: Sadhu Johnson, City Manager
Gill Kelly, Director of Planning & Development



GRANDVIEW WOODLAND

• AREA COUNCIL •
gwac.ca

January 21, 2020

City of Vancouver
453 West 12th Avenue,
Vancouver, British Columbia
V5Y 1V4

Attn: Mayor Kennedy Stewart and City Councillors:

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

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

Grandview Woodland Area Council opposes the rezoning project at 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury.

Through our experience in dealing with rental projects over the last five years in our neighbourhood, eg. at 1st and Clark, Grant Street, and a proposed Boffo project at Commercial and Venables, we acknowledge, that this rezoning is already a “fait accompli”.

. So, providing our view as a neighbouring community is a statement of optimism in the face of the evidence being provided by the City and its Planning department.

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 too short
- 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
- area schools are already overcrowded
- the community centre is too crowded with no space for small children
- the large mature street trees will be destroyed; trees are a significant part of local heritage and a community amenity
- there is too much traffic in the area now because of new developments
- Grandview Woodland as well as Cedar Cottage have been overburdened with this type of building that does not provide adequate parking. There have already been 3 projects of this



GRANDVIEW WOODLAND

• AREA COUNCIL •

gwac.ca

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 has been totally discarded.

- the rental building at Knight and 15th is listed on AirBNB; this project may also end up on AirBNB which does nothing to increase affordable housing for the local population, and runs counter to the need to provide affordable housing.
- 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 invest their lifetime earnings to buy into a community expecting certain neighbourhood attributes to remain reliably.
- there is yet another 6 storey project being proposed at 1405 East 15th and again at 3047-3071 Madams Street
- if the City insists on 5-6 storey buildings in residential neighbourhoods, in all fairness distribute them equally across Vancouver; and not primarily in East Vancouver
- this type of project takes years to construct, that is years of noise and dust and disruption in a single family residential neighbourhood.

Yours truly,

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Dorothy D. Barkley, *Past Chair*

On behalf of

Grandview Woodland Area Council (GWAC)

"s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"

CC: Sadhu Johnson, City Manager

Gill Kelly, Director of Planning & Development

Choi, Rowena

From: Jilly Tiffin "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 5:54 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 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 I am writing in response to the recent application of development for a 6 (18 m) story building, of which I am opposed in it's current application.

After living in the neighbourhood for approximately 7 years, it has been exciting and invigorating to watch the densification of this area of Cedar Cottage. One of the things I was most excited about was the potential this neighbourhood has for becoming a vibrant and varied community, with a mixture of commercial and residential spaces and lots of hustle and bustle on Commercial Street.

And over the first 5 years it started to come to fruition, with many new comprehensive developments adding families and density to a neighbourhood that is urban by location and desirable in it's access to many amenities.

But over the last 2 years there has started to be some concern among residents in the planning aspect of recent additions to the neighbourhood. As the development has continued, the city has been understandably focused on increasing it's rental market to help balance out the cost of housing in our city. But these rental developments come with some hidden costs to our neighbourhood that we were made aware of at the information meeting for this development last year.

Because of the focus on rentals, the city has given developments of this nature a pass on the money that a building of this size usually has to apply to neighbourhood infrastructure. DCLs and CACs are what gets waived as incentives for developers to build rental housing instead of strata/owned properties. These charges pay a lot of neighbourhood improvements including:

- Libraries
- Childcare facilities
- Community centres
- Transportation services
- Cultural facilities
- Neighbourhood house

So 500 units are being added to our area, with no money is going to elements of the neighbourhood that are part of what is making it so appealing to developers. If this is in fact the case, I would like to know how the city will be making up for that as the increased population will naturally require more money for surrounding parks.

For example, Brewers Park, two blocks north of both the Strand and 1956 Stainsbury Ave., has been waiting for it's improvement for approx. 4 years now, with neighbourhood input and a lot of promises from the parks board around the start to it's already planned and approved improvements. How does a park, which had a violent attack happen because of it's decrepit state last year, get looked over year after year when all this multi-million development is going in so close by?

The traffic on 22nd Ave has always been an issue as it serves as a connection between Victoria and Clark and is often used as a shortcut. Speed bumps have made a difference, but if we continue to add population without any infrastructure or thought towards how we will manage our growing density, it's an increased risk for our children walking to school and the neighbouring parks.

I was told at a information meeting for this building that "most people don't drive anymore, so 30 parking stalls for 80 units is just fine." The reality is that during the construction of Stance, the building immediately north of the proposed site, has shown an dramatic increase in parking, just from the construction staff. What happens when all those units are populated and the streets become overridden with cars, before the proposed building even breaks ground?!

I'd like to quote one of the supporting letters:

"Finally, I would like to add that the amenities of the neighbourhood, all within walking distance, including the schools (Lord Selkirk Elementary and Gladstone Secondary), Trout Lake Community Center and the lovely park it is situated on, the stores on Commercial Drive, and many more, should be equally accessible to homeowners and tenants. It would make a great neighbourhood for couples and families to rent, grow, and thrive in, and would be a step in the right direction in addressing the issue of limited rental housing that many of us face in Vancouver."

There's an issue here as the support for this building is coming from the attractive balance we have in this neighbourhood. Naming the vary amenities that are at risk of over-subscription is to me an indicator that marketing is taking the place of real long term planning.

- Our schools are already bursting with a lottery system for entrance, so these families are more then likely not going to be going to them
- Our community centre programs are now very challenging to register for, creating less opportunity for the community to participate.

Please, please I urge the council to make and effort add give us a long term plan. Density in the outlying areas of Vancouver makes sense but requires thoughtful and thorough planning so that the balance that everyone wants to move here for is maintained.

Please consider these important elements as our neighbourhood needs to be protected as it grows.

--

Jilly Tiffin

Choi, Rowena

From: Joseph Jones s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2020 12:24 AM
To: Public Hearing; Carr, Adriane; Boyle, Christine; Hardwick, Colleen; De Genova, Melissa; Swanson, Jean; Stewart, Kennedy; Dominato, Lisa; Wiebe, Michael; Fry, Pete; Bligh, Rebecca; Kirby-Yung, Sarah
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Hearing 21 January 2020 – Item 3. Rezoning Application - 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.

Public Hearing 21 January 2020

Item 3. Rezoning Application - 1956 - 1990 Stainsbury Avenue

We take this occasion to call to your attention the extreme amount of density dumping that has occurred in one very small area of Cedar Cottage, a neighborhood in which we have been resident for forty years. This one tiny area of Cedar Cottage has never enjoyed the benefit of any focused planning. The area's adjacency to the elevated SkyTrain line between Broadway/Commercial and Nanaimo stations seems to have condemned it to rapid and careless build-out.

The supposed "neighbourhood centre" for all of Cedar Cottage was established at Kingsway/Knight in July 2004:

<http://former.vancouver.ca/commsvcs/planning/neighcentres/kingswayknight/index.htm>

That particular long-range piece of "planning" asserted that outlying areas of Cedar Cottage would be less dense.

This new rezoning proposal compounds the effects of five previous rezonings, carried out under recent and volatile varieties of "policy" which exhibit blatant kludging:

2018 July 10

4. REZONING: 3560-3570 Hull Street and 2070-2090 East 20th Avenue
<https://council.vancouver.ca/20180710/phea20180710ag.htm>

2017 Nov 14

3. REZONING: 3681 Victoria Drive and 1915 Stainsbury Avenue
<https://council.vancouver.ca/20171114/phea20171114ag.htm>

2016 June 23

1. REZONING: 3365 Commercial Drive and 1695-1775 East 18th Avenue
<https://council.vancouver.ca/20160623/phea20160623ag.htm>

2014 May 20

1. REZONING: 3120-3184 Knight Street
<https://council.vancouver.ca/20140520/phea20140520ag.htm>

2011 Jan 18

1. REZONING: 3522 Porter Street
<https://council.vancouver.ca/20110118/phea20110118.htm>

Most of the development listed above is visualized in Figure 2 on Page 4 of the report that proposes rezoning for 1956-1990 Stainsbury Avenue.

This sixth instance of density dumping in the heart of East Vancouver leads us to ask Council these two questions:

- How can the City of Vancouver maintain even a façade of good conscience while exacerbating already egregious historical inequity?
- How can such a concentration of new density be allowed without explicit provision for concurrent and compensating amenity?

Our Cedar Cottage neighborhood is being ravaged by the excesses of focused profiteering. Council needs to direct city planners to ameliorate this aggregation of severe new impacts. A good place to start would be to

fund the seriously overdue renewal of Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood House.

Sincerely,
Joseph and Jeanette Jones

Choi, Rowena

From: Jenn Barker "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2020 10:26 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] REZONING: 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.

Dear Mayor Stewart and Councillors,

Please accept this email as opposition to the rezoning application of 1956-1990 Stainsbury Ave from myself and my family.

I have been in Cedar Cottage for over 12 years. I support the City of Vancouver and how we need more rental units but Cedar Cottage has done enough to help make the change. When more rental units were built on Victoria Dr there were positive changes in my community. Now unfortunately we are being overrun and developers are going too far to take advantage of a popular neighbourhood.

Here are some issues that the City really needs to urgently address:

Cedar Cottage does not have the infrastructure to support this many new units at once. There have already been three large rental projects built or approved to be built over the last 5 years including Commercial Dr and 18th, Hull St/Victoria Diversion and Knight and 15th. Not to mention the tower that will also be constructed on the old Rona site on Kingsway and Dumfries.

Everyday I see the effects of having more traffic on the roads, putting more children at risk walking to school. With more traffic comes more aggressive drivers and more accidents. The lack of parking to units will only create more issues in an area that is already overcrowded with street parking.

Our community centre, childcare facilities and schools are over capacity. Trout Lake and it's 2010 Legacy renovation is already too small to support the neighbourhood. Now you have to apply to a lottery system to get your child into the neighbourhood catchment- the school is well over capacity. The stats that the developer supplied have already proved to be inaccurate. This is also before the 4 new developments have even been occupied. It will only be a bigger issue in the future and destroy the opportunities for young families to have their kids go to a school within walking distance.

This building is too tall and unfair to the families living on the same block. It should be no higher than 3 storeys. This building is too large to be built without effecting surrounding properties in a negative way.

The building on Knight St has been advertising vacancy for the last 2 years and one of the suites is posted as an Air BnB. This is a sign that there will be enough rentals units available in this area and the city needs to look to other neighbourhoods that could benefit from the improvements. Cedar Cottage is being negatively altered by developers and the lack of long term city planning. There are so many other neighbourhoods that could really benefit and the city needs to direct developers to those areas, instead of simply rubber stamping another project on top of the 4 new developments that are guaranteed to further exasperate all of the above concerns.

Please help our community and turn down this project in the Cedar Cottage area. Please continue your

important job of creating much needed rental units in other neighbourhoods who could truly benefit from densification. There are ways to create a balance and this would be the first step. I hope the City of Vancouver recognizes this and acts accordingly.

Sincerely,

Jenn Barker

Choi, Rowena

From: Joanna Walton "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2020 10:03 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 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.

I OPPOSE THIS DEVELOPMENT

There are already more than enough rental buildings in this neighborhood ,either being built or finished.

Spread the rental buildings throughout the city

- This one is too high in a a block of houses .
- Not enough parking.
- Overloaded schools

Please listen to residents not developers.

Thanks

Choi, Rowena

From: Karley Fraser "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2020 7:44 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public Concerns for 1956-1990 Stainsbury Development
Attachments: image.png

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.

Hello,

As a current owner at "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential", I am very concerned about the parking situation at this new development.

The 80 unit building has proposed only 30 parking stalls. This is going to make our already very congested street parking more challenging for the residents on the block.

I am sending you this note as a concerned neighbour ahead of tomorrow's public hearing. 30 stalls is simply unacceptable.

Regards,
Karley & Dan Fraser

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

January 7, 2020

1956-1990 Stainsbury Avenue

Vancouver City Council will hold a Public Hearing on:
Tuesday, January 21, 2020 at 6 pm
Vancouver City Hall, 453 West 12th Avenue,
Third Floor, Council Chamber

Council will consider amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law. If approved, the zoning would change from RS-1A (One-Family Dwelling) District to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District.

The proposal is to develop a five-storey residential building that includes:

- 80 secured rental housing units, with a minimum of 20% of the residential floor area permanently secured as moderate income units;
- a total floor area of 5,715 sq. m (61,518 sq. ft.);
- a floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.67;
- a building height of 18 m (59.2 ft.); and
- one underground parking level with 30 vehicle spaces and 190 bicycle stalls.

SUBMIT PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS:

Email: publichearing@vancouver.ca

Mail: City of Vancouver, City Clerk's Office,
453 West 12th Avenue, Third Floor,
Vancouver, BC V5Y 1V4

All submitted comments will be distributed to Council and posted on the City's website.

REGISTER TO SPEAK AT THE PUBLIC HEARING:

Starting at 8:30 am, Friday, January 10, 2020 until 5 pm on Tuesday, January 21, 2020

Email: publichearing@vancouver.ca

Phone: 604-829-4238

In Person: from 5:30 - 6 pm on the day of the Public Hearing



PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT



LOCATION

Read the draft by-law:

Available starting Friday, January 10, 2020 at Vancouver City Hall, City Clerk's Office, 453 West 12th Avenue, Third Floor.

Watch the Public Hearing live online:
vancouver.ca/councilvideo

Follow:
vancouver.ca/speaker-wait-times
@VanCityClerk on Twitter

Review the Public Hearing minutes:
vancouver.ca/councilmeetings
(approximately two business days after meeting)

Information: vancouver.ca/publichearings

More information on this proposal:
vancouver.ca/rezapps

Choi, Rowena

From: denise8 [REDACTED] "s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Monday, January 20, 2020 6:19 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Rezoning Application - 1956-1990 Stainsbury Avenue

Mayor and Councillors

I am against this project, Rezoning Application - 1956-1990 Stainsbury Avenue. I rent [REDACTED]

"s. 22(1)
Personal
and
Confidenti

[REDACTED] Doesn't fit with small houses. What about the trees that will be torn down.

No. No. No. NO NO

Denise Santano