

Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street (OPPOSED)

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/27/2020	15:07	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	As neighbours living s.22(1) of 6031 Dunbar, we oppose the application for rezoning. Site Plan ? Tree removal of all conifers including a mature Douglas Fir tree which we consider to be contrary to The Greenest City Action Plan. ? Insufficient room for garbage and recycle bins. Site Context ? Two distinct buildings cover virtually all the 60 x 129 ft. lot. The allowance between the new buildings and the property line to the north is smaller than previously required and don?t recognize the N to S slop of about 5 feet. Rendering ? Land allowance at the rear of 6031 Dunbar is basically nil and is an issue for cars turning and wide vehicles including garbage trucks. ? Insufficient parking is provided. Where is consideration for seniors and mobility issues? ? The one-off application proposes nine suites with a total of 25 bedrooms is grossly exaggerated in terms of size. Building Sections and Building Elevation ? Elevation ? Building A is 11 feet higher than 6015 Dunbar on the north side and 21 feet higher than 6049 Dunbar on the south side. ? Building B appears to be the height of the current house at 6031 Dunbar Shadow Study ? Large trees currently adjacent to the lane at 6031 Dunbar are not solid and we receive filtered or direct sun light all year. Buildings are solid and block all light so it is obvious that we will receive no light on virtually 50% of our garden. ? From February to April, shadows indicated on the Shadow Analysis, 10 am, noon and 2 pm. are frightfully accurate in estimating that we will be limited to 4 hours of light per day. ? Should the roof level of Buildings A and B remain the same, at 10 am and at 2 pm from March to September, at least a half of the south of our property will be in complete shade. At best, at noon from March to September, the only sunlight is a strip of approximately 15 feet in the centre otherwise total shade. ? Rooflines of both buildings must be reduced based on Shadow Analysis alone. Landscape Plan ? Landscaping plans include four small deciduous trees. Seven conifers are to be destroyed.(in addition to about 7 more in recent years) Relevant Factors ? In the past three years, the garden at 6031 Dunbar is overgrown, the house unkept, the back door boarded up and no back exit exists on the upper floor of the house at all. Renovations were done to divide the living room into two bedrooms and a sink was installed in the main upstairs hall. Renters number up to ten 10 at a time. Garbage and house parties have been a problem with little oversight by owners. ? Both residential and commercial realtors are actively showing interest and in higher density opportunities on Dunbar Street. There is an increase in the number of rental houses on Dunbar between 41st and SW Marine. Approval of this singular plan will mean that any future plan that includes defined appropriate densification sensitive to functional, of property environmental, social and other community needs will be significantly limited.	Ms LYNN OWENS-WHALEN		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Dunbar-Southlands	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	16:49	PH3 - 2. CD-1 REZONING: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	Regarding 6031 Dunbar - I am apposed to a project of that size going in. 9 units with 25 bedrooms in total on a single residential lot seems too high and out of character for the neighbourhood This could be 25 to 50 people on a single 60 foot lot? 4 storeys, 2 buildings Are these UBC Students, what happens in the summer eg airbnb etc? Only 4 dedicated parking spots in total for all 9 units so, Additional parking anticipated on Dunbar and Alma streets Additional trash in the lane Additional load on sewer / water / drainage etc Additional noise Note that Complaints to the city about trash, parking and other Standards of Maintenance bylaw violations (e.g. 3675 SW Marine just down the lane) have frequently gone unaddressed for months. Why will this be different? No way I would want this in my lane and backyard (literally!)	Mr JONATHAN AITKEN		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Dunbar-Southlands	No web attachments.

Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street (OPPOSED)

07/27/2020	17:16	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	Complaints to the city about trash, parking and other Standards of Maintenance bylaw violations (e.g. 3675 SW Marine) have frequently gone unaddressed for months. Why will this be different?	Prem Chand		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	17:22	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	4 storeys, 2 buildings Are these UBC Students, what happens in the summer airbnb etc? Sending this from myself using my email My dad, Prem Chand has also used my email to forward his concerns	Prem Chand		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Dunbar-Southlands	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	17:27	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	This is a ridiculous sized unit being planned for such a small residential area The traffic is heavy, no place for young families to play, can't cross street during busy hours which are from 7:30-9:30am and then again 2:30-6pm Who will live in here once students are done with school? Most probably Aor BNB just like the home farther up north on the street and City is approved a laneway home so they can host more Air BNB on private websites	No Name No Name (ps)		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Dunbar-Southlands	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	18:17	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	This is a single family residential area.	Tammy Young		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	18:57	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	Having lived on Alma St for 20 years the prospect of a development of this size is untenable. The laneway traffic is heavy, it floods and more volume would make it worse. 2 laneway/ coach houses are already underway that access from the laneway. The density of this proposed project seems way to much. I am all for density but this use of space is too much. It will be detrimental to our home and the enjoyment of our property.	IAN MITCHELL		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Dunbar-Southlands	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	21:10	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	We submitted an email expressing our concerns about the density for services (parking, trash etc.), loss of large trees, actual affordability, and lack of accessibility.	Meredith Aitken		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Dunbar-Southlands	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	21:29	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	Dunbar, above 41st, is already an area of business and multi family homes. There are already a number of lots waiting for approval for development. Why not wait until these are approved and developed before this block is changed forever.	allison carson		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Dunbar-Southlands	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	21:36	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	I am a professional in the real estate industry and generally in favour of development in our city. However, my review of the plans for this site, has given me unequivocal hesitation and opposition to the rezoning and design idea, theme, use, and form of development. Basic principles of single family neighbourhood design and development call for uniformity, fit, appropriate height, density, consistent use, and conformity with neighbourhood uses, all supported by the appropriate infrastructure (access/egress, parking, garbage removal, view corridors, etc.). The proposed development is in contravention of all basic design and use principle for the neighbourhood. It will set poor precedent and create a random "hodge podge" of higher density uses that do not fit the neighbourhood and does not make sense for this area of the city. I stand opposed to the proposed form of development for 6031 Dunbar Street.	Raymond Ng (ps)		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Dunbar-Southlands	No web attachments.

Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street (OPPOSED)

07/27/2020	21:59	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	Please see you letter forwarded to city of Vancouver	Tracy Pickett		tapfence@hotmail.com	Dunbar-Southlands	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	23:45	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	9 units with 25 bedrooms in total on a single residential lot seems out of character for the neighbourhood. Complaints to the city about trash, parking and other Standards of Maintenance bylaw violations of (e.g. 3675 SW Marine - unkept lawn, illegally paving their backyard with asphalt, causing a flood to neighbour's property at 3663 SW Marine) have frequently gone unaddressed for months. How will the City assure residents that with additional density on a single residential lot, these problems will be adequately addressed?	Dawn Tse		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	08:31	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	Why ruin a lovely distinct neighbourhood that is on the verge of losing most of its beauty for a few high-end units that will likely be rented/sold to off-shore interests? How does this help the citizens of Vancouver?	Ms EVELYN JACOB		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	08:59	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	Dear City Council, This proposal of a 4 storey, 9 apartment dwelling in the middle of a single house street will stick out like a sore thumb both at the front and the back. It will increase pedestrian and automobile traffic and significantly impact the sunlight for the adjacent neighbors, especially those up the hill. Another problem will be in small, 1 car only laneway, which the last time I used it, was not paved. It will have to accommodate an additional 4 vehicles, if not more for the 9 apartments. Since this laneway has only room for one car - the increased traffic will mean cars meeting head on - and one having to reverse all the way to get out, not an easy task in such a narrow lane. It will also significantly increase parking on Dunbar. Four in front of one house will not fit, and will mean parking in the neighbors area. One might hope that not all occupants will have cars - but this cannot be guaranteed. The walkways on the sides of the property that allow the occupants to move from the garage to the appartments appear very small and very close to the neighbors property. This will increase the noise and pedestrian traffic for the immediate neighbors and at nighttime could be a serious disturbance, given the proximity of the entrance path to the neighbors property. Furthermore, this is a 4-story building on a steep hill with not much space between adjacent houses. To dig a deep foundation for such a structure could well disturb the foundations and earth from the adjacent dwellings making them unsafe. To me, this is a serious concern. Why is this being proposed in the middle of the block? It doesn't make alot of sense. Where is the overall plan for the neighborhood? Wouldn't it make more sense to have appartments at the top of dunbar, close to W41st where they can transition from the bus loop and garage to the single dwellings? I notice some of these properties are for sale as an assembly. An apartment block at this area would only shadow the garage and so is a better choice. This would lead to better consistency and an easier transition that something just being ?plonked? into the middle of the street full of single house dwellings. This not only sounds very inequitable and unfair to the neighbors, but comes across as an ad-hoc change, indicative of no planning or a badly thought out plan. I urge the council to consider the ramifications of such a radical spot rezoning change and instead consider a larger vision that would gradually incorporate apartments closer to the main arteries, where the blocking of sunlight and increased pedestrian and automobile traffic can be minimised. I used to live on Dunbar, in this area and hence have a knowledgable perspective. I feel very badly for the neighbors who will be directly upstream and downstream of this complex, and for those who use the laneway, should it be given the go-ahead. I think the city can make better decisions to increase density with a better plan that minimises the ne	Pauline Johnson		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	APPENDIX A
07/28/2020	09:37	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	Not suitable for the neighbourhood, and the owner already has a poor track record of taking care of their existing property!	ASHLEY LAMBERT-MABERLY		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Fairview	No web attachments.

Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street (OPPOSED)

07/28/2020	09:46	PH3 - 2. CD-1 REZONING: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	I against this because it will increase the traffic to Marine Dr. and also it will lower the house price of the Dunbar Marine Drive area which we pay so much property tax every year that I think is very unfair.	Jenny Suk Yu Tse		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Dunbar-Southlands	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	12:09	PH3 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 6031 Dunbar Street	Oppose	Dear Sir or Madam, We have concerns, outlined below, regarding the proposed 9-Plex at 6031 Dunbar Street. We hope that you give our perspective, and those of our neighbours, serious consideration as you evaluate all aspects of this proposal. Yours sincerely, Tracy and Ian Wassor s.22(1) Personal Concerns: Policy: This project is predicated upon the Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy that isn't approved and in this location is problematic in its own right. The Policy has been written without regard to topography, school boundaries, neighbourhood porosity and walkability, the urban forest, groundwater recharge, neighbourhood character and replicability on neighbouring sites when the cumulative impact is accessed. This site is included in an interim policy utilising a 2D exercise that includes sites purely based upon their access to the frequent transit network and services ? an exercise that inexplicably excludes sites that provide much better access and grades and hasn't been properly ground proofed. The outlines of the policy area need to be much better resolved before proceeding with pilot projects. Or at least the City should choose pilot projects on sites that have all of the metrics necessary to succeed, not marginal sites such as this that under closer scrutiny don't offer a desirable location for so much density. Not Child friendly: Based upon our experience of renting a laneway house, family rental with children is the most in demand at this location, but there needs to be enough room for families to inhabit the space, including adequate storage and outdoor living space or safe and proximate greenspace. The closest parks are located south of the site and the street crossing is perilous and there are no sidewalks on Marine Drive or Dunbar Street, south of Marine Drive and Dunbar. The plans include little storage and certainly not enough for a bike for each bedroom (and two for the parents). This proposed building is at the edge of the school boundary for Southlands Elementary, which forces children to walk along a busy street (Marine Drive) and cross a busy intersection (Marine Drive & 41st). Far from ideal. Not Accessible: The suites aren't accessible. There is significant demand for accessible units, with appropriate parking in this neighbourhood. This site is located at the bottom of one of the City's steepest arterial hills which requires a climb up the 327m hill from 18m to 42m or a 13.625% hill. Maximum grades are 8% for wheelchairs. We have witnessed on more than one occasion, motorized wheelchair users losing control and crashing on the this grade. Furthermore, because of the grade, the site is wholly inaccessible in snowy/icy weather to transit and vehicles. Transportation Challenged: The combination of location and topography make this a relatively isolated location with a walk score of 64 based up distance, but with topography included this score drops and would induce driving, begging the q	Ian Wasson		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Dunbar-Southlands	APPENDIX B

From: Pauline Johnson
To: [Public Hearing](#)
Subject: [EXT] Rezoning Application - 6031 Dunbar Street - for the public hearing: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 at 6 pm
Date: Monday, July 27, 2020 9:17:24 PM

City of Vancouver security warning: Do not click on links or open attachments unless you were expecting the email and know the content is safe.

Dear City Council,

This proposal of a 4 storey, 9 apartment dwelling in the middle of a single house street will stick out like a sore thumb both at the front and the back.

It will increase pedestrian and automobile traffic and significantly impact the sunlight for the adjacent neighbors, especially those up the hill.

Another problem will be in small, 1 car only laneway, which the last time I used it, was not paved. It will have to accommodate an additional 4 vehicles, if not more for the 9 apartments. Since this laneway has only room for one car - the increased traffic will mean cars meeting head on - and one having to reverse all the way to get out, not an easy task in such a narrow lane. It will also significantly increase parking on Dunbar. Four in front of one house will not fit, and will mean parking in the neighbors area. One might hope that not all occupants will have cars - but this cannot be guaranteed.

The walkways on the sides of the property that allow the occupants to move from the garage to the apartments appear very small and very close to the neighbors property. This will increase the noise and pedestrian traffic for the immediate neighbors and at nighttime could be a serious disturbance, given the proximity of the entrance path to the neighbors property.

Furthermore, this is a 4-story building on a steep hill with not much space between adjacent houses. To dig a deep foundation for such a structure could well disturb the foundations and earth from the adjacent dwellings making them unsafe. To me, this is a serious concern.

Why is this being proposed in the middle of the block? It doesn't make alot of sense.

Where is the overall plan for the neighborhood?

Wouldn't it make more sense to have apartments at the top of dunbar, close to W41st where they can transition from the bus loop and garage to the single dwellings?

I notice some of these properties are for sale as an assembly. An apartment block at this area would only shadow the garage and so is a better choice. This would lead to better consistency and an easier transition that something just being "plonked" into the middle of the street full of single house dwellings. This not only sounds very inequitable and unfair to the neighbors, but comes across as an ad-hoc change, indicative of no planning or a badly thought out plan.

I urge the council to consider the ramifications of such a radical spot rezoning change and instead consider a larger vision that would gradually incorporate apartments closer to the main arteries, where the blocking of sunlight and increased pedestrian and automobile traffic can be minimised.

I used to live on Dunbar, in this area and hence have a knowledgable perspective. I feel very badly for the neighbors who will be directly upstream and downstream of this complex, and for those who use the laneway, should it be given the go-ahead. I think the city can make better decisions to increase density with a better plan that minimises the negatives and allows both existing and new neighbors to live together in harmony.

Sincerely,
Pauline

Re: Proposed re-zoning: 6031 Dunbar Street

Page 1 of 2

s.22(1) Personal and
Confidential

8 March 2020

To: City of Vancouver, Planning Department

Dear Sir or Madam,

We have concerns, outlined below, regarding the proposed 9-Plex at 6031 Dunbar Street. We hope that you give our perspective, and those of our neighbours, serious consideration as you evaluate all aspects of this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Tracy and Ian Wasson

s.22(1) Personal and
Confidential

Concerns:

Policy: This project is predicated upon the *Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy* that isn't approved and in this location is problematic in its own right. The Policy has been written without regard to topography, school boundaries, neighbourhood porosity and walkability, the urban forest, groundwater recharge, neighbourhood character and replicability on neighbouring sites when the cumulative impact is accessed. This site is included in an interim policy utilising a 2D exercise that includes sites purely based upon their access to the frequent transit network and services – an exercise that inexplicably excludes sites that provide much better access and grades and hasn't been properly ground proofed. The outlines of the policy area need to be much better resolved before proceeding with pilot projects. Or at least the City should choose pilot projects on sites that have all of the metrics necessary to succeed, not marginal sites such as this that under closer scrutiny don't offer a desirable location for so much density.

Not Child friendly:

Based upon our experience of renting a laneway house, family rental with children is the most in demand at this location, but there needs to be enough room for families to inhabit the space, including adequate storage and outdoor living space or safe and proximate greenspace. The closest parks are located south of the site and the street crossing is perilous and there are no sidewalks on Marine Drive or Dunbar Street, south of Marine Drive and Dunbar. The plans include little storage and certainly not enough for a bike for each bedroom (and two for the parents).

This proposed building is at the edge of the school boundary for Southlands Elementary, which forces children to walk along a busy street (Marine Drive) and cross a busy intersection (Marine Drive & 41st). Far from ideal.

Not Accessible: The suites aren't accessible. There is significant demand for accessible units, with appropriate parking in this neighbourhood.

This site is located at the bottom of one of the City's steepest arterial hills which requires a climb up the 327m hill from 18m to 42m or a 13.625% hill. Maximum grades are 8% for wheelchairs. We have witnessed on more than one occasion, motorized wheelchair users losing control and crashing on the this grade. Furthermore, because of the grade, the site is wholly inaccessible in snowy/icy weather to transit and vehicles.

Transportation Challenged:

The combination of location and topography make this a relatively isolated location with a walk score of 64 based up distance, but with topography included this score drops and would induce driving, begging the question about where the 5 extra cars will park?

Cycling Access:

The north-south bike lanes along Dunbar are shared with traffic, street parking, and three bus stops between W41st Avenue and SW Marine Drive, and have a "hard" stop with a light at the bottom of the steep grade hill. Currently, relatively few cars park along this stretch of Dunbar, however, busses continuously weave across the bike lane to access the stops. Increased vehicle parking along Dunbar will further endanger cyclists by encroaching on the shared path, and by decreasing sight-lines to the very busy intersection at Dunbar and SW Marine drive. There has been at least one cyclist killed on this stretch of Dunbar between W41st and SW Marine.

Destructive to the Urban Forest:

There is no room for trees on the lot. This is a neighbourhood of large conifers, which native birds and animals are dependant upon it. This scale of development leaves no room for the urban forest to survive. Is the City looking to see the decline of the urban forest and wildlife? Have the x^wməθk^wəyəm (**Musqueam**) people been consulted on this?

Decreases Infiltration:

Minimal infiltration has been retained increasing reliance upon storm sewers and diminishing groundwater recharge. Flooding and water egress from Southwest Marine drive and south of that is already extremely problematic.

Poor Planning: Not Replicable. This is a desirable neighbourhood due to the urban forest, lack of congestion, spacial separation, living unit size, storage, onsite parking, outdoor living space and is a benefit to the wetlands below it due to the ground water recharge, and evapotranspiration of the trees and habitat values of the urban forest and hedgerows. If adjacent sites were to redevelop in the same way there isn't neighbourhood capacity to support it and still retain the values that draw people to live here in the first place. A design and density should be chosen to allow adjacent properties to redevelop to the same density and not overwhelm City services or diminish the neighbourhoods natural capacity. There are good examples of this east of Arbutus and north of 16th Avenue, where a similar lot would have no more than 4 rental or strata units. Densification using existing city bylaws with secondary suites and laneway housing have already been successfully incorporated into this area.