

Public Hearing - July 29, 2020 (reconvening from July 28, 2020) Item 3 - CD1-Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue (OPPOSED)

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/29/2020	15:00	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	I strongly oppose a development of this size. This site is not suitable for a 81 unit 4 storey building. There are no amenities within walking distance - grocery stores, restaurants, coffee shops, which will lead to residents needing cars. Only 70 parking stalls are provided, a lot of units may have 2 cars. This will lead to high traffic volumes and congestion on narrow streets, also on W.33. The developer is quoted as saying this development will attract downsizing seniors, and young families. Well, they are not going to be in a 1 bedroom. In that case, townhouses are more suitable and of a less imposing size. The application is proposing entrances on W.32 Ave and a 20ft hedge along Granville St. It should be the other way around. The main arterial road is a major part of this policy, therefore the entrances should be on Granville and mature landscaping along W.32. This will retain somewhat of the shaughnessy RS-5 feel. This is a highly coveted part of BC. Council - pls consider this very carefully.	Ranjit Rai		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/29/2020	16:34	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	Oversized.....no local convenience shopping which promotes the need for cars , the proliferation of which this council is supposedly opposed to When this city stops allowing affordable low rise rentals to be torn down, displacing long term tenants and approving their replacement with unaffordable , over sized "market rate" rentals, (minus the tiny % of "below market" mini-suites allowed in exchange for huge extra bonus size allotments), is when I might stop being angry about being forced to feel guilty for trying to protect my beautiful environmentally friendly neighborhood of single family homes that I, and most of my neighbors earned with a lifetime of hard work. Covering the city of Vancouver with concrete and replacing grass yards with roof top gardens, which is the direction we are going in now, is so environmentally unfriendly that it's hard to reconcile the hypocrisy of this city council and their constant pontificing about green space. There's a shortage of rental housing because developers have for years been permitted to build masses of unaffordable luxury condos, many left empty. Now that there is such a shortage of residential land left in Vancouver , the policy has become to drive homeowners out of their neighborhoods so the developers can once again destroy beautiful living spaces, only to reap more destruction , only this time it'll be with unaffordable "market rate" rentals.	Geri Davis		[REDACTED]	Kerrisdale	No web attachments.
07/29/2020	16:41	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West	Oppose	Please see attached.	Rick		[REDACTED]	Unknown	APPENDIX A

Wong, Tamarra

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 3:32 PM
To: Public Hearing
Cc: Shirley Heberton; Cameron Jones; Ken Rai
Subject: [EXT] 4750 Granville Street Rezoning Application

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.

Good afternoon,

Unfortunately due to unfortunate family circumstances I am not able to participate in this hearing as I had intended. I am hoping you would be able to add this e-mail to the Council submissions for today? Much has been said and more is to be said tonight. I have focussed my comments on important specific issues that warrant serious revisit in advance of Council making its decision tonight. I have shared this information today with James Boldt the rezoning planner for this project.

Unfortunately with rezoning applications the submission does not equate to development permit submission quality so the potential for a package to fall short on addressing issues is a risk in this process. The review is only as good as the information received. In fairness to the proponent they too have to do their best to provide the support for their development and what is important on the regulatory side is not necessarily so on the proponent side.

On pages 1 and 2 of the 8 page traffic consultant report provided by the applicant on July 10, 2020 supports the neighbours concerns with the design and location of proposed driveway at the lane. The report states there will be issues. More specifically it states that two way traffic on the ramp, and at the lane, and exiting or entering the lane, requires one of the vehicles to stop and relent to the other vehicle. This is assuming that both drivers cooperate with one another with one driver giving way to the other. The commotion and conflict will occur directly in front of the deck and bedroom window of a valued heritage asset. A 70 car parking garage that includes visitor parking(for 81 units) collectively will generate many situations in front of the bedroom window and deck of the immediate neighbour. This neighborliness is unconscionable especially on such a large site which offers many opportunities for other forms and massing that would extinguish this conflict.

I would also note the sketches in the report show the location of a portion of the neighbors house. It seems to only show the second floor roof. It is missing the deck and 1st storey that project to the lane property line. It correctly shows all of the stopping and maneuvering machinations that need to take place in front of the deck and bedroom. It also shows that the full width of the lane is required to complete the maneuvers. The lane is currently encroached upon with other landscape and hedges. According to these sketches these would have to be removed to allow use of the full lane width. The conditions recommended by staff clearly suggest that the City anticipates and significant increase in traffic in the lane thereby warranting under condition requiring the developer to provide speed bumps throughout the lane.

One can only surmise that once Engineering completes its traffic management review in the development permit process but after Council approval that full lane width will be required to provide needed travel conditions. In this respect not unreasonable to anticipate that the speed bump requirement will be followed with other changes including

the removal of encroaching mature hedges currently provide privacy for the neighbours. This would negate the privacy and overlook presentation you saw yesterday. The hedge that is being relied for this claim would be lost. In a highly travelled lane with speed bumps it is not unusual to also find other parking regulations in the lane. This may be needed regardless due to the current traffic and parking conditions in the neighbourhood.

It is most unfortunate that the full traffic management review regarding the lane and the general area for that matter has not been completed prior to this application being sent to you for decision. This is a time with circumstances existing and proposed that clearly warn all of us that the final disposition of the lane and traffic management in the immediate vicinity ought to be fully understood and determined in advance of any decision. This is one of the flaws in the rezoning process – Council granting an approval and serious issues deferred to the development permit process. Very difficult optically and politically for staff in that subsequent review to come back with a change in mind or significant development changing requirements. In a nutshell the rezoning process is not the best tool especially where the conditions of approval are significant in degree of change required and just sheer volume and overall impact of the conditions. This is unfair to the proponent and the neighbours. The DPB process with predetermined ODPs is by far the better process with a greater capacity for expediency; but the bottom line is rezoning is not the tool to execute these policies. It is a tool for very special unique site and development circumstances and not a bypass for ODPs and fuller advance engagement to establish certainty of outcome and public subscription/support. This is a more complex conversation for another time.

The apartment form and massing is the core of all issues here. The policy clearly supports the townhouse, multiple building duplex solution. Yesterday your Council approved this form in a similar context with RS-5 zoning with very minor issues. It will be a very successful development and one of the models of the missing niche known as gentle densification. That is the more appropriate neighbourly form and massing in this context and in many other like contexts that have been identified in your policy as future locations for housing. But not thru site by site rezoning - wrong tool. This would be a dramatic change for the developer hence a different solution to the mix here that works for the developer is a must such as a mixed missing niche. This too is not a 5 minute discussion. At minimum I would encourage the Council to defer decision to allow the bigger issues to be fully flushed out. Ideally the city would find its way to working with the developer to a more neighbourly form and massing and issues resolution in a revised developed that also rewards and meets the developer – again this may have to be another housing mix solution and potential future model for more of the same that collectively rise to the challenges of in numbers and typology.

I have not spoken to RS-5 being a very unique circumstance unto itself and as that special factor that is relevant to new densification beyond just materials. The heritage potential of the neighbouring site is also a special circumstance that warrants fair and reasonable consideration – highly unlikely this asset will be that heritage advocates would let go (and shouldn't) as a demo site.

One last note, this is no debating we are in housing crisis and no debate it needs to be solved like yesterday! It is a very complex issue and requires all hands on deck, private and public. Densification and housing that fits its context and meets the needs is the broader consensus. Doing it well invites more proponents to jump on board, public support grows and more housing happens. Do it badly, proponents not wanting debate and conflict drop out, public support wains and housing gains are painfully slow and those in need are not served as they should be.

Thank you for time and patience,

Rick