

Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street & 1494 West 32nd Avenue (OPPOSED)

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/27/2020	14:44	PH3 - 3. CD-1 REZONING: 4750 Granville Street & 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	will cause a unsafe community and low down the quality of its community	yuqing gu		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	14:50	PH3 - 3. CD-1 REZONING: 4750 Granville Street & 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	No hing good to us	Rita Gu		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	15:03	PH3 - 3. CD-1 REZONING: 4750 Granville Street & 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	will cause an unsafe community and low down the quality of our community	yuqing gu		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	15:12	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	An opp[portunity to retain the gateway to the city, we see the mountains, visitors are not interested on apartments , they are everywhere.They see the retention of character" here is a city that cares, the people care, at this rate every downtown artery will be thronged with, buildings that reflect little imagination, just mass development. We will loose sight of the mountains, are forefathers imagined a future, sure change has to happen. Cambie has only been saved because of the Park, though it is bad enough. There are other places arteries into the city, no lets do Granville. Why not thrash Shaughnessy. Where is the justification? Surely you have other areas, why not the Clark Drive area, people could walk/cycle from hat area. The property surrounding the new hospital, what exactly are your plans, maybe you should present to the people your development proposals for the Ciy. Can you imagine living in a residential area & all of a sudden having an apartment building towering over you, out of he blue, middle of a block., on a busy street. You;re only affecting the arterials but the block behind with noise & traffic. Thanks for listening.	Frank Shorrock	my family	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	15:14	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	I oppose the current application.	Marie Pinton		[REDACTED]	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	15:22	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	It is outrageous to even consider putting a huge rental building in a beautiful single family area. There are a group of people that seems determined to destroy the charm and character of Vancouver that has made our city so unique and attractive. I am all in favour of building rental buildings which are desperately needed. There are many much more appropriate locations which need redevelopment, Shaughnessy is not one of them.	No Name No Name (ps)		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	15:35	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	Re Public hearing for 4750 Granville Street and 1484 West 32nd Ave, We understand this letter, sent to he Panning Department, was summarized for their report to Council. We want you, the Council, to see it because it touches so many issues that are very important to us. Respectfully, The surrounding neighbours	Ms SHIRLEY HEBENTON	Surrounding Neighbours	[REDACTED]	Unknown	<b>APPENDIX A</b>
07/27/2020	16:09	[REDACTED]	Oppose	Proposed development completely, dramatically and fundamentally out of character.	Eric Pugash		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	16:15	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I am strongly opposed for the reasons ar iculated by Anthony Chu, Vice President of the Shaughnessy Heights Property Owners Association.	Dan McLeod	Owner, 1412 West 32nd Avenue	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	16:32	[REDACTED]	Oppose	Totally out of proportion for the area...and poor planning as to services and architecturally looks like student dormitory in Shaughnessy area	Brick Daem		[REDACTED]	South Cambie	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	16:36	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	Absolutely no possibility for people in the neighbourhood to downsize into this planned chaos...no attempt to blend into the neighbourhood	Catherine tanaka		[REDACTED]	South Cambie	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	16:50	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I oppose the current application	DAVID CHANDLER	Home owner	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	17:04	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	Inappropriate Too dense Inappropriate architecture- doesn?t blend wi h the neighbourhood	Lucile Flavelle		[REDACTED]	Kerrisdale	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	17:22	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I support opposition reasons of SHPOA.	Rosemary Wakefield		[REDACTED]	Kerrisdale	No web attachments.

**Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street & 1494 West 32nd Avenue (OPPOSED)**

07/27/2020	17:31	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	I oppose the current application. 81 unit Monster project in a small lot @heritage area with 4 visit parking only.	Gary Cheng			Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	18:19		Oppose	This definitely does not fit into the neighbourhood, but you are already well aware of that. It is an example of spot rezoning which is a process very subject to abuse. It does seem strange that the CoV seems to be working overtime to prevent residents of Shaughnessy from developing their own properties by complex heritage regulations and then overrides all other considerations to proceed to favor a land developer who will probably be on to the next project before this one is finished. We have to live with the consequences of your actions. Robert Angus 1838 West 19th	ROBERT ANGUS			Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	18:31		Oppose	Gross undersupply of parking. Cars are going to clog up all of he sides streets Insufficient green space in short walking distance. No amenities. This development is just too big, too dense and too intrusive on the character of this area.	Palmer Wright			Unknown	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	18:50		Oppose	I oppose the current application. This 81 unit proposal is too big for the area; has inadequate parking; does not fit the City's design requirements; was submitted as trial submission and the City no longer supports such "spot rezoning" applications based on prior nega ive experiences and impacts. This neighbourhood is full of character homes and the City has extensively regulated it for low density residential zoning to maintain and retain that character. This proposal would detract from the neighbourhood's character and would set a precedent for other developers.	Dr Simon Whyte			Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	19:04		Oppose	This will hugely impact the already busy parking in the few blocks surrounding the proposed building site. What wth the Ryerson Unitd church which is a duo church also used for a community hall, Montessori and a huge number of community groups and services impacting the surrounding he neighborhood right in the proposed proposed project area, the idea of building an 81 units rental building which will house 160+ persons with only parking spaces for 71 cars (which includes 4 visitor parking spaces) is ludicrous. It is going to affect the neighborhood in many negative ways affecting our own parking, home security, increased traffic (3 schools already in the neighborhood) not to mention the value of our homes in what is a historically designated area. Why would you allow a monstrosity like this to be built in a historic neighborhood. Buildings like this should be built where there are already commercial buildings, not in the middle of individual family homes.	Donald and Patricia Stark	None		Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	19:27	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	The monstrosity your are considering is just that - a monstrosity because it will be situated in a single homed residen ial neighborhood. This proposed building of 81 units will not even have enough parking for the 81 suites but only for 67 spaces for the renters plus 4 spaces for visitors. This is going to impact the neighborhood because most apartment owners have 2 cars - that will add approximately 320 or more cars to the neighborhood, and there will only be 67 spaces constructed for tenants. Where will the other approximately 263 cars park (and hat doesn?t include any or all visitors they would have as well). If you don?t think that this won?t have a huge impact on the surrounding street then you are dreaming. Additionally this will set a precedent for the construction of many more of these sorts of buildings built in completely inappropriate - the centre of a historically designated family neighborhood of single family homes. An apartment building of this magnitude should be constructed in a more commercially appropriate area and should include at least one (if not more han 1) parking space for every unit that is built in the building.	Ian and Phyllis Hayter, 4875 Commaught Drive			Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	19:32		Oppose	We commented before a few minutes ago relating our concerns and expressing our opposition to this development but by mistake in the Subject address box above, I put our address on Connaught drive in that box. The proposed building site at 4750 Granville Street s the address of what I am objecting to. Sorry about that mistake in the first box.	Donald and Patricia Stark			Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	20:10		Oppose	I oppose the current application	Jenny			Unknown	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	20:12	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	no transparent process or meaningful engagement with the community/residents directly impacted, documenting why this development is deemed necessary and beneficial to to the city as well as the directly affected community	Robert George Wakefield			Kerrisdale	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	20:14		Oppose	i oppose the current application	Jeffrey Zhu			Shaughnessy	No web attachments.

Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street & 1494 West 32nd Avenue (OPPOSED)

07/27/2020	20:14	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I oppose the current application	Adam		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	20:15	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	I oppose the current application. Because it will be dangerous for our community.	Lisa Li		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	20:39	[REDACTED]	Oppose	My family has been in the Shaughnessy neighborhood for 30+ years. We are against this proposal. We want the neighborhood to stay as it is. We really value the heritage and peaceful area. Having a massive 81 unit rental building in the area will only negatively affect the neighborhood. The increase in traffic and parking alone will be difficult for us, not to mention issues on home security. We'd be more accepting of a smaller rental building that would fit more in line with the neighborhood. Not as massive project such as this. Thank you. Regards, David Chow	David Albert Chow		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	20:44	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I strongly oppose this project. I am a nearby resident, one block away.	Manreet Gill		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	21:05	[REDACTED]	Oppose	The proposed change will create the need for huge increase in traffic in the neighbourhood since the development is far away from existing shopping areas. While I support development of living space for smaller families, the development must strive to create the least disturbance to existing living arrangements. Such development should start from neighbourhoods in proximity to existing traffic centers such as skytrain stations and existing shopping facilities such as shopping malls or commercial segments.	Winkle Kwan		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	21:32	[REDACTED]	Oppose	Do not change single residential nature of area.	alan wickens	Sam Management Ltd	[REDACTED]	Downtown	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	21:47	[REDACTED]	Oppose	The application doesn't fit into the neighbourhood! It destroys the harmony of surrounding area!	Qing Zhong		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	21:58	[REDACTED]	Oppose	The current application doesn't fit in the neighbourhood as it will create more traffic, noise, parking etc. Hence I am opposing the current application.	Wilson Makgawinata		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	22:25	[REDACTED]	Oppose	This is and should always be single family housing. There is no need for higher density.	CHRISTOPHER WALKER	Mr.	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	22:46	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	This project is not appropriate to show Vancouver's Green entrance to the world ....particularly coming from the airport.	Virginia Richards		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/27/2020	23:26	[REDACTED]	Oppose	1 Our land value will be drop 2 That big rental units building won't suit this neighborhood 3. Beautiful quiet neighborhood will not be the same 4. It's important to keep historic beautiful neighborhood 5. Beautiful town house might be works	Mark Hunter		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	04:21	[REDACTED]	Oppose	L.S., The proposed construction is out of place as the massive apartment development doesn't "fit" in the lush, scenic and historically significant neighbourhood. It will take away from the strong heritage and character value of this part of the city and from what makes Vancouver, with its diverse neighbourhoods, so unique. It will create parking and congestion issues on Granville street and the narrow surrounding streets as it is far from any amenities or community infrastructures. This will only promote the need to use cars in an already congested zone of Granville street. In order to help solve the need for more dense living, there are plenty of examples of other forms of multifamily developments on other parts of Granville Street. I therefore oppose the proposed development at 4750 Granville. Yours sincerely, Stuurta Urban	STUARTA URBAN		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	07:20	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I am not in favour of the proposed 81 unit rental building on Granville & 32. As a resident of this neighborhood I feel the building is too, too large for this area. As well the design needs some tweaking to allow it to fit the style neighborhood. Let's not lose the look of the neighborhood. It looks like an extension of the all the other many buildings on Cambie Street.	Jane Kennedy	Neighbor	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	09:02	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I live in the area and strongly oppose this application. It dramatically changes the character of the neighborhood. It is inappropriate and out of place to locate a large rental building in an established single family home neighborhood.	Carol Challoner	Home owner	[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.

**Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street & 1494 West 32nd Avenue (OPPOSED)**

07/28/2020	09:02	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	Completely inappropriate in this location. Will negatively impact neighbourhood properties, except for Granville St., for which this will only be the first of many destroying the area if his is approved. There are other more appropriate ways to create housing.	Judith Hansen	x		Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	09:07		Oppose	I own a house a few blocks North of this proposed development, and am shocked that you would even consider something so inappropriate for this neighbourhood. Please reject this proposal. Thank you, Paul Nowarre 4238 Granville Street	Paul Nowarre			Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	09:58		Oppose	July 27, 2020 Dear Mayor & Council Re: Proposed Development at 4750 Granville Street and 1494 32nd Avenue (the ?Proposed Development?) We are strongly opposed the Proposed Development for the following reasons, 1. This proposed development is an assault on our neighbourhood. The size, form, and massing are inappropriate in every way. We recognize that the City is facing a serious housing problem but believe the problem would be better resolved with other forms of multifamily development of which there are numerous examples on other parts of Granville Street. We are referring to lower impact, transitional, ground oriented forms such as row houses or townhouses that are more in keeping with the existing neighbourhood. 2. We note that the City?s publication ?Housing Vancouver Strategy: Annual Progress Report and Data Book 2019? shows that ?Purpose-Built Rental? approvals by Council in 2018 and 2019 aggregate only 52% of the annual target required to meet the 10 year strategy. We note, however, hat the number of townhouse approvals in the same period achieve only 17% of he number required to meet that 10 year target (figure 1.1.3 on page 20). 3. Vancouver city Council is pushing to densify all neighbourhoods. All major international cities, London, Paris, New York, Hong Kong have areas such as Shaughnessy, which have larger, more expensive proper ies (which also provide higher tax revenues to the city). Those cities don?t attempt to make every neighbourhood the same. The diversity and differences among neighbourhoods adds to the overall character of he city. 4. In pushing the numbers to achieve targets, City staff have not properly weighed the following factors: ? The proposed 81 unit development will add more than 160 people to a neighbourhood that was designed to accommodate 2 families on that property. The design includes only 71 underground and 4 visitor parking spaces. Since the streets were designed for single family residences, the result will be serious congestion. ? The portion of Granville Street between King Edward and 33rd Avenue is already highly congested school mornings and afternoons because it is he main entrance to three large schools: York House; Little Flower; and Shaughnessy Elementary. Parents anxious to get to work or home are already engaging in dangerous behaviours. ? The Proposed Development is not well located in relation to the amenities its citizens will require. The nearest shopping is located at Arbutus Mall or at Oak Street and King Edward Avenue. Both require in excess of a kilometer walk. Both require a bus transfer at King Edward Avenue. The King Ed buses are infrequent and often off schedule. The residents are going to minimize the inconvenience of the location by taking to their cars. We realize that we must continue to look for ways to deal with the housing issues our city faces. However, we think that the way to win support for workable solutions is to inst	Ms GAIL BROWN			Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	10:26		Oppose	While I appreciate our city's housing crisis and don't oppose growth and more housing I strongly feel this particular project is out of character for Shaughnessy neighbourhood . Perhaps smaller row houses similar to Oak street and 37th avenue? OF course as neighbours its clear to see that Granville street all the way from Park Drive to 33 Avenue has already been earmarked for developers to build multi unit dwellings and probably his is the future of all major arterial roads in he future . Noticed in our neighbourhood: King Edward, Oak, Cambie, 41st with little input or ability to comment. However egressing into the smaller cross streets will definitely impact the future character of each neighbourhood. I feel that we should preserve he rich heritage of the older homes of Vancouver. Certainly not tear down houses of architectural and heritage value to put up a concrete box Please look seriously at giving this project more time to look at other designs or plans . Perhaps for 6-8 units as I see being done on 25th West King Edward Avenue & Hudson or Selkirk street my next fear is developers coming down 33 Avenue ( note 33 & Larch & now 33 & Oak to Hea her) without thought to the beauty and character of our street , that is NOT a major artery .	THELMA WRIGHT	Homeowner		Shaughnessy	No web attachments.

**Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street & 1494 West 32nd Avenue (OPPOSED)**

07/28/2020	10:31	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	I am opposed to the development proposed in its current form. I don't see any thought to preservation of the character of the neighbourhood. Please give much more thought to the architecture and the density that we should consider.. Oakridge is already well over any density. Why don't you put more rental space there and what about the absolute waste of space on the east side of QE Park at Ontario and w 37th -33?	Lee Wright	Homeowner	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	10:55	[REDACTED]	Oppose	Preserve some central streets from going the way of Oak and Cambie streets	No Name No Name (ps)	Nil	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	11:00	[REDACTED]	Oppose	Mid block development seems to break up a neighbourhood's continuity, where as corner block allow for better transportation to the renters and reduces the use of the car.	Jacquelyn Lising		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	11:15	[REDACTED]	Oppose	The area is completely incoherent for multiple family dwelling. It is a move more a political purpose. The area has no commercial activities and mainly single family home. As well, it will be much cheaper cost wise to build in a more commercial area where tenants can access to daily needs such as king Edward and oak area.	Theresa auyeung		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	12:35	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I oppose the current application.	No Name No Name (ps)		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	13:11	[REDACTED]	Oppose	The contemporary design does not reflect the neighborhood at all. Too large in an already extra busy area with hospitals, schools and two churches plus hospice. I am concerned about traffic, parking and why you are building these corridors of rentals on main streets into the city. It is ruining a beautiful city.	KATHY ARMSTRONG		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	13:52	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	This project does not fit within the current neighbourhood. In addition, the area cannot absorb the additional street parking needed for it. Visually it will stick out like a wart among all of the single family homes.	Craig Fabische		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	13:54	[REDACTED]	Oppose	i strongly oppose this current application.	Ms MARIANNA CIARNIELLO	self	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	13:58	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I oppose this current application. I live at [REDACTED]	nicholas ciarniello	self	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:03	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I oppose the current application.	Richard Lai		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:11	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	I oppose the current application	Henrietta Tso		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:16	[REDACTED]	Oppose	The proposed development doesn't fit into the City's design requirements & the neighbourhood.	Janet Mak		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:18	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I am not opposed to rental units. Having 81 units on two lots that used to be single homes is just in sane. In keeping with the character of the area, tasteful building of two floors with 10 - 12 units on each lot can work quite well verses four floors 81 units monstrous building. If this is up zones, why just up zone one strip along the street, why not up zone the entire Shaughnessy area so that we can forget about this exclusive area in the city?	Ming Tiampo	resident	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:23	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I strongly oppose this application for 4750 Granville street. I my husband and i built and lived at [REDACTED] since 1985. We worked 6 days a week to be able to afford to live in this neighbourhood because of the larger lots and design guidelines and character buildings. Our peaceful surroundings will be challenged by additional traffic possible increase in crime and property values will go down. We have worked all our adult life to achieve a certain standard and it is being taken away. YES I OPPOSE THIS APPLICATION FOR 4750 GRANVILLE STREET.	Ms MARIANNA CIARNIELLO	self	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:28	[REDACTED]	Oppose	This proposed development is an assault on our neighbourhood. The size, form, and massing are inappropriate in every way.	Mr Alan Mak		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:29	[REDACTED]	Oppose	In order to maintain the beauty of this beautiful and historical neighbourhood, it should remain as single family dwellings. Apartment buildings should be located off sky train.	Lisa Hall		[REDACTED]	Grandview-Woodland	No web attachments.

Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street & 1494 West 32nd Avenue (OPPOSED)

07/28/2020	14:34	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	It is unreasonable to assume everyone living in the area is all rich and does not care about a big drop in the property value due to this vast structure in the neighbourhood that changes the characteristic of the area. People in this area also worked very hard to make their living and invested with their hard earned money for future growth. The winner of this project is the developer and not the renters. Real benefit of rental housing is high density development near the sky train stations in urban convenient settings and not in the middle of a quiet neighbourhood.	Jamie Tiampo	resident	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:42	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I oppose this application for 4750 Granville street	sonja ciarniello	self	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:43	[REDACTED]	Oppose	The proposed building structure will very much disrupt the neighbourhood and the additional traffic and parked cars in the area will be a horrendous situation. People living in the area should not be expected to pay the same amount of property tax! Tastful eight-flex on each lot would also add to the rental housing stock. why doe its have to be 81 units? Only person that will benefit is the developer!!!	Christopher Burton	Residence	[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:53	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I oppose the current application.	Donna Pauletto		[REDACTED]	I do not live in Vancouver	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:53	[REDACTED]	Oppose	Dear Mr. Mayor and City Council, Please stop the proposed 81 unit rental property to be built on the Cnr of Granville and 32nd Street. I understand there are those who feel residents of this historically fine neighbourhood should share the wealth so to speak, and those who jealously envy those owners, but those same owners treasure the history which is part of the City's wealth. Gladly, the City of Vancouver takes high property tax amounts from Shaughnessy and while the owners of these fine homes built on valuable land do not complain, they have every right to be undisturbed by a huge apartment building interfering with their lives. After all, they have worked very hard to be able to afford to live in their beautiful homes. Of course none of them understand why the complex in question needs to be built on that corner when many other corners are better suited. With that said, the developers have no problem charging absolutely outrageous rents for the ?poor seniors who need somewhere to live.? I believe \$1,641.00 for a STUDIO apartment should keep you all awake at night. What about traffic congestion, parking in the area, no sky train ... or are you also planning to bring noisy, rapid transit to the area as a special treat? Please excuse me for showing my hostility. Let me ask you though, why you are okay with any of this and what it will surely bring in the sordid future to the currently beautiful area, envied by many and a complete addition to your City's pride. Would you be happy if you lived in this prestigious neighbourhood? Shame on you. Sincerely, D. Walman	Karen Sawchuk		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:55	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	I oppose the current application.	Geoffrey Adams		[REDACTED]	I do not live in Vancouver	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	14:56	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	I oppose the current application.	Giuseppina Pauletto		[REDACTED]	I do not live in Vancouver	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	15:06	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I oppose the current application.	No Name No Name (ps)		[REDACTED]	Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	15:11	[REDACTED]	Oppose	This is ludicrous. The neighborhood is one of the most well regarded, if not THE most in Vancouver. Low income housing?!? Discredits what people have worked so hard to attain for their families by working to be able to live in this area, only to have low income housing devalue property value and the safety and reputation of the neighborhood. I oppose	Alessia Harper		[REDACTED]	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	15:13	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I OPPOSE THE CURRENT APPLICATION!!! PLEASE DO NOT DO THIS!!	Sienna leone		[REDACTED]	Kerrisdale	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	15:16	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I oppose the current application. This will ruin the neighborhood. If a building is to go in this space it should be much smaller in occupancy.	Marina Brewer		[REDACTED]	Kerrisdale	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	15:20	[REDACTED]	Oppose	I oppose the current application	Shana Chow		[REDACTED]	Fairview	No web attachments.

**Public Hearing - July 28, 2020 - Item 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street & 1494 West 32nd Avenue (OPPOSED)**

07/28/2020	15:22	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	density, traffic, parking, neighbors, neighbourhood ambience. affordability, Spoils entrance to Vanc. from airport, U.S. border, totally inappropriate and unnecessary.	Patricia Shaw	none		Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	15:30		Oppose	I oppose the current application.	April Kapchinsky			Downtown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	15:39		Oppose	Please do not allow this development to proceed. It is going to ruin the lovely character of our neighbourhood, flood our quiet streets, and set a precedent for more buildings of this kind. It is too large, there is not enough parking, and it does not at all fit in with the neighbourhood. The city is very stringent on renovations in this area and keeping the character intact, yet this completely goes in the face of what others allowed to do. Please do not allow it to proceed	Marina Newson			Unknown	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	15:43	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Oppose	I oppose the following development !!!!	Carla Gabriela De Los Santos Leone	Private citizen		Shaughnessy	No web attachments.
07/28/2020	15:45		Oppose	I oppose the proposal. These low income housing spaces only help certain people. I own a home and would like a handout. Property tax is through the roof, along with fortis and hydro and a carbon tax. Where is my break. Because I make more money I should have to support others. The city just purchased the Howard Johnson hotel and another one to house the junkies of the downtown east side, maybe fill those rooms up first?	Pamela			Grandview-Woodland	No web attachments.

To Mayor and Council

We, the neighbours surrounding the proposed development site **at 4750 Granville Street and 1484 West 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave**, are opposed to the proposed redevelopment of these sites with a very high-density four storey multiple dwelling.

The development lacks contextual support or relevance and imposes many unneighborly impacts to the larger neighborhood. The overall form, massing and character of the development conflicts with the neighborhood zoning and guidelines which are the most demanding and comprehensive by-law and design guidelines in the city for low density development. This form and massing as proposed produces adversities that will prove far too challenging for the neighborhood and for the future tenants of the development. These include many significant issues and conflicts such as traffic parking, visitor provisions, loading and general everyday building servicing needs amongst others.

The housing crisis is complex as are the solutions which at times are suboptimal. Allowing this proposal in its current form would be a mistake netting serious adversities for the tenants and the neighbours. This predicament is unnecessary. The city, proponent, and community ought to be working together to conceive solutions and project dynamics that work on all major fronts and balances public and community interests.

## **OUR RESPONSE TO THE SUBMISSION**

### **Application Package**

The submission package is lacking critical information and details, which if provided, would clearly illustrate and support some of our concerns.

The submission includes distant streetscapes of the west side of Granville Street, but none of W 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave. The W32nd Ave. streetscapes showing the immediate context adjacent to and in front of the development are important in this review. The proposed development fronts W32nd Ave. The nearest impacted W32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue neighbors are part of the streetscape and paramount in establishing context.

The lane context is incomplete. The existing lane condition will undergo a dramatic change with this proposal. The existing condition is comprised of substantive privacy walls and mature landscaping. Except for one small pocket of mature trees, this proposal includes the removal of all existing privacy walls and mature landscaping at the lane. The existing conditions on both sides of the lane are critical in illustrating the relationship and impacts of this development to the lane and neighbours on the lane.

### **Rezoning**

Our understanding and belief are that the rezoning process to be whole must consider Council policy specific to the proposal and all other applicable policies, guidelines and plans affecting the site use and development. The rezoning must serve a public interest, which in this case is housing and which we all agree is a most serious priority. Community plans and community building are also much valued and important public interests and must be served; one is not sacrificed or made to suffer for the other.

The applicable two-page Council rezoning policy provides very general limited direction regarding neighbourliness and neighbourhood fit as compared to the current by-law and guidelines applicable to these sites and larger neighbourhood. Yet it is noticeably clear in targeting specific locations for implementation.



The current neighbourhood zoning is RS-5 which is a unique and special zoning with a storied history. The RS-5 District Schedule is accompanied by 50+ pages of comprehensive and detailed design guidelines and a workbook applicable to the much lesser density developments permitted in this zone. Whether a rezoning process is the most appropriate process for effecting a city-wide policy with specific locational targets in a heavily design scrutinized area is questionable. A more comprehensive neighborhood-sensitive zoning and commensurate process may better serve the objective, proponents and neighbours. More substantive zoning direction and overall process efficiency, content and certainty may lead to more successful promotion and achievement of the priority objective(s) and less neighborhood controversy.

### ***Observations and Concerns***

#### **1. Form and Massing Options**

The affordable housing policy lists two form and massing options for this section of Granville Street. One option is the four-storey apartment building form which is what has been proposed here.

The other and first noted option is: “ground-oriented forms up to 3 ½ storeys (which is generally sufficient height to include small houses/duplexes, traditional row houses, stacked townhouses, and courtyard row houses”. These forms or combinations thereof are the obvious better opportunities for achieving a more neighbourly and contextual fit. These forms better relate to the existing context and the applicable RS-5 area zoning with its incredibly detail driven comprehensive design guidelines. By far these are the better form and massing choices even for a high-density development.

Where this rental proposal fits into the housing spectrum is not clear, but this may offer more insight into potential design flexibility and latitude necessary to achieve the needed improvements contextually and in neighborliness.

To suggest the only solution to housing is this incompatible and unneighbourly form of development is wrong and does not elicit support or confidence in the strategy or community building.

#### **2. Overall Design and Compatibility Concerns.**

The overall design, a function that in part arises from the form and massing is absent of the of the high degree of design integrity of the immediate neighborhood in respect to existing older character buildings that must be retained and new development that went thru a very detailed design scrutiny in earning their right to be. Materiality alone does not constitute nor achieve the design integrity contemplated and imposed on other development in the area whether new or renovation and addition to existing character buildings.

Again, addressing form and massing would open the door to more choices and improved design opportunities and more neighborhood compatibility. To accept less of a development at more than twice the maximum permitted density and 8-10 times the maximum unit density permitted in this zone is wrong. This would not be city planning or community building at its best, nor would this serve the housing strategy.

The immediate context, together with its history and zoning tools provide ample guidance in deciding how best to be a good high-density neighbour. Housing and neighborliness can be provided for, albeit not as currently proposed.

### **3. Lack of Neighbourliness**

This proposal is not considerate of, or compatible to, the valued character building (potential heritage site) immediately east of this proposal (1488 W32nd Ave.). The house at 1488 W 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave is an original 1923 vintage character building with some very minor inconsequential 1965 interventions. Under the current zoning it is a target character building if not a heritage prospect. It is the most immediate east neighbour to the proposed development and fronts W32nd Ave. as does the proposed development.

Many of the east facing units and decks in the proposed development seriously compromise many windows and rooms of the heritage prospect plus its west side yard and rear yard. This is a consequence of the apartment form and massing. The degree of overlook and privacy loss is most unneighbourly and unnecessary. The non-apartment forms and massing options noted in the housing policy for this section of Granville Street are the better solutions for addressing these issues.

### **4. Garbage Facilities and Driveway Proximity to Character Neighbor**

The proposed lane accessed driveway to the underground 70 car parking garage and adjoining lane level garbage facilities are directly opposite the deck and bedroom windows of the east neighbour described in 3 above. This is not clear in this submission but should be. The development site has more than 266' of lane frontage for locating the driveway and garbage facilities. The worst possible location is being in alignment with neighbour's home and windows as is proposed here. Adverse impacts include privacy, visual and noise. In respect to the latter the driveway is parallel to the lane hence vehicle entering and exiting must make to 90 degree turns. This is not a straight in straight out circumstance. There could at times be some additional congestion and maneuvering situations. This is a disrespectful and unfair imposition on the neighbouring character and potential heritage asset.

### **5. Parking –Traffic Management**

There is inadequate discussion on overall parking and traffic management in the submission. There are existing conditions in the larger neighborhood that will be seriously taxed with the addition of 81 dwelling units with 70 parking spaces with no visitor parking or residential loading facilities or building servicing parking.

The two passenger loading spaces shown off the lane are more than 100' away from any common entry. They are too distant to have any real value as passenger loading.

This residential neighbourhood lies between Granville and Oak Streets. The parking on the streets on the east half between Hudson and Oak Streets are restricted to resident parking only due to the traffic and parking issues arising from the hospital on the east side of Oak Street. The traffic and parking issues are not fully resolved but have been improved.

The pavement widths between curbs along W32nd Ave are only 24'. With parking on both sides of W32nd Ave. the travel width is down to one vehicle.

Adding 70 vehicles plus those of visitors and service vehicles generated by 81 additional units is not plausible from parking and traffic management perspectives and on a narrow roadway further reduced to one travel lane.

Visitor parking demand for an 81-unit development will tax the street parking capacity and at the same time impede traffic movement in the area.

Most days, and especially during the busier travel times, the added congestion and traffic will net many conflicts and frustrations for the tenants, neighbours and all visitors and service operators. The situation will be unbearable for all, especially as an added condition to that which exists due to the hospital to the east. West 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave does not have the capacity for the added parking/ loading demand and associated traffic.

The intersections of W32nd Ave and Minto Crescent are not signalized at Granville Street. Any vehicle wanting to turn left onto Granville will more likely proceed two blocks south in the lane to the traffic light at 33<sup>rd</sup> Avenue thereby adding to the congestion and frustration at that intersection. This increased traffic in the lane will be another impact of note. I

The policy allows for a reduction in parking to 46 spaces. The provision of 70 spaces suggests the target rental here is car oriented and not transit based. Consideration of a lesser unit density in a different form and massing that realistically matches parking/loading/traffic generation to occupancy and car demand is required.

### **Conclusion**

In the interest of promoting housing and improved neighborliness and contextual fit the optional form and massing of the policy ought to be the premier choice in this regard. This may very well require an economic formula that is sustainable only in a hybrid housing formula and mix. The developer should be encouraged to pursue a more neighbourly form, massing, density and design while meeting the objective of rental housing. This may need a new mixed tenure to ensure viability.

The proposal as currently presented is highly unneighbourly, incompatible contextually and in design and will cause many adversities for the neighbourhood and for its tenants. Consequently, we neighbours are strongly opposed to this rezoning proposal.

One additional comment regarding neighbour participation. The current Covid-19 circumstances prevent the pursuit of the traditional petition. We would note this brief is the opinion and work of the undersigned.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Shafik Rajani

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Barbara & Andy Daem

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Shirley & Sholto Heberton

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Ranjit Rai

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Dan McCleod

Yolanda Sepien

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Cameron Jones

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]