

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/28/2020	15:40	PH3 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue	Other	<p>To Vancouver City Council Re: Zoning and Development Application 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue I have been reading with interest the comments both in support of and opposed to the above development. I recognize and support in principle the desperate need for increased housing and increased housing density in our city, including in Shaughnessy. However, I have several issues with the proposal as it stands. I have concerns about the ?spot rezoning? that this application is entered under, and I think requires greater input and thoughtfulness before it is approved. This decision has the potential to significantly alter (both positively and negatively) the direction housing takes in Vancouver. It would be a mistake to rush to a decision while ignoring major flaws in the proposed design. I believe the current design is too dense for the lot and I would pose a few questions for council to consider before approval. Who is the target demographic for this development? What is the intended rental rate? (ie who will be able to live there?). What are considered ?family friendly? criteria? Surely the developers don?t consider that it is possible to raise a family in 560 square feet? (the majority of the units). Equally for seniors who might be downsizing, the nearest amenities are not within walking distance, or even a simple bus ride away. Is it anticipated that every age group/demographic will be eschewing cars in favour of bicycles? (ie proposal includes less than one parking stall per unit). The anticipated increase in vehicle traffic and on-street parking needs are all too real in this neighborhood. If I read the proposal correctly, there does not appear to be adequate storage for each unit, usually contained on the garage level. There are insufficient interior measurement details provided on the plans; for example, how big are the bedrooms? the kitchen? the bathrooms? where are the interior doors located? These are just a few of the issues that come to mind. In many of the support comments, the phrase creating a ?vibrant and exciting neighborhood? recurs often enough to suggest an equally vociferous organized campaign to support this project. Perhaps what is forgotten in the excitement is that residents of Shaughnessy still pay property taxes that are already breathtaking. I would urge council to reflect on the development under consideration at 6031 Dunbar. That particular proposal is much more modest in scale, and fits in very well with the neighborhood. Surely, something better could be envisioned for Granville and 32nd. It is crucial that reflection and community input without rhetoric continues in order to develop a more coherent plan for the city as a whole.</p>	R. Jean Shapiro		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Shaughnessy	APPENDIX A

July 28, 2020

To Vancouver City Council

Re: Zoning and Development Application 4750 Granville Street and 1494 West 32nd Avenue

I have been reading with interest the comments both in support of and opposed to the above development. I recognize and support in principle the desperate need for increased housing and increased housing density in our city, including in Shaughnessy. However, I have several issues with the proposal as it stands. I have concerns about the “spot rezoning” that this application is entered under, and I think requires greater input and thoughtfulness before it is approved. This decision has the potential to significantly alter (both positively and negatively) the direction housing takes in Vancouver. It would be a mistake to rush to a decision while ignoring major flaws in the proposed design.

I believe the current design is too dense for the lot and I would pose a few questions for council to consider before approval.

Who is the target demographic for this development? What is the intended rental rate? (ie who will be able to live there?). What are considered “family friendly” criteria? Surely the developers don’t consider that it is possible to raise a family in 560 square feet? (the majority of the units). Equally for seniors who might be downsizing, the nearest amenities are not within walking distance, or even a simple bus ride away. Is it anticipated that every age group/demographic will be eschewing cars in favour of bicycles? (ie proposal includes less than one parking stall per unit). The anticipated increase in vehicle traffic and on-street parking needs are all too real in this neighborhood. If I read the proposal correctly, there does not appear to be adequate storage for each unit, usually contained on the garage level. There are insufficient interior measurement details provided on the plans; for example, how big are the bedrooms? the kitchen? the bathrooms? where are the interior doors located? These are just a few of the issues that come to mind.

In many of the support comments, the phrase creating a “vibrant and exciting neighborhood” recurs often enough to suggest an equally vociferous organized campaign to support this project. Perhaps what is forgotten in the excitement is that residents of Shaughnessy still pay property taxes that are already breathtaking.

I would urge council to reflect on the development under consideration at 6031 Dunbar. That particular proposal is much more modest in scale, and fits in very well with the neighborhood. Surely, something better could be envisioned for Granville and 32nd.

It is crucial that reflection and community input without rhetoric continues in order to develop a more coherent plan for the city as a whole.

Yours Sincerely,

R. Jean Shapiro