

7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
11/13/2020	14:48	PH1 - 7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	As an owner-resident at the very southern end of 's.22(1) Personal with a view that mainly faces due East, the construction of this 349 East 6th Avenue, as proposed to be wider on a 'north-south axis,' would substantially restrict my current daytime view. The construction of this building would have a negative effect on the enjoyment of my residential unit. In its proposed form, the building is far taller (i.e. completely inconsistent) with those surrounding it and is not in harmony with surrounding building stock. In more technical terms, the building massing is more than 3.5 times taller than permitted by its base zoning, and twice as tall as the IC-3 zoning immediately to its west permits. The renderings show this building simply towering over the others, and its width benefits those with a northerly view ' not an easterly one. The final form of this building, therefore, should be massed in keeping with its surrounding neighbourhood, and the height should not substantially exceed the zone-compliant buildings to its west. Thank you for your consideration.	Dan Enjo		"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"	ount Pleasant	No web attachments.
11/14/2020	19:44	PH1 - 7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	I write in opposition to this proposed rezoning due to the extraordinary height proposed to be allowed relative to the base and neighbouring zoning and the lack of context for such a built form in the Mt Pleasant Community Plan. As the renderings reveal, this project would literally tower over its neighbours, and work against the built form emphasizing the natural Mt Pleasant topography (the "Hilltown" of the Community Plan.) The proposed height of 38.7 m is 3.6 times that allowed by the existing RM-4 zoning (10.7 m), and just over twice that allowed by the IC-3 zoning that begins a property to the west and north. Allowing such an extreme increase in height ensures this building would be far out of scale with its neighbours. How would this influence further spot rezonings in the area, including what might be requested for the existing site of Lion's Manor' This site is not an arterial, where higher buildings are envisioned, and is taller than the Community Plan envisions along Broadway, aside from near the Main/Kingsway/Broadway focal point. My personal interest is that this rezoning would allow a building that would have a modest impact on our current view from an 8th storey unit on Main. That is a mild concern but if this should set a precedent for other such proposals, including 325 East 6th Ave, it would be a far greater concern. I will note that I am supportive of the proposed use of the building but concerns over its height greatly outweighs that. As the use is a benefit to the entire city, allowing out-of-scale buildings as proposed in this rezoning disproportionately impacts one neighbourhood and undermines the effort residents have put into previous planning exercises.	Ian Fisher			ount Pleasant	No web attachments.
11/17/2020	15:24	PH1 - 7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	Not enough parking spaces. There is no more street parking available.	Gordon Mortimer			ount Pleasant	No web attachments.
11/20/2020	10:26	PH1 - 7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	This makes no sense! A tower in a neighbourhood that is all 3 stories maximum' What are we thinking here' This will be so out of place! This is not downtown, this is a community and a neighbourhood. More and more young families are moving here and living here and it needs to be a safe place to live. With Main street near by and east Hastings population expanding in surrounding areas, putting in social housing is a terrible idea. Not all that need or use social housing are poor characters, but many are. By opening 12 stories up to a demographic that needs social housing in a children and family forward neighbourhood is wrong. Please consider our children and the direction the community that actually lives there wants this neighbourhood to go. You folks in the city probably do not even live in this neighbourhood, yet you are making decisions for us. I have seen this play our 100 times before. Nothing we say or do can change what the city actually does when it comes to social housing. So this was probably a huge waste of my time and yours too (if you even read this). However, if you do read this, please no that nobody actually wants this in their neighbourhood or community. NOT 12 stories for heaven sakes. Please at minimum re-consider the development height but ideally do not proceed with this at all. Limit the social housing. Thank you for your time and considerations.	Josh McKissock			ount Pleasant	No web attachments.

7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue

11/22/2020	13:12	PH1 - 7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am writing today in opposition of this proposal in its current form. While I support the City's endeavours to tackle our escalating housing crisis, this proposal feels like it is trying to do too much with too little, at the expense of its neighbours and surrounding community. The need for affordable housing cannot be met with a single building alone, and I would encourage the more thoughtful pursuit of many modestly sized developments rather than a singular brute force development. This proposal is unsupported by existing policy and community plans. The proposed building is 4x what is currently allowable & appropriate for this location within the Mount Pleasant community. This development is clearly out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood and threatens to set a precedent that diminishes the existing quality and character of Mount Pleasant. Proposed Max. Building Height - 38.7m FSR - 4.87 Current Max. Building Height - 10.7m FSR - 1.45 The Mount Pleasant community plan emphasizes maintaining the 'hilltown' identity, allowing for the low-rise residential to co-exist with the higher density mixed use building thoughtfully placed on the arterial streets of Main Street, Broadway, Kingsway & 2nd Ave. 'Hilltown' identity Conceive of Mount Pleasant as a distinctive 'hilltown' area whose centre is a high-attraction zone for both residents and city visitors. Recognize that its slopes are natural form-makers on which a low profile for residential and commercial properties helps keep the sense of hill intact. - page 9, Mount Pleasant Community Plan A development of this scale would be suited for a site along Kingsway, Broadway or an arterial street as outlined in the community plan. There are currently 6+ other market and non-market residential and mixed-use buildings under construction or with approved rezoning in the immediate vicinity, each of which are sited along a major arterial street. Main Street Arts - Main & 6th - 22.6m (building height) 188 East 6th - Main & 6th (non-market housing bu) - 30.94m Elenore - Main & 5th - 23.5m (FSR 3.0) Main Street Arts 2 - Main & 4th - 21.8m 1847 Main - Main & 2nd - 35.8m Archetype Main & 1st - Max. 47.6m (3.5 FSR Residential) 304 E 1st - 30.5m This proposal's height exceeds all but one of the above developments, and lacks the arterial site within the community plan to allow for it. I strongly support non-market and affordable housing in this neighborhood, but this site is not appropriate for a 12 storey building. The proposed site is surrounded by 3 storey mid-rise, multi family residential buildings and modest detached homes. This site, if developed at the appropriate scale, has the potential to elevate the quality and character of its neighbourhood while providing much needed housing units. At the wrong scale, the benefit of the added housing units is quickly negated by the serious impacts of contextually insensitive massing, shadowing, and oversight. Thank you for your consideration</p>	Kelsey Nilsen		"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"	Mount Pleasant	Appendix A
11/22/2020	16:07	PH1 - 7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Hard one to oppose given the social housing, but just can't support 12 storeys in what is now an area that averages 3-5 storeys. I get that this is a spot-zoning, but if this developer gets 12 storeys then others will come along and say "what about me" 12 storeys is way out of touch with the character of the area.</p>	Gavin Ross			Mount Pleasant	No web attachments.
11/22/2020	16:07	PH1 - 7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>Hard one to oppose given the social housing, but just can't support 12 storeys in what is now an area that averages 3-5 storeys. I get that this is a spot-zoning, but if this developer gets 12 storeys then others will come along and say "what about me" 12 storeys is way out of touch with the character of the area.</p>	Gavin Ross			Mount Pleasant	No web attachments.
11/24/2020	18:44	PH1 - 7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue	Oppose	<p>I've been living in the same block since 2008. I'm just tired of one high after another, especially this inside the quiet residential area. However, I understand the need but how long we can continue overstressing the neighborhoods. Isn't high time to start developing small towns' Thanks,</p>	Sukhki Singh			Mount Pleasant	No web attachments.

Appendix A

Supporting statements:

Setbacks

RM-4 Zoning

Front yard setback 6.1m

Side yard 2.1m

Rear yard 10.7m

Proposed setback

Front & side yard 3.6m

Rear yard 7m

Existing & Proposed Neighborhood Context

Building height allowable along main street as per the mount pleasant community plan:

Main Street between 2nd & 7th - up to 6 stories (up to 10 storeys at 2nd ave and 7th ave)

Main & 12th - 6 stories

Main & 16th - 6 stories

Kingsway & Broadway - The Independent development - allowed as a “landmark” building
Although currently out of scale with the neighborhood, it is anticipating future transit oriented development in this area along broadway.

Broadway west - maintain 6-8 stories on broadway south

- Allow for more height on broadway north

Broadway East - maintain 4-6 storeys on broadway south

- Allow for more height on broadway north

From the Mount Pleasant Community Plan

“‘Hilltown’ identity

Conceive of Mount Pleasant as a distinctive ‘hilltown’ area whose centre is a high-attraction zone for both residents and city visitors. Recognize that its slopes are natural form-makers on which a low profile for residential and commercial properties helps keep the sense of hill intact. “ (page 9)

“Predominantly low to mid-rise massing Honour the local preference for a ‘high-low massing rhythm’ across the hill town, but with modest height as the norm: mostly low to mid-rise buildings, high rises only on selected sites. Emphasize infill opportunities in achieving density objectives.” (page 9)

“For the purposes of achieving more appropriate site development (meaning more open space, less paving, better connections to the street) and important public benefits (including

contributions to heritage retention, new cultural amenities, affordable housing, childcare, flexible gathering spaces, improved pedestrian environment, provision of cycling routes, streetcar amenities, green space), pursue additional height and density in select locations. For these sites, participants in the planning process considered and supported a variety of built form options. Any additional height and density would be contingent on further urban design analysis, including shadowing, view impacts, 'look and feel' of the area, 'permeability' of the site (the ability of people to see and walk through the site), and other public benefit considerations as noted above. **Distribute the height/bulk in relation to the character of adjacent streets (e.g., more height along Broadway, reduced height along 10th Avenue and Prince Edward, larger scale on Kingsway vs. smaller scale along Main Street).**" (page 10)

"4.1 (i) Additional Housing Opportunities • Allow increased housing density in Mount Pleasant near transit hubs, commercial centres, parks, along arterial streets, and/or streets with linear parks, and with adequate provision or leading to the provision of public services like schools, parks, childcare, community centres, and transit. " (page 14)

"Investigate opportunities to increase the 'quality' of new housing being built (e.g., better scale, materials, detailing, and craftsmanship)" (page 16)

"Parking

Recognize the importance of short-term street parking to local merchants (especially in light of revitalization efforts); parking reductions should not result in an increase in demand for on-street parking.

Investigate parking reductions near transit interchanges where travel choices exist beyond the use of a single occupancy vehicle." (page 33)