

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

| Date Received | Time Created | Subject | Position | Content | Name | Organization | Contact Info | Neighbourhood | Attachment |
|---------------|--------------|---|----------|---|-------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| 12/09/2020 | 20:02 | PH1 - 7. CD-1 Rezoning: 349 East 6th Avenue | Oppose | When I purchased my home in this neighbourhood I relied on the MPCP. The vision for the area East of Main Street and south of Broadway East is a Hilltown identity with low to mid-rise buildings. I do not agree with buildings higher than six storeys that would erode the character of this Hilltown. Approval of the proposed development sets precedent for this area. We do not want to change the character of the neighbourhood. It would be higher than the buildings on Main. Community submissions demonstrate a desire to retain the low to mid-size building height at no higher than 6 storeys. 51% oppose the project. Not because it's social housing but because it's not appropriate for the area. Staff response to the concerns do not make sense. I'm also concerned about having seniors and persons with disability in a 12 storey building. Six storeys makes more sense for their safety and quality of life. Parking space shortfall will exacerbate limited parking in the area. The higher building casts shadows, creates wind tunnels and obstructs views. I'm also concerned about the use of 325 6th East site. Will building above two storeys be allowed for that site in the future? I have noted that all of the other projects presented for approval are no higher than six storeys including the seniors social housing project at 2924 Venables. That project had 75% public support because it did maintain the character of that area. Those opposed to the current proposal are not opposed to social housing. They are opposed to social housing that does not fit into the character of the community, as envisioned in the Community Plan. They are opposed to setting precedent for further projects in the area that will fundamentally change the character over time. When I bought, I thought the Plan was brilliant and never expected such a major diversion. The Plan clearly identifies large sites for construction of high rises while the Hilltown was designated for mid to low rise housing compatible with the lines of the distinctive slope. Please honour the Plans principles and maintain its integrity. To do otherwise is a betrayal of trust. | Janice Reid | | "s.22(1) Personal" | Mount Pleasant | No web attachments. |
| 12/09/2020 | 22:34 | PH1 - 7. CD-1 Rezoning: 349 East 6th Avenue | Oppose | Please see attachment for previous comments. | Janice Reid | | "s.22(1) Personal" | Mount Pleasant | Appendix A |
| 12/10/2020 | 09:36 | PH1 - 7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue | Oppose | the height is my main concern for the following reasons: (1) it will make a major impact on the block and significantly change its character. A 6 storey building would be in keeping with the neighborhood and still could provide a significant amount of social housing. (2) The proposal is sitting on the top of the block running from Great Northern way, which creates an even greater impact to the buildings in the surrounding area Additionally, we can all admit that parking in every neighbourhood has issues, but allowing this proposal to have a 50% reduction is a bit unreasonable considering good percentage of the street parking is now permit parking only. I know that developments don't take the street parking into consideration, but it become a factor when you eliminate the reduce the requirement parking as per the bylaw. | Nicole Choi | | "s.22(1) Personal" | Mount Pleasant | No web attachments. |
| 12/10/2020 | 15:32 | PH1 - 7. CD-1 REZONING: 349 East 6th Avenue | Oppose | Mayor Stewart and Council I am writing to you to oppose this proposed rezoning. My objection to the rezoning is that it represents a significant departure from what is currently approved for this site. The staff reports attempts to cover this by noting on page 9 that it will conform to future "likely" recommendations for the Broadway Plan. This is effectively the same justification that was used to justify the rezoning of 2538 Birch Street. One is left with the unfortunate impression that staff is actively trying to front-run the completion of the Broadway Plan and get approval for projects which will effectively set the floor, in terms of height and density, for what comes forward in the Broadway Plan. The City (meaning staff and council) has to decide whether it is really committed to inclusive and meaningful public engagement in the development of the Broadway Plan, or be honest and abandon any pretense of consultation, and simply tell residents what the City intends to impose in the Broadway corridor. The continued efforts to incrementally set precedents seriously undermines the credibility of the consultation process. Regards Ian Crook | Ian Crook | | "s.22(1) Personal" | Fairview | No web attachments. |

APPENDIX A

Mr. Mayor and Members of Council, my name is Janice Reid. I live on the same block as the proposed development at 349 East 6th Ave. I stand opposed, mainly because this is a precedent-setting decision for that distinct area of Mount Pleasant and a significant compromise to the spirit and integrity of the Mount Pleasant Community Plan.

I am not opposed to social housing developments compatible with the surrounding area in density, scale, architectural character and operation. The Plan provides for multiple objectives, not just social housing. To alter a community plan of the depth and breadth of the Mount Pleasant Plan should not be taken lightly. Much community time and resources were invested in its development. It embodies a clear vision for each unique area included in the community. I for one, relied on the integrity of the Plan in making my decision to purchase in the area. If the plan has no integrity, then trust in the City's processes is broken. I expected low to mid-rise building construction no higher than 6-storeys in my local area east of Main and south of East Broadway. I expected the adjacent site to remain a two-storey building.

The Plan identifies the valuable asset of "Hilltown"; the unique topographical rise of the slopes from the False Creek Flats up to 16th Avenue. It states the slopes are natural form-makers on which a sense of hill contact is maintained by a low profile for residential and commercial properties. An overarching principle of the Plan is to honour the local preference for mostly low to mid-rise buildings with high rises only on large sites (The Independent, Kingsway Mall).

I have two concerns about a strategic diversion from the plan:

1. First, the current zoning of RM-4 (Multiple Dwelling) is compatible with the character of this particular local area of Mount Pleasant. The replacement is not consistent with the character of the local area. If the current proposal is approved it sets precedent. This is a diversion from the overarching principle in the Plan. It opens the door to erosion of the unique Hilltown character the Plan was meant to protect. There is silence about future development on the adjacent site at 325 East 6th Ave. It is two-storeys. What will happen to it?
2. Second, there are 19 underground parking spaces. The assumption is that the social housing residents will not own cars. This does not seem reasonable. While the site population would increase by almost four times (from 23 to 82 plus), available parking would decrease from 23 to 19. There is not adequate parking on the street. Even if the assumption of car ownership is true, surely the demand for visitor parking will increase. This cost has not been included in the financial viability calculation for the project.

I have concerns about the staff assessment's narrow focus on the objective of social housing:

1. It is stated that the area is changing by development along Main Street and by way of the subway expansion on Broadway. In fact, The Main Street corridor and the Broadway corridor are identified as separate areas with separate considerations for development. It was envisioned to be higher in density than the hill slope interior. As far as I know, none of the buildings on Main Street are as high as the current proposal. I think they are no higher than six storeys.

2. It is stated that the application seeks to optimize the opportunity to develop affordable housing within walking distance of two subway stations, while respecting the character of the local area. A 12 storey building is not respecting the character of the local area. Although there are two subway stations, one is at the top of the hill and one is at the bottom of the hill making it difficult for senior's to walk to the subway stations.

The applicant received 178 public submissions with 51% opposed and 36% supportive. The concerns reflect overwhelming support for social housing, with opposition to development that compromises the Plan and alters the character of the neighbourhood. In other words 12-storeys is too high; 6-storeys is more desirable. Residents do not want shadows, obstructions of view and parking issues. Neither do they want that for future residents.

I have concerns about staff responses to these concerns.

I sat through the meeting last week and I noted that none of those projects exceeded six-storeys, including the senior's social housing project at 2924 Venables Street. That project had 75% support with 10% opposed. There were no concerns expressed about height.

The 8-storey building on the north side of 6th Ave. is an anomaly. It was built about 50 years ago. There exists wide setbacks and a dedicated parking lot.

Seniors don't have to live in CD-1 housing. In fact, the Seniors Supportive and Assisted Housing Guidelines lays out the need for safety and easy access for seniors. This is good policy for seniors whether they are living independently or in supportive housing. The lower the building, the better.

Thank you for your time and I hope that you will take my points into consideration.

Respectfully,

Janice Reid