

3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street - OPPOSE

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
02/09/2021	10:14	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I do not support this building. It is not what residents want.	Weimin Larry Xiong		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	10:57	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	See attached	Cynthia Lewis			Kitsilano	Appendix A
02/09/2021	13:17	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I OPPOSE THIS APPLICATION	KHRIS SINGH			Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	14:06	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I am in opposition	JP Morrison			Mount Pleasant	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	14:10	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	No	Andrea Williams			Unknown	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	15:28	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	This proposed development exceeds the height of all existing buildings in the neighborhood. It also does not provide adequate setbacks as other buildings in the area. Many residents fought very hard to restrict building heights in Kitsilano which has resulted in the by-law currently in place. I would suggest that you respect this by-law until the next civic election and you can then campaign to change the by-law. This is how democracy works.	Jeffrey Michael Gerelus			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	15:28	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I am opposed to the re-zoning of this property because of the overall density of 2.95 and the building height of 6 stories which are not consistent with the density and building height of other properties on 4th Avenue which are generally 4 stories and lower density. Even in relatively dense commercial areas such as West Broadway between Macdonald and Collingwood, the building heights are restricted to 5 stories. This project as currently proposed does not reflect the quiet residential nature of the surrounding neighbourhood. For these reasons I do not support the current re-zoning proposal.	Ewan Wilding			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	16:05	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	See attached.	John Richards			Kitsilano	Appendix B
02/09/2021	16:27	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	Dear Mayor Stewart and City Councillors: As a member of the West Kitsilano Residents Association I am opposed to the rezoning application for Fourth and Balaclava. The proposed building does not conform to MIRHPP policies because there are presently more than 3 rental units already on the site. Your City Urban Designer, Scot Hein's ideas for a secured rental project with family oriented townhouses over a number of apartments is a more efficient building form without the need for elevators, stairs and hallways, which can take up about 25% of the building. The developer, James Evans, has been open to discussions and has confirmed that the townhouse over apartment form is financially feasible. Also, the owners are open to pursuing an alternate design. Please reject this rezoning application and let the neighbourhood and the developer arrive at a more acceptable innovative missing middle housing form that will have broad neighbourhood support. A win-win for all. With Thanks, Ursula Litzcke s. 22(1) PIR	Ursula Litzcke			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	16:56	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	Please see attached document with my objections to this proposal. And in case you don't read it, here's a precis: it's too large and high for the neighbourhood.	Jennifer Virtue			Kitsilano	Appendix C
02/09/2021	17:48	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I oppose this rezoning	Gloria Huang			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	18:02	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council: As an immediate neighbour directly affected by this rezoning application, I am opposed for the following reasons: - I moved here because of the character and feel of the neighbourhood. - The proposed building at 4th and Balaclava is bad design. It is an oversized and overly tall square box placed on a too small piece of land, with no room leftover for any proper greenery and trees. This is an extremely inequitable proposal to the immediate neighbours. We share the City's objective to get more secured rental housing but this design is far too aggressive and you are asking us to directly shoulder the negative consequences related to an overbuilt building. - I would support a secured rental project with an apartment/stacked townhouse building form that would fit into the neighbourhood context. - This building does not have a good green footprint since it is overbuilt for the lot size - We are concerned this will set a precedent and pave the way for similar rezonings throughout the neighbourhood. - The enabling MIRHPP policy specifies a maximum of 3 rental units on eligible sites. This site has 6 units and staff have not provided an explanation in the Council report. - The West Kitsilano Residents Association and the WeLoveKits group have an alternate proposal that could provide secured rental housing, working with the developer, to create a much more reasonable proposal which also helps enhance neighbourhood livability and environmental objectives We can do better than this, let's work together and show that you value neighbours caring about their neighbourhoods and adding much needed rental housing Sincerely, Sheldon Duff	Sheldon Duff			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	18:10	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I am opposed to the 4th and Balaclava. The building will change the look and feel of the area as it is a bad design with an oversized and overbuilt square box square box placed on a too small piece of land, with no room leftover for any proper greenery and trees. This is an extremely inequitable proposal to the immediate neighbours. We share the City's objective to get more secured rental housing but this design is far too aggressive and you are asking us to directly shoulder the negative consequences related to an overbuilt building. I would support a secured rental project with an apartment/stacked townhouse building form that would fit into the neighbourhood context. This building does not have a good green footprint since it is overbuilt for the lot size We are concerned this will set a precedent and pave the way for similar rezonings throughout the neighbourhood. The enabling MIRHPP policy specifies a maximum of 3 rental units on eligible sites. This site has 6 units and staff have not provided an explanation in the Council report. The West Kitsilano Residents Association and the WeLoveKits group have an alternate proposal that could provide secured rental housing, working with the developer, to create a much more reasonable proposal which also helps enhance neighbourhood livability and environmental objectives We can do better than this, let's work together and show that you value neighbours caring about their neighbourhoods and adding much needed rental housing	Jenny Chen			Arbutus-Ridge	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	18:20	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I am opposed to this application because the City has not informed residents-at- large of the essential parameters of the rezoning process as disclosed in the City Council mtg of Jan 20th. At that mtg, four functionaries (Mayor, City Mgr, Dep Director of Planning, & Legal Counsel) all stated the little-known fact that the Planning Dept is free to bring forward projects which do not comply with plans or policies. Not only is Planning free to interpret plans/policies, but City Council is free to approve projects, whether or not they comply with existing plans/policies. (Ref: City Website, Jan 20th video, minutes 8:04 ' 8:36). As the Mayor summarized, 'Because we pass a policy, it doesn't mean we have to follow it.' Citizens city-wide have been under the misapprehension that approved plans and policies are, in effect, a pact of understanding between City leaders/staff and citizens. To act with integrity, Council must ensure that citizens are informed immediately that compliance with policy is not mandatory. Citizens can then stop wasting their time on participating in neighbourhood planning or public hearings. They can also then judge if there is any use at all in participating in the much-vaunted neighbourhood process that will be part of the Vancouver Plan.	Kelly Talayco			Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	18:32	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	Bad design, oversized,	John Hilborn			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	18:37	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I oppose the rezoning to allow the construction of a 6 story building. All houses on West 4th should be 4 stories or less.	Susan Hilborn			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	18:41	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	The project is out of scale and does not conform with the neighborhood character.	Peter Lunka			Kitsilano	No web attachments.

3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street - OPPOSE

02/09/2021	19:43	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	Dear Mayor & Council. I am a big supporter of secured rental housing in Vancouver, but ask that we explore other options to the current 6-storey development proposed for 3084 W 4th Ave & 2010 Balaclava St. In particular, I believe the design is incompatible with the historic character of our neighbourhood and the beautiful 'Heritage B' buildings only meters behind, on 5th Avenue. Pls. consider an apartment/stacked townhouse building form that would fit into the neighbourhood context As an immediate neighbour directly affected by this rezoning application, I am opposed for the following reasons: - Too tall and out of scale. The proposal is requesting double the height and double the density of what is currently allowed in the RM-4 Zone; - No neighbourhood context; - Building design is poor, a "box design"; - Setbacks are too small and inconsistent with neighbouring buildings. No room for trees in the meagre setbacks which impacts privacy of neighbours; - Negative impacts include overlooking and shadowing; - It sets a terrible precedent for the area. Kind Regards, Brita Cloghesy and Mark Devereux 10-3036 West 4th Avenue Vancouver, BC V6K 1R4	Brita Cloghesy-Devereux		s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	20:05	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I oppose the proposed rezoning.	Jana Davison			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	20:28	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	Please see pictures for attachment to letter from Sarah D. Hansen of today's date.	Sarah D. Hansen			Kitsilano	Appendix D
02/09/2021	21:08	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council. I am an immediate neighbor directly affected by this rezoning application and confirm that I am opposed for the following reasons: I moved here almost twenty years ago, because it is a very green residential neighborhood, with a local community feel. The proposed building at 4th and Balaclava is an oversized square box on a small piece of land and appears to have no setbacks for greenery and trees. The size of the building appears to negatively impact the daylighting of the neighboring properties. While being supportive of the City's objective to get more secured rental housing, this design is far too aggressive for the size of the site. I would support a secured rental project with an apartment/stacked townhouse building form that would fit into the neighborhood context. If this development goes ahead as currently presented I would be concerned that this will set a precedent for similar local rezoning that would change the fabric of the neighborhood. I am concerned that by voting to not to defer the public hearing, the City has a predetermined position with regard to this development. I understand that the West Kitsilano Residents Association and the WeLoveKits group have an alternate proposal that could provide secured rental housing, working with the developer, to create a much more reasonable proposal which also helps enhance neighbourhood liveability and environmental objectives. Let's work together and show that the City of Vancouver values neighbours caring about their neighbourhoods by finding a sustainable way to add much needed rental housing without changing the community feel. Sincerely, Caroline Taylor.	Caroline Taylor			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	21:12	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	1) The proposed design is completely out of character with the surrounding buildings and will have a negative impact on those living in neighbouring properties. An opportunity is being lost to implement a design which compliments the neighbourhood and can be used as a blueprint for further developments. 2) There are alternatives designs put forward by the local community which would address the critical need for affordable rental properties while reducing the impact on neighbouring properties. Time should be made available for the developer to evaluate these proposals and adapt as needed. 3) The process by which this proposal is being considered is piecemeal. What is needed is for the City to work with the neighbourhood on a vision for how Kitsilano will develop into the future, addressing the critical need for affordable housing while also helping to maintain the unique character of Kitsilano for generations to come.	John Hughes			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	21:54	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	Too tall for the neighborhood! Not enough set back from curb! Not enough parking for the number of units! Does not fit character of the largely historic neighborhood!	Megan Lievesley			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/09/2021	22:04	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	Development is out of scale and does to align to historical neighborhood. Set backs are too small, building too tall and dense, and poor box like design.	Peter Lunka			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/10/2021	09:05	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I support the position put forward by the West Kits Residents Association. The proposed building is far too big and does not adequately address the need for secured affordable rental housing in Vancouver.	Brent Ash			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/10/2021	10:31	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I oppose the redevelopment of 4th Ave/Balclava	Nan Prittie			Unknown	No web attachments.

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

February 9th 2021

Dear City of Vancouver Planning Department and City Counsellors,

Re: Our concerns regarding the application for rezoning of the lots at 4th and Balaclava
Submitted By : Cynthia Lewis and John Richards , s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

We the homeowners at 3rd and Balaclava are strongly OPPOSED to the Rezoning application for 4th and Balaclava to be reviewed at the Public Hearing February 11th.

GIVEN that the City is engaged in mid term and long term policy and zoning changes to address the affordable housing and rental shortage in the city, and that the neighbourhood of West Kits does not currently have a "neighbourhood" plan, like others such as Broadway and Marpole, individual rezoning applications such as this one are "one off actions" leading to changes which could have disastrous long term effects on the character and current affordability of the neighbourhood.

Our neighbourhood to date has been mixed housing, with many older homes converted to basement suites and duplexes which have retained the character and natural setting of this community. They also currently provide a range of affordable rental suites. ALBEIT that it is a positive and necessary goal to increase density and affordability in low density neighbourhoods in Vancouver, surely we do NOT have to sacrifice historical character, natural beauty and heritage in order to achieve these goals.. Being careful to respect these values and revitalize areas at the same time can lead to innovative and pleasing neighbourhoods- eg Main Street, East Village, others. Creating "new neighbourhoods" with all the same style such as 49th and Cambie, or the River District, can also serve needs and include parks etc with a homogeneity of architecture and density. But throwing opportunistic wild card development with no plan, into existing neighbourhoods will ruin these neighbourhoods.

The particular application for the proposed structure at 4th and Balaclava is a worst case complete disaster of a plan! It's a oversized box planted on a too small piece of land designed to maximize profit for the developer, with no green footprint at all. Ironically, not much "affordable" housing will even come out of it. It will overshadow existing houses and stick out like a sore thumb. The "We Love Kits" group have an alternate proposal , working with the developer, to create a much more reasonable structure in order to add to the character of the neighbourhood, not destroy it. As immediate neighbours directly affected by this proposal we fail to see its logic. In particular the City is saying the rationale for the City to consider this falls under its MIRHPP policy , but the conditions stated in that do not apply to this application. I wish to speak at the Public Hearing to reinforce the need for a PLAN for my community which will mitigate against these "one off" shots at profiteering, and create ongoing sustainability and affordability, while maintaining the character and green footprint of the neighbourhood.

Respectfully submitted
Cynthia Lewis

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

February 9th 2021

Dear City of Vancouver Planning Department and City Counsellors,

Re: Our concerns regarding the application for rezoning of the lots at 4th and Balaclava
Submitted By : Cynthia Lewis and John Richards , s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

We the homeowners at 3rd and Balaclava are strongly OPPOSED to the Rezoning application for 4th and Balaclava to be reviewed at the Public Hearing February 11th.

GIVEN that the City is engaged in mid term and long term policy and zoning changes to address the affordable housing and rental shortage in the city, and that the neighbourhood of West Kits does not currently have a "neighbourhood" plan, like others such as Broadway and Marpole, individual rezoning applications such as this one are "one off actions" leading to changes which could have disastrous long term effects on the character and current affordability of the neighbourhood.

Our neighbourhood to date has been mixed housing, with many older homes converted to basement suites and duplexes which have retained the character and natural setting of this community. They also currently provide a range of affordable rental suites. ALBEIT that it is a positive and necessary goal to increase density and affordability in low density neighbourhoods in Vancouver, surely we do NOT have to sacrifice historical character, natural beauty and heritage in order to achieve these goals.. Being careful to respect these values and revitalize areas at the same time can lead to innovative and pleasing neighbourhoods- eg Main Street, East Village, others. Creating "new neighbourhoods" with all the same style such as 49th and Cambie, or the River District, can also serve needs and include parks etc with a homogeneity of architecture and density. But throwing opportunistic wild card development with no plan, into existing neighbourhoods will ruin these neighbourhoods.

The particular application for the proposed structure at 4th and Balaclava is a worst case complete disaster of a plan! It's a oversized box planted on a too small piece of land designed to maximize profit for the developer, with no green footprint at all. Ironically, not much "affordable" housing will even come out of it. It will overshadow existing houses and stick out like a sore thumb. The "We Love Kits" group have an alternate proposal , working with the developer, to create a much more reasonable structure in order to add to the character of the neighbourhood, not destroy it. As immediate neighbours directly affected by this proposal we fail to see its logic. In particular the City is saying the rationale for the City to consider this falls under its MIRHPP policy , but the conditions stated in that do not apply to this application. I wish to speak at the Public Hearing to reinforce the need for a PLAN for my community which will mitigate against these "one off" shots at profiteering, and create ongoing sustainability and affordability, while maintaining the character and green footprint of the neighbourhood.

Respectfully submitted
Cynthia Lewis

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

Dear Mayor and Council,

As an immediate neighbour directly affected by this rezoning application, I am opposed because the proposed new building at 4th and Balaclava does not fit into the neighbourhood and has no room leftover for any proper landscaping. Also there are no buildings higher than 4 stories in this neighbourhood. By allowing this, you will set a precedent for the area which will have a negative impact.

I would support a secured rental project with an apartment/stacked townhouse building form that would fit into the neighbourhood context.

The West Kitsilano Residents Association and the WeLoveKits group have an alternate proposal that could provide secured rental housing, working with the developer, to create a much more reasonable proposal which also helps enhance neighbourhood liveability and environmental objectives

Sincerely,

Jennifer Virtue

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

February 9, 2021

Sarah D. Hansen

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential

**Private and Confidential
Email**

Mayor and Council

Dear Sirs and Mesdames:

Re: 4th and Balaclava Public Hearing – Statement of Opposition to Rezoning Application

As an s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential on West 5th Ave between Bayswater and Balaclava directly affected by this rezoning application, and I am opposed for the following reasons.

I understand the proposed project to be a rezoning application at 3084 W 4th Ave and 2010 Balaclava St. The proposal is to allow for the development of a 6-storey residential building. The zoning would change from RM-4 (Residential) to CD-1 (Comprehensive Development) District. This proposal includes:

- 35 secured market rental units (with 20% of the residential floor area assigned to moderate income households)
- A floor space ratio (FSR) of 2.95
- A gross floor area of 2,027.5 sq. m (21,824 sq. ft.)
- A building height of 20.23 m (66.37 ft.)
- 15 vehicle parking spaces and 54 bicycle parking spaces

I purchased my home on s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential in or about 2014 specifically because of the proximity of the home to General Gordon and because it was not impacted visually by buildings higher than 3-4 stories on 4th Avenue and provides me with a view of the mountains and no shading in the community while still living in a densely populated area.

The area on 5th Ave between Balaclava and Bayswater is well known as “Heritage Row” due to the number of heritage homes on the block. Over the last several years, the community has become more dense in an appropriate way, by lifting houses and adding additional suites.

No Traffic Control Plan

After the City of Vancouver decided to close off Point Grey Road, traffic on 4th Ave on this block increased dramatically and the intersection at 4th and MacDonald became much more busy. It is often backed up and when I drive home [REDACTED] my turn backs up traffic to Macdonald Street making the intersection much more busy and I would argue, more dangerous. There have been many times where I have almost been rear-ended turning left from 4th Ave to Balaclava where this proposed building is to be located.

I oppose adding 6 stories of units without consideration of a traffic and management study before making a decision on the proposed project. I have not seen a traffic control plan, nor have I seen how the developer intends to ensure entrance to and from the underground parkade will be accessed safely (assuming that the City would never allow street parking where it is already highly congested, even with public transit options).

I understand that a traffic and management study was requested by another neighbour, and the City declined to require such a study to be completed. I cannot see the logic in that. Given the close proximity to MacDonald Street and the use of the intersection of 4th and Bayswater by school children and families, together with the already increased traffic from the Point Grey Road Closure; City Council ought to require a traffic and management study before making a decision on the proposed project as this may affect the design of the building and affect the City Council's decision on the proposed project.

The Proposed Project is not an Eligible Project under the Pilot Program

My second point of opposition is the precedent the City would set by allowing change to the Zoning rules for this development in that the proposed project does not meet the requirements of the Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (the "**Pilot Program**") adopted by City Council on November 28, 2017. There is no basis for an exception to the Pilot Program for this proposed development.

The Pilot Program, General Guidelines for Additional Height and Density, specifically provided that for additional height and density in RM Zones:

"Consider redevelopment of a limited number of highly underutilized sites with a low number of existing tenants – buildings with a maximum of 3 existing rental units."

Up to 6 storeys on arterials.

Consider higher forms at arterial intersections. On larger sites off-arterials, consider up to 6 storeys where appropriate.”

At page 3 of the Staff Referral Report it clearly states that the site is currently occupied by three duplexes with six (6) existing rental units housing 13 tenants. The existing site buildings have six (6) existing rental units, not three (3) and therefore the proposed project is not an eligible project under the Pilot Program as it does not meet the general guidelines for additional height and density.

The City cannot argue that: if the eligibility threshold is for “buildings with a max. of 3 existing rental units”; and as there are 3 duplex buildings with only 2 existing rental units in each, then the site is an eligible site under the Pilot Program. That is not what the Pilot Program says and City Council must give effect and meaning to the full language and intent of the guideline when interpreting its meaning.

Any ambiguity concerning interpretation of the language used in the Pilot Program requires new language to be added to or removed from the Pilot Program, with the benefit of full public consultation on the proposed revisions or clarifications to be made. The proposed project is not eligible for redevelopment under the Pilot Program as follows.

First, the Pilot Program’s eligibility guidelines set out the types of sites that would be considered, that is, “consider redevelopment” of “underutilized sites”, not underutilized buildings. Secondly, the additional language “ - buildings with a maximum of 3 existing rental units” when read together with the first part of the same sentence must mean what it says, namely buildings on underutilized sites with a maximum of 3 existing rental units are not eligible.

In this case, the buildings on this site exceed 3 existing rental units. The Pilot Program guidelines do not say:

To be an eligible site, each building on the site must not exceed 3 existing rental units.

The guideline says that to be an eligible redevelopment site, buildings (plural) on the site must have a maximum of 3 existing rental units. In this case, the buildings on the site exceed 3 existing rental units.

That reading of the Pilot Program is consistent with the object and purpose of the Pilot Program which is to only consider redevelopment on “underutilized sites”, not “underutilized buildings”.

There is no basis in the application materials for City Council to make an exception to the Pilot Program, this is particularly true of a pilot program, where City Council intended to learn from a small-scale, short experiment how a large-scale project may work in practice. It is not reasonable to make *material* revisions to the Pilot Program

at this early stage in planning, where City Council is using the pilot as a metric for how success will be determined.

As this proposed development does not meet the criteria established under the Pilot Program, City Council ought not to be approved as it sets a bad precedent in this community given the following circumstances.

Additional considerations under the Pilot Program require proposed projects to consider and respect transition to surrounding areas and homes and neighbourhood context. There are no 6 story buildings in this neighbourhood, that is, no higher buildings beyond 3-4 stories, no precedent for higher buildings such as is being proposed.

There are two large vacant lots on the same side of 4th Ave and one site on the other side of Balaclava (immediate across from the proposed development area). If City Council approves this exception and allows 6 stories, you provide a pathway for the next 3 applications for the other lots at the same 6 story height. The exception will fundamentally change the character of the neighbourhood and the traffic in the neighborhood as well as the visual appeal of my home and my community.

The proposed building at 4th and Balaclava is also a bad design. It is an oversized and overbuilt square box placed on a too small piece of land, with no room for any proper greenery and trees. The Shading Study provided is too limited in scope and there is no noise study available (in addition to the absence of a traffic control and management plan).

I would support a secured rental project with an apartment/stacked townhouse building form that would fit into the character of the neighbourhood (lower height, 3 stories), provided that the owner becomes a good neighbor and keeps care of his or her tenants. The roof on the existing building has had a tarp over it for several months (presumably because it leaks) and there is black mold all over the outside of the existing building (see the picture attached) which has been in that state for years.

Kindest regards,

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential



Sarah D. Hansen

Attachment – picture of existing building at 4th and Balaclava





