

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
02/11/2021	16:14	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava	Oppose	Aggressive height and density not in keeping with the neighborhood. Jeopardizes 3 established cedar trees. Does not comply to several MIRHPP guidelines.	Kate Walsh		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/11/2021	16:33	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava	Oppose	Please attribute this correspondence to West Kitsilano Residents Association	Jan Pierce			Kitsilano	Appendix A
02/11/2021	17:28	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	1. Proposal Does Not Qualify for the Moderate Income Rental Housing Pilot Program (MIRHPP). This proposal should not have been considered for this site because it does not meet the city's criteria laid out in the MIRHP Program. The site has 6 existing rental units and 13 tenants that will be displaced. The MIRHP Program states that only sites with a maximum of 3 existing rental units should be considered. 2. Design Concerns. ' The proposal is too aggressive for the small 71 x104 site size, in height, scale and footprint; ' The proposal is almost double the permitted height (10.7m / 35 feet to 19.3m / 63.4 feet) and more than double the density/floorspace of what is allowed in the RM-4 Zone (FSR 1.45 to 2.95). ' No context: There are no buildings higher than 4 stories along Fourth Avenue and the nearby adjacent RM4 developments are 3 1/2 stories with a lower ground floor to reduce height to 35 feet. ' Building design is poor: an unimaginative "box design" that disrespects the streetscape, design and character of the neighbourhood; ' Setback relaxations result in very narrow setbacks which are inconsistent with neighbouring buildings. Consequences of the narrow setbacks are little space for greenery and loss of privacy. There will be only 6 feet between the balconies and the rear property line. Reducing the north setback as proposed will bring new residents closer to the noise and pollution of 4th Avenue and could jeopardize the 3 existing, mature cedar trees; ' Inadequate treatment of garbage and recycling - needs to move underground; ' Shadowing will occur in late afternoon, the time when Vancouverites often want to sit outside after returning home from work; ' Minor mitigating conditions in the City's Report do not solve the problems listed above. I support a more appropriate design for a market rental alternative using a combination of apartments and stacked townhouse building form, up to 4.5 stories, with trees and appropriate setbacks (see below). This could be an innovative rental housing project that would more than replace the existing rental housing on the site. It would still involve an increase in density and number of units over current RM4 zoning but in an efficient and attractive building form that would fit into the neighbourhood. I would support an alternate Design for 4th & Balaclava: An apartment and townhouse-style, Up to 4.5-stories. Please refer to	Mark Werner			Kitsilano	No web attachments.
02/11/2021	18:32	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	I support the position stated here: <a href="http://coalitionvan.org/posts/2021-3084w4th-2010-balaclava-public-hearing/#more-782">http://coalitionvan.org/posts/2021-3084w4th-2010-balaclava-public-hearing/#more-782</a> Council should not push this development through as planned. Council should take the time to fully consider the alternative plan put forward by members of the neighbourhood together with urban designer Scott Hein. Don't foist yet another contentious out-of-scale MIRPHH development on an unwelcoming neighbourhood especially when such a win-win alternative has been provided.	Roberta Olenick			Unknown	No web attachments.
02/11/2021	19:53	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	West Point Grey Residents Association is opposed to this plan as proposed. The local community have raised many concerns that need to be addressed. Please see our letter attached.	Board of Directors			Unknown	Appendix B
02/11/2021	22:05	PH2 - 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Avenue and 2010 Balaclava Street	Oppose	My husband and I are strongly against this development. The height of the building and the lack of set back from the street is completely out of character with the neighbourhood. It will also cast a shadow on our back patio early in the afternoon. This monstrosity will negatively change the feel of the neighbourhood and open up the possibility for more oversized developments like it. This could completely box in our building and decrease our property value. Please tell me why the city council is considering amending the Zoning and Development By-laws all for only 6 or 7 units secured as MODERATE income. Why? And what type of units will these be? 1-bedroom? Studio? City council cannot allow this development to go through. It will directly affect the property value and quality of light for the hundred or so people who live in The Santa Barbra building and many others living in the surrounding houses. It will also negatively change the feel of the whole neighbourhood, affecting thousands of people. All for what? So that 6 or 7 young professionals or UBC students can enjoy a 'moderate' cost of housing? Vancouver needs AFFORDABLE housing for families! This development only benefits the developers! This is not acceptable! Please reply via email to acknowledge that my opinions have been heard. Or call me to follow up. Sincerely, Sarah Steele & Paul Dunwoody s.22(1)	Sarah Steele			Kitsilano	No web attachments.

Dear Mayor Stewart and City Councilors

West Kitsilano Residents Association is **opposed** to this rezoning application.

The proposed building **does not conform to MIRHPP policies** because there are presently more than 3 rental units already on the site; it does not transition to neighbouring residential properties and it does not fit into the context of the area.

We would like to move beyond just opposition and **use this opportunity to build a collaborative process with the developer and owners of the site** in order to create a secured rental project that fits into the area, helps meet the City wide goals of more rental housing, meets the financial viability test for the owners, and shows how alternate innovative designs can be used to provide rental housing in a way that neighbourhoods will support.

Scot Hein, one of the City's best urban designers, has shown us that there is a **better solution** for this site that will have support from the neighbourhood and still meet the City wide goal of provision of rental housing and be financially viable!

One reason that the proposed building is over sized is because of the building typology which is not a good choice for a small site. 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 so much of the building's space being taken by elevators, stairs and hallways.

The amount of space lost to non-living space is about **25%** of the building.

This number is particularly **high because of the small site** - a **shallow** 104 by 71 foot lot. The proportion of lost space goes up the smaller the site.

Under the alternate more efficient design, there is almost no unusable space since **each unit would have its own entrance** so that almost the same amount of livable floor area can be provided in a three and a half storey 2.1 FSR building.

This results in a much **more Covid friendly design** without requiring shared elevators and stairwells and also uses less concrete and has a **lower carbon footprint**.

This alternate design also means that the **resulting family oriented units will actually be livable over the longer term for a family** unlike the tiny two bedroom units being provided. We note that the so-called family units are mostly under 600 square feet and only one is over 700 square feet (721 Sq.ft.)

We do not think that councilors should be trying to redesign a building in the midst of a Public Hearing. We also have learned through the 1805 Larch St development permit process, that council should not rely on the development permit process to

deal with the problems. Suggestions for further 'consideration' of possible improvements does not mean that this will happen.

However, we do want to indicate some of the specific problems with the current building. They are:

1. **Sixth floor** is not supportable in view of surrounding scale of development
2. **insufficient rear yard (only 6 feet after balconies)** so that the six storey building **will overshadow** gardens in the Santa Barbara next door in late summer afternoons when people want to sit outside. The 6 foot rearyard means that suggestions for trees and urban agriculture are unrealistic.
- 3, **Balconies** that protrude a full six feet rather than being inset into the building
2. **insufficient setback** on the top floor of only 4 feet which results in unusable private space for top floor units

We have been fortunate that the developer, James Evans, has been open to discussions and has confirmed that the townhouse over apartment form is financially feasible. We also understand that, if this rezoning is rejected, that the owners are very open to pursuing an alternate form. In fact, this may well be their preferred option over all.

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.

Thank you



West Point Grey Residents Association  
Info@wpgra.ca  
www.wpgra.ca

February 11, 2021

City of Vancouver Council

Dear Mayor Kennedy Stewart and Councillors,

**Re: Public Hearing Item 3. CD-1 Rezoning: 3084 West 4th Ave. and 2010 Balaclava St.**

Agenda: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20210211/phea20210211ag.htm>

Report: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20210211/documents/phea3rr.pdf>

West Point Grey Residents Association is **opposed** to this plan as proposed. The local community have raised many concerns that need to be addressed.

The main concern is that the proposed building **does not conform to MIRHPP policies** because:

- there are presently more than 3 rental units already on the site;
- it does not transition to neighbouring residential properties
- it does not fit into the context of the area.

The proposal is far too big for this small site, both in height and density, is out of character with the area, and doesn't include enough onsite parking.

Please do not approve this rezoning. There are many other options that could be pursued to add more rental that would be a better fit for the community.

Yours truly,

West Point Grey Residents Association Board of Directors