

1. Streamlining Rental Around Local Shopping Areas - OTHER

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Full Name	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
11/01/2021	14:44	PH1 - 1. Streamlining Rental Around Local Shopping Areas - Amendments to the C-2, C 2B, C-2C and C-2C1 Zones and Creation of New Rental Zones for Use in Future Rezoning Applications in Surrounding Low Density Areas Under the Secured Rental Policy	Other	Beautiful densification, faster. If this plan will result in a blanket approach of big 6-storey block buildings ('Blue zones') being permitted in RS-zoned areas ' it will take away from the unique beauty of Vancouver streets - I hope you will require designs that enhance neighbourhoods' distinct character. There has to be a middle ground that works for everyone. I live along 11th avenue in Point Grey and can see the zoning will stretch up 10th west of Highbury, well into the residential area which populated by 33' homes, many with rentals. I am really worried that density is in keeping with the surrounding area. 6 stories creates shading and massing that will dwarf existing neighbourhoods, and consideration should be given to the character and building heights nearby for light and liveability factors. These are the things that make Vancouver beautiful. I AM IN FAVOUR OF MORE RENTAL NEARBY, and gentle densification where individual properties or rows of properties can be developed with townhome or multiplex styling to preserve neighbourhood beauty. This can give more folks ground level living and more street vibrancy at a better price for buyers if for sale. This better connects renters and new owners to the ground and children to the neighbourhood I believe. Many such multiplexes exist in Kits, for example, and they are lovely AND CAN BE BUILT MORE QUICKLY! I think you will have happy taxpayers (new and old) across the board if you seriously address the fear over neighbourhood context when you approve densification for rental. The blanket nature of this rezoning plan that envisions 6 Storey monolithic buildings occupying whole blocks is just disturbing, and in any event is overkill with ~10-15,000 units coming to Jericho, and another 10,000 in Oakridge and Senakw. There are some major arterials (Cambie and Granville for instance) that have been developed by swallowing blocks that had homes in severe underuse and disrepair and the resulting buildings represent a real improvement to what they replaced. Along Oak street the density offered with a townhome feel to the street is, I think, a great model for densification, as it reduces and diffuses street noise for the renters/owners and blends beautifully with the surrounding neighbourhoods. Understandably, homeowners care about their community feel, and are sensitive to the huge financial impact of light, views, streetscape, contextual feel being compromised, but homeowners are also wanting economic enivgoration and youth ' so yes, let's densify but can we envision some respect for neighbourhood beauty. I own my own home and I cannot imagine having a 6 storey wall erected beside my home, and of course I am very worried because of the serious after tax invested costs I have put into my home, maintaining and caring for it over 21 years. And no, I have not realized gains. I live there. I want new and more neighbours, but not walls. Let's change for the better!	Fiona Brodie	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	West Point Grey	No web attachments.
11/01/2021	22:41	PH1 - 1. Streamlining Rental Around Local Shopping Areas - Amendments to the C-2, C 2B, C-2C and C-2C1 Zones and Creation of New Rental Zones for Use in Future Rezoning Applications in Surrounding Low Density Areas Under the Secured Rental Policy	Other	The best part of this proposal is that it "could" add more families and kids to many of our areas that have ample school spaces and great amenities; many areas that actually have seen very little growth of people and some areas that have actually lost people. Areas that once had a lot of kids but now do not. The "could" really lies in the percentage of 2 and 3 bedroom units. What I find odd is why the only 35% of 2&3 bedroom units (with no breakdown between 2 and 3 bedroom) applies here. It makes no sense for this low percentage of 2 and 3 bedrooms units when you are adding significantly more density to "residential" RS zoned areas. Summary: Support with amendments: 1) Higher Percentage of 2 and 3 bedroom units required in Residential RS areas and 2) Separation of 2 and 3 bedroom requirements	V k Khanna		Shaughnessy	No web attachments.