

Item 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 1406-1410 East King Edward Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
05/27/2022	16:00	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 1406-1410 East King Edward Avenue	Oppose	I am opposed because this will be the third type of this housing within 8 to 10 blocks of each other. 2335 Vanness is one of them and there are now passed out men on the sidewalk out side that complex and next to a community park and high school. Outrageous, that the an upstanding community has to deal with this behaviour. I own property a few blocks form all three of the proposals of this type in Cedar Cottage. The City is moving the downtown east side into respectable neighbourhoods so that the rich can take over properties in the downtown east side by the water and mountain views to build more expensive condos.	Grace Mackenzie		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
06/05/2022	17:39	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 1406-1410 East King Edward Avenue	Oppose	Dear Mayor and Council, I oppose the re-zoning of 1406-1410 East King Edward Avenue to allow the development of the building as it is currently proposed, for the following reasons: 1. Concentration ' Too much nearby The Biltmore Hotel and Day's Inn providing supportive housing are both within approximately 2 kilometres of this site (2.1 km and 1.5 km respectively). According to re-zoning planner Chee Chan, this fact has not been considered. If the goal is not to create another Downtown Eastside, then distribution, concentration and proximity of like projects needs to be considered. 2. Density - Too much onsite The proposal is for 14 storey building with 109 social housing units. This site is barely equivalent to two standard single family lots on a busy corner. Creating this kind of density for the relatively small site (more dense than the Biltmore) is going to impede the success of the project, not help it. Warehousing as many people as possible on the site should not be the goal. A successful project should be ' please see next point. 3. Research Findings ' Different mix Through a card in the mail, the City has advised me that: 'the affordability levels have been adjusted to 100% down to approximately 30% of units renting at the shelter component of income assistance and the balance at rents-eared0to-income for income-qualifying renters.' Most residents will not understand this terminology/jargon. What is clear from research and lived experience (e.g. Biltmore Advisory Committee) on supportive housing projects of this kind is that the mix of residents is critical to their success. As noted in a March 5, 2021 report to Mayor and Council from the then General Manager, Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability on the subject of social housing: 'The community housing sector stressed that mixed income projects including a share of low-end of market units are increasingly the norm for new non-market developments. Research has demonstrated that mixed-income developments show positive outcomes for social development outcomes for all children in communities where the developments are located, as well as greater access to community services and broader community acceptance.' (page 4 of 7) Thank you for considering my comments. I hope that this project is reduced in size and that a broader mix of affordability levels is used, in order to better ensure long-term success of this project.	Alison McNeil			Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix A
06/09/2022	10:11	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 1406-1410 East King Edward Avenue	Oppose	I feel that the size of the development is excessive for the size of the lot.Also, there will be inadequate setback from the street to the building entrance. Removal of existing boulevard and Kingcrest Park trees is not something that I can support.The trees are within the park and should not be touched.	Joanne Wiedeman			Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
06/09/2022	19:02	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 1406-1410 East King Edward Avenue	Oppose	I do not support the application by BC Housing and non profit for low barrier housing located at 1406-1410 East King Edward Ave. The density, and height of the building far exceeds what is outlined in the community plan for the area. BC Housing does not have a track record of being a "good neighbour" and providing support for the surrounding community, with housing developments such as the proposed. With the proximity to Kingcrest Park, and elementary school, I believe that this development is wholly unsuitable as proposed.	Peter Kieser			Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
06/09/2022	19:04	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 1406-1410 East King Edward Avenue	Oppose	I do not support the application by BC Housing and non profit-operated for low barrier housing located at 1406-1410 East King Edward Ave. The density, and height of the building far exceeds what is outlined in the community plan for the area. BC Housing does not have a track record of being a "good neighbour" and providing support for the surrounding community, with housing developments such as the proposed. With the proximity to Kingcrest Park (playground, and community gardens), and Selkirk Annex elementary school, I believe that this development is wholly unsuitable as proposed.	Julie Deveau			Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
06/09/2022	20:02	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 1406-1410 East King Edward Avenue	Oppose	I'm all for increased density along this stretch. However, I do not feel that low barrier housing is appropriate in this neighbourhood, given the short walking distance to MULTIPLE elementary schools. The proposal is not brand new idea -- we have see the impact of such developments on their surroundings, including playgrounds and parks.	Yue Chen			Unknown	No web attachments.

APPENDIX A

June 5, 2022

Dear Mayor and Council,

I oppose the re-zoning of 1406-1410 East King Edward Avenue to allow the development of the building as it is currently proposed, for the following reasons:

1. Concentration – Too much nearby

The Biltmore Hotel and Day's Inn providing supportive housing are both within approximately 2 kilometres of this site (2.1 km and 1.5 km respectively). According to re-zoning planner Chee Chan, this fact has not been considered. If the goal is not to create another Downtown Eastside, then distribution, concentration and proximity of like projects needs to be considered.

2. Density - Too much onsite

The proposal is for 14 storey building with 109 social housing units. This site is barely equivalent to two standard single family lots on a busy corner. Creating this kind of density for the relatively small site (more dense than the Biltmore) is going to impede the success of the project, not help it. Warehousing as many people as possible on the site should not be the goal. A successful project should be – please see next point.

3. Research Findings – Different mix

Through a card in the mail, the City has advised me that: “the affordability levels have been adjusted to 100% down to approximately 30% of units renting at the shelter component of income assistance and the balance at rents-eared0to-income for income-qualifying renters.” Most residents will not understand this terminology/jargon. What is clear from research and lived experience (e.g. Biltmore Advisory Committee) on supportive housing projects of this kind is that the mix of residents is critical to their success.

As noted in a March 5, 2021 report to Mayor and Council from the then General Manager, Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability on the subject of social housing:

“The community housing sector stressed that mixed-income projects including a share of low-end of market units are increasingly the norm for new non-market developments. Research has demonstrated that mixed-income developments show positive outcomes for social development outcomes for all children in communities where the developments are located, as well as greater access to community services and broader community acceptance.” (page 4 of 7)

Thank you for considering my comments. I hope that this project is reduced in size and that a broader mix of affordability levels is used, in order to better ensure long-term success of this project.

Sincerely,

Alison McNeil

s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential