

4. CD-1 Rezoning: 3970-3998 Main Street - OPPOSE

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Full Name	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/04/2022	16:12	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 3970-3998 Main Street	Oppose	It is really disheartening that so many of the 16 support people for this project are from Colliers, the real estate industry, lawyers and property management companies. I hope this Council will take this into consideration when deciding who really supports this project. It certainly appears that those who support are those that will profit from the project rather than those who will have to live with the finished project. It is disgusting how those not living in the area have so much influence.	Grace	s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Mount Pleasant	No web attachments.
07/04/2022	21:47	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 3970-3998 Main Street	Oppose	proposal. I have been a resident of the Riley Park area since I first immigrated to Canada in 1996, I attended nearby General Wolfe Elementary, and Eric Hamber High School. I currently live in a two-bedroom apartment in s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential" when this re-zoning proposal is approved. This has been the home for me and my partner for more than 5 years. It is likely that once we are demovicted from our current home we will no longer be able to afford to live in this area, and I will be forced to leave a community that I have lived in for the past twenty-five years. The protections of the Tenant Relocation Policy are paltry and offer me and my partner with no consolation if we are displaced. We will certainly have to pay higher rents when we are evicted. The current average rent for a 2-bedroom apartment of \$2,7983 in Vancouver would represent more than a 300% increase over our current rent. The current provision of the Tenant Relocation Policy that offers to allow renters to return to the new building with a rent that is discounted by 20% are laughable given how much rents have increased in the past 5 years. I urge you to vote against this re-zoning application, and all other similar proposals that displace renters from their communities and further immiserate them. We all know	Esteban Gonzalez		Riley Park	No web attachments.
07/05/2022	09:37	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 3970-3998 Main Street	Oppose	See the section below for comments.	Allan Buium		Riley Park	Appendix A
07/05/2022	11:37	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 3970-3998 Main Street	Oppose	Dear council, I am writing to oppose the application for rezoning for 3970-3998 Main Street and I encourage you to also oppose this proposal. The development application claims to be addressing the need for rental housing in Vancouver and the Riley Park area. However, the development application proposes entirely market rental rate units. The current market rental rate in Vancouver is \$2,367 per month for a one-bedroom. Considering rent as a third of income, that rent is affordable only for someone making upwards of \$85,000 a year. The application notes the "unique character" of Main Street. Yet it is the diversity of Main Street that adds to its "uniqueness." What with the unaffordable nature of market rental rates, the proposed development neglects the needs of students, artists, young people, immigrant families, and families of various incomes. The development application will not serve to diversify the area, but rather--by prioritizing a culture a wealthy renters as many other such developments do in the immediate surroundings of 3970-3998 Main Street--will just further contribute to the neighbourhood's further homogenization and displacement of low and middle-income residents. Thank you for considering my concerns seriously. Best, Sasha	Sasha Langford		Riley Park	No web attachments.

4. CD-1 Rezoning: 3970-3998 Main Street - OPPOSE

07/05/2022	12:04	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 3970-3998 Main Street	Oppose	<p>I am writing to express major concerns as s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential whose property is just a few doors from the proposed rezoning of the lot on the northeast corner of Main and east 24th Ave. In general, I am in support of increased densification and rental housing. However, this proposed rezoning raises two major red flags that make the current plan inappropriate for this corner. My concerns are as follows: 1.) The height of the building is significantly greater than that of the condo building across the street (southeast corner of Main Street and east 24th avenue). The height is such that it will shadow much of our block after 3:00 in the afternoon. This is an unwarranted and undemocratic impact on the neighbours. And it is out of keeping with other multi-family development on the street. The new building is simply too tall. 2.) I have a major concern about the increased load on street parking. 27 parking stalls for 69 units is inadequate and the developers must provide more parking for the building in order not to overburden the street parking which already must accommodate residents and shoppers/diners/visitors to Main Street.</p>	Paige Raibmon	s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/05/2022	13:10	PH1 - 4. CD-1 Rezoning: 3970-3998 Main Street	Oppose	<p>The height of the proposed development is absurd in this context. This building (with the rooftop component) will be over 80' tall towering over neighbouring homes and apartment buildings. I urge council to reject this project as it is proposed. Full name: Chris Johnston Organization you represent: Strata of s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential Which neighbourhood do you live in' Riley Park Email: s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential Please do not reply to this message. If you require further assistance, visit us online: Report an issue or request a service: https://vancouver.ca/vanconnect-desktop.aspx Find City online services, tools, and mobile apps: https://vancouver.ca/online-services You may also contact us by calling: 3-1-1 604-873-7000 (outside Vancouver) We are open to take your call from 7 00 am to 10:00 pm, 7 days/week, 365 days/year (including holidays). We also offer interpretation services in over 170 languages.</p>	Chris Johnston	s. 22(1) Personal and Confidential	Riley Park	Appendix B

APPENDIX A

Re: 3970-3998 Main St.

The Riley Park South Cambie Community Visions Steering Committee (RPSC-CVC)** has discussed the proposed project and concluded that we cannot support the project as submitted. Although there are some positive aspects, they are outweighed by the negative aspects.

Positive aspects:

— A secured rental building is much needed in the area with reasonably sized family units. We hope that the expected monthly market rental rates will not be prohibitive for families wanting to reside in the area. (The possible rates between \$2400 and \$3200 are a bit steep for the average working family.)

— Street level commercial space appears to be appealing.

— Improved setback of the building, to create a more pedestrian friendly environment, is welcomed and could be further enhanced with more greenery.

Negative aspects:

— The overall height of the building is excessive for a 6 storey structure. The height is 88.7 ft. (not 83 ft. as stated). See A3.1 of Application
Top of elevator housing: 322.43 ft., Grade: 233.77 ft. == 88.66 ft.

Due to the slope of the land, the retail level heights range from 16 to 18 ft. And the five residential levels are each 10.2 ft., so that is 69 ft. The rest is rooftop amenity and elevator housing.

— The ground floor is too high. There is a cavernous feeling, in spaces with such ceiling height. An example is across the street at *Caffe Artigiano*. This height is unnecessary and is an additional expense for both the builder and the tenant.

— The rooftop amenity is a feature that RPSC-CVC has never accepted. It was placed into the Cambie Corridor without consulting the community and is now a feature outside of the Corridor as well. The amenity creates a “silo” effect detracting from the creation or enhancing of

a community. The “rezoning rationale” notes the parks and activity along Main St. so the rooftop amenity discourages tenants from becoming involved in the community. A few pertinent questions on this type of amenity should be asked of the developer. *Why do developers like these facilities? Do tenants actually like such resources? What are the planning arguments for more rooftop amenities? Has anyone, anywhere, done research into rooftop amenities?*

— The “rezoning rationale” seems to have omitted any reference to the following amenities: Tupper Greenway, the north side of Livingstone school - a parklike setting that is used extensively by families, Riley Park and the Riley Park Community Garden. In addition, there is no mention of the Little Mt. Neighbourhood House (LMNH) across the street from the proposed building. Yes, it is to be eventually relocated to the Little Mt. Housing site but your building may be completed before the new LMNH is built. The LMNH is a very important amenity in the community — offering daycare and seniors’ programmes are just 2 of many activities. In addition it oversees the Community Garden - an excellent example of building community.

-- The mention of Hillcrest Centre and Douglas Park Community Centre must be clarified as the former is a destination Centre as defined by Park Board and is near capacity and Douglas is at capacity for most of its programmes.

— Balconies: Some hang directly off the front of the building. These are dangerous for passers-by below as objects can easily fall to the sidewalk. A suggestion is to use recessed balconies in all instances. In addition the use of glass balconies provides no privacy for residents and exposes the public to the clutter that often accumulates as “storage”.

See A2.2-0 of Application. (On 5 floors at northern end of west facade) The balconies overhang the setback. What is the point of a setback if you have balconies jutting out into it?

— Shape and Cladding:

Rather boxlike; however the proposed cladding may soften the look. If the drawing indicates colour accurately, it is too stark. White is out of character with homes in the surrounding neighbourhood. It is too

jarring.

— Glazing:

Some concern with the west facing wall. The summer heat can be quite intense. A suggestion is to reduce the window sizes or create a visually appealing shading fixture. Has consideration been given to the potential hazard to the extensive bird population?

— There appears to be an omission of a “step back” for the 5th and 6th floors. We thought such a feature was mandatory.

— Shadowing is a serious concern. The neighbours to the east will be significantly affected by the building’s height as will the building on the south side of 24th Avenue.

**RPSC -CVC was established in November 2005 by Vancouver City Council as a community group that was part of *City Plan*. As we have evolved over these past 16 years, RPSC-CVC has been recognized as a credible community *watchdog* with a strong *institutional history*.

APPENDIX B



