

**5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue - OPPOSE**

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Full Name	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/02/2022	08:51	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	I oppose this project.	Roberta Olenick	s22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	14:52	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Hello and thank you for taking the time to read this. I am a member of the Cedar Cottage Community Garden and I oppose the rezoning of this area. I am in full support of affordable public housing but I am finding it difficult to understand why a bustling, biodiverse community ecosystem is being paved over when there are many empty lots and buildings all throughout the city. I understand land development is difficult and requires much consultation, but I do believe that the city would be better off with more community gardens and less luxury housing or abandoned lots. This is all to say that this is a chance for the city of Vancouver to set a precedent going forward. We are in a time of climate crisis and any little bit of tended earth helps mitigate the current destruction. Affordable community housing can and should exist but not on top of a community hub. Rather, it should exist beside and in conjunction with outdoor spaces. This city is industrial enough without ripping up another bit of well-cared for land. Please consider the long term effects of removing yet another ecosystem that benefits the bees, the birds, the bugs, the earth, and the surrounding community. I am sure that there are ways to create more housing without sacrificing pre-developed spaces. I wish whoever reads this all the best going forward and hope a satisfactory solution can be found.	Jake Duncan		Unknown	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	15:48	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Please see the attached Document from the Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours (CCAN)	Mr. B. Straten, CCAN secretary		Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix A
07/03/2022	17:09	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	The building is too tall. t should be only one 6 storey building as is in the Rental Policy of 2022 <a href="https://bylaws.vancouver.ca/zoning/policy-rezoning-secured-rental.pdf">hxxps://bylaws.vancouver.ca/zoning/policy-rezoning-secured-rental.pdf</a> Provide more parking on site too. No market rentals here only HILs in every unit.	3. Jillian Henderson		Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.

**5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue - OPPOSE**

07/03/2022	17:46	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Below is a list of some concerns from me and my neighbourhood: ' the proposal should be 100% HILs social housing with no market-rental units ' 32 8 million dollars of taxpayers' money has been allotted for this proposal and this money should be spent on a building with 100% non-market HILs housing units ' the original form of development bid in May 2021 should be kept, it was for a six-story, 101-unit, 2.40 FRS building, not the current proposal of two 7 storey buildings with 123 units and 3.46 FSR ' there are already market rental units sitting empty in the surrounding new apartment buildings so no more of this type of housing is needed in this area of the city ' the building height is 87.93 ft (26 80 m) to the top of the roof mechanical enclosure, this height will set an unwanted height precedent for this area of low-rise housing. This height is shown in the Applicant Booklet. ' residents in these two 7 storey buildings with tiny 320 sq ft units will be warehoused not provided nice homes ' Reduce the density and build only one 6-storey building to create more open space and distance from the SkyTrain for the tenants ' the proposed building is too close to the SkyTrain tracks ' the noise from the SkyTrain will create an unlivable situation in the units and in the building courtyard ' the SkyTrain noise will reverberate off this very tall building into the neighbourhood and this will be very disruptive to the neighbours ' the project is not neighbourly ' the tall building will create shadowing on neighbouring buildings, streets, and sidewalks ' the public Community Garden will be taken away ' the trees and fruit trees on the site will be removed ' plant large trees between the project building and the SkyTrain tracks ' the public mountain views will be blocked from view while looking down Victoria Drive from the south ' not enough parking stalls are provided on site for the number of units proposed in the building ' provide more parking on site	Kristin Leung	s22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	17:56	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	There should be no market rentals in the project. Every unit should be H Ls. Listed below are some concerns with regard to this proposal at 2009 Stainsbury: ' the proposal should be 100% HILs social housing with no market-rental units ' 32 8 million dollars of taxpayers' money has been allotted for this proposal and this money should be spent on a building with 100% non-market H Ls housing units ' the original form of development bid in May 2021 should be kept, it was for a six-story, 101-unit, 2.40 FRS building, not the current proposal of two 7 storey buildings with 123 units and 3.46 FSR ' there are already market rental units sitting empty in the surrounding new apartment buildings so no more of this type of housing is needed in this area of the city ' the building height is 87.93 ft (26 80 m) to the top of the roof mechanical enclosure, this height will set an unwanted height precedent for this area of low-rise housing. This height is shown in the Applicant Booklet. ' residents in these two 7 storey buildings with tiny 320 sq ft units will be warehoused not provided nice homes ' Reduce the density and build only one 6-storey building to create more open space and distance from the SkyTrain for the tenants ' the proposed building is too close to the SkyTrain tracks ' the noise from the SkyTrain will create an unlivable situation in the units and in the building courtyard ' the SkyTrain noise will reverberate off this very tall building into the neighbourhood and this will be very disruptive to the neighbours ' the project is not neighbourly ' the tall building will create shadowing on neighbouring buildings, streets, and sidewalks ' the public Community Garden will be taken away ' the trees and fruit trees on the site will be removed ' plant large trees between the project building and the SkyTrain tracks ' the public mountain views will be blocked from view while looking down Victoria Drive from the south ' not enough parking stalls are provided on site for the number of units proposed in the building ' provide more parking on site	Analyze Simeon		Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	18:56	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	I have attached my letter in doc form.	Grace MacKenzie		Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix B

**5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue - OPPOSE**

07/03/2022	19:30	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Every unit in this project should be below market rentals. This neighbourhood has many new apartment buildings in the last few years in this same area and every new building still has many vacancies every month. We don't need more of these new market rental buildings with their expensive rents. We also don't need more shelter rate units either. We have 218 of these units in the immediate area. What we need is units for people working with low income jobs, so they will only pay rents of 30% of their incomes (H Ls). The project is too close to the Skytrain as well. This train goes by every 2 minutes during the day and is very, very noisy. The future tenants MUST be protected from this noisy by planting tall, mature trees between the new building and the train. I hope you listen to reason for a change and do these suggestions. We in the neighbourhood know what is going on here better than any City Planner or developer. Thanks for listening.	Mark Simeon	s22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	19:46	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Build one six storey building with 2.40 FSR. The rents should all be HILs meaning the tenants pay 30% of their wages on rent. Don't allow any market rentals in this building. There are so many of these new rental buildings with expensive rents in our community and they sit empty. People in the new buildings built over the last 6 years have to share tiny apartments to afford to live here. Then both have cars so now it is really hard to find parking on the street. And the new rental buildings didn't put in enough parking stalls for every tenant. The situation now is ridiculous and it is the fault of the City for allowing all this to happen. Below are just some of the problems with this proposal at 2009 Stainsbury. ' the proposal should be 100% H Ls social housing with no market-rental units ' 32 8 million dollars of taxpayers' money has been allotted for this proposal and this money should be spent on a building with 100% non-market H Ls housing units ' the original form of development bid in May 2021 should be kept, it was for a six-story, 101-unit, 2.40 FRS building, not the current proposal of two 7 storey buildings with 123 units and 3.46 FSR ' there are already market rental units sitting empty in the surrounding new apartment buildings so no more of this type of housing is needed in this area of the city ' the building height is 87.93 ft (26 80 m) to the top of the roof mechanical enclosure, this height will set an unwanted height precedent for this area of low-rise housing. This height is shown in the Applicant Booklet. ' residents in these two 7 storey buildings with tiny 320 sq ft units will be warehoused not provided nice homes ' Reduce the density and build only one 6-storey building to create more open space and distance from the SkyTrain for the tenants ' the proposed building is too close to the SkyTrain tracks ' the noise from the SkyTrain will create an unlivable situation in the units and in the building courtyard ' the SkyTrain noise will reverberate off this very tall building into the neighbourhood and this will be very disruptive to the neighbours ' the project is not neighbourly ' the tall building will create shadowing on neighbouring buildings, streets, and sidewalks ' the public Community Garden will be taken away ' the trees and fruit trees on the site will be removed ' plant large trees between the project building and the SkyTrain tracks ' the public mountain views will be blocked from view while looking down Victoria Drive from the south ' not enough parking stalls are provided on site for the number of units proposed in the building ' provide more parking on site	Jennifer Ellison		Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	20:25	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Please see the word document attached.	Denise Chattan		Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix C
07/03/2022	21:19	PH1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	While I believe that social housing is important, I must oppose this rezoning because it leaves the Cedar Cottage Garden homeless. This garden is such an important community pillar, creating a sense of being and providing endless opportunities and benefits to the local residents. This garden has such a strong team behind it, it is an immense shame that the City of Vancouver is forcing this group to essentially disband without providing a new space for this garden to continue.	Katie Slimmon		Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.

# APPENDIX A

Dear Mayor Stewart and City Councillors

RE: Item # 5 -- Public Hearing of July 5 2022 for the Social Housing Project at 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury Ave. with 30% market rentals.

We are the Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours (CCAN). We are 93 members strong.

We know you are very busy and I appreciate your time.

We are opposed to the proposal at 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury Avenue as it stands.

We feel this project should have no market rental units. There should be 100% HILs units in the proposal.

We ask that you do not approve this report presented by Staff at the Public Hearing of July 5 2022 as we feel our neighbourhood citizens' concerns have not been addressed through the rezoning process. We would like, at the least, that this proposal go to the Urban Design Panel first before Council decides on it. This is a contentious site because the proposed building is extremely close to the SkyTrain line. Because it is so close we feel as proposed the units and courtyard will be unliveable for the tenants due to the noise levels. We have suggested to the rezoning staff something different, as below, but we feel none of our suggestions have been considered.

This proposal is feet from the SkyTrain line and will be very noisy for the occupants. It is too dense; it consists of two seven storey buildings with a narrow interior courtyard. This feels like warehousing people, not creating homes. There is 32.8 million dollars of taxpayers' money put toward this project and we feel there should be no market rental units. All the units must be non-market NILs units.

We are asking for..

- a less dense, less tall building on this RS-1 site
- one - six storey, 2.4 FSR, 101 unit building, as originally proposed in the government bid
- provide more parking on site
- situate the building further away from the SkyTrain, while still leaving a good setback from Victoria Drive
- plant mature trees between the proposed building and the SkyTrain to absorb the SkyTrain noise for the tenants

This project is actually situated on Victoria Drive, so should be 3 to 4 storeys tall according to the [KCC Community Vision](#). The applicant and City are relying on the Kensington-Cedar Cottage Community Vision for this rezoning.

[KCC Community Vision](#) says:

*New Housing Choices*

*In addition to new three to four storey mixed use buildings, mainly along Kingsway and Victoria, there should be new forms of housing around the Knight and Kingsway and Victoria and 41st*

*neighbourhood centres. This new housing should be attractive and fit into the existing neighbourhoods.*

### *Seniors' Lowrise Housing*

*Lowrise (up to four storey) buildings designated for seniors should be permitted. They should be located near local shopping and transit. Scale and design should fit into the neighbourhood. Support %: 83/10/7*

Also, the recently approved policy, the [Secured Rental Policy Incentives for New Rental Housing](#) of January 2022 says the following:

*On Table 2: Up to 6 storey residential apartment or mixed use for projects including a minimum 20% of the residential floor area that is counted in the calculation of FSR secured as below market rental units (See section 4 for specific requirements) or where 100% of the residential floor area is secured as social housing.*

It also says: *2.4.3 Social Housing*

*Rezoning for projects where 100% of the residential floor area is secured as social housing will be considered on sites zoned RS or RT, including in locations that are not illustrated by Map A in the Appendix. The RR-2C district includes provisions to enable some additional density for 6 storey social housing developments on arterials. As appropriate, staff may also support consideration of rezoning to another RR district or a CD-1.*

This is a rezoning from 0.75 FSR in the RS-1 zone to 3.46 FSR in a CD -1 zone. This is an increase in density of 461%. The FSR in this proposal should be much less, at the most 2.40 FSR, as originally proposed in May 2021.

The new [RR zoning in the Zoning and Development By-law #3575](#) allows a maximum height of 19.8 m (64.9 feet); and 6 storeys. On Shape Your City this proposal is 78.18 or 87.93 feet depending on where you measure it to. This proposal is as tall as the Lee Building at Broadway and Main and it is in an RS -1 zone. Since this proposal is not 100% below market social housing the height should be less.

### **Background information:**

The City changed the proposal from one six storey, 2.4 FSR, 101 unit building to two seven storey, 3.46 FSR, 123 unit buildings. They say the change was done to "*maximize the amount of affordable housing being delivered on public land.*"

These changes were not done to maximize urban design or to reduce the noise that will reverberate off this building from the Sky Train into the neighbourhood. Changes were not made to reduce the noise going into the units from the SkyTrain which is feet from this proposed building. NO, the changes were made to ensure that the applicant got the most profit they could at the expense of the occupants and the neighbourhood -- maximize housing delivered.

The following two links show the contract bids:

<https://bids.vancouver.ca/bidopp/RFP/documents/PS20201156-RFPArchitectsServicesatViennaHouse.pdf>

<https://bids.vancouver.ca/bidopp/RFP/documents/PS20201589-ConstructionManagementforViennaHouse.pdf>

This bid shows there is already \$32.8 million set aside for this project as originally proposed.

If efficient use of public money is a priority, then do away with the internal outdoor courtyard which will sit right under the SkyTrain so will likely not be usable anyway. Build one six storey building as originally proposed.

---

**Following is what a CCAN members asked on the [Shape Your City website for the proposal](#):**

*Q. Which units have been designated to fall in the 30% low-income group, which are charged market rents?*

*Chris Flerlage asked about 1 month ago*

*A. This application proposes to provide a mix of 50% of units occupied by households with incomes below housing income limits (HILs), 20% of units at shelter rate and the remaining 30% of units at market rents. The specific units that will be tied to each rental rate type has not yet been set and will be determined by the operator based on a need and demand analysis with consideration for the overall project budget.*

---

**Another questions asked of City Staff and their answers:**

*Hi Allison*

*As of May 2021, the Vienna House project at 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury Ave. was a 6 storey, 101 unit, 2.40 FSR building. On December 2, 2021, the application received date, within 7 months, it is now two 7 storey buildings, 123 units and 3.46 FSR.*

My three questions:

1. On what date did this project turn in to a building equivalent to a 14 storey building, that being a 14 storey building consisting of two 7 storey buildings, 123 units, and 3.46 FSR?

*The proposed building is considered one 7-storey building with a courtyard form. Page 8 of the [Rezoning Booklet](#) shows the various building forms that were explored by the applicant before landing on the current design. Between May and the application submission, the applicant team explored different building forms to determine the most efficient building that met overall project objectives such as sustainability, livability, resident connection opportunities, modular construction, etc.*

2. Who made these changes to this proposal?

*The applicant team, including VAHA, the housing operator (More Than a Roof) and the architect.*

3. Why were these changes made, given that these changes are not part of the 32.8 M construction budget bid?

*The applicant made changes to ensure project viability, meet Passive House standards, enhance livability, and maximize the amount of affordable housing being delivered on public land. The applicant has advised that the budget has increased due to the additional units, however the increase in the number of units helps to minimize cost per unit for the land while increasing capital and operating cost efficiency through economy of scale.*

---

**Further background information, the Hull Street project neutralized more projects in this area:**

Following is the link to the Council report of Jun 2018 for the Hull Street project which is immediately to the east of the Stainsbury project and still under construction:

<https://council.vancouver.ca/20180619/documents/p2.pdf>

The Hull Street Council report said: **This is the second rezoning application within a 10-block radius (the first one approved was at 18th Avenue and Commercial Drive), thereby neutralizing this portion of Commercial Drive and the Victoria Diversion from future AHC applications.**

The 2009 - 2037 Stainsbury and the Hull Street proposals fall under the Mayor's Task Force on Housing Affordability. They are apartment buildings containing affordable rental housing. So, we are very confused as to why this proposal is being allowed in this location when the neighbourhood was told that this portion of the street is exempt from future affordable housing projects because there are already too many of them here. The current rezoning staff say of the Stainsbury project it is different than the Hull Street project because: "*The proposed rezoning application at 2009-2037 Stainsbury Ave is not being considered under the Affordable Housing Choices (AHC) Interim Rezoning Policy*". This answer is simply an excuse to ignore what was already promised this neighbourhood in the Hull Street report. This makes absolutely no common sense -- an affordable housing project under the Mayor's Task Force on Housing Affordability is still an affordable housing project.

Another tall, dense affordable rental housing project with reduced parking on site in this area is still an affordable housing rental project with less parking, and there is no way to get around this fact. It is actually insulting to this neighbourhood to use the excuse 'not the same policy'.

We do realize that City Hall has the authority to change their minds on anything they have said in the past. It is just very frustrating to the general public when this happens so frequently.

In conclusion, we ask that you instruct staff to take this project back and re-evaluate this proposal before Council considers it. We ask that Staff come back with a proposal that more closely reflects the suggestions made by this neighbourhood and that is closer to the original proposal in the government bid for the project, that being one six storey building with 101 units and 2.40 FSR.

Yours sincerely

Mr. B. Straten, CCAN secretary on behalf of our members

# APPENDIX B

Hello Mayor Stewart and City Councillors

**RE:** Item 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue at the July 5 2022 Public Hearing

My question to you is, should a “non-profit” developer be allowed profit on the backs of taxpayers? Is it right that a private company use City land to build a project and be paid \$32.8 million dollars of taxpayers' money to do it, and then be given 30% of the units in the project as market rentals for 60 years with unaffordable starting rents as follows:

<https://bylaws.vancouver.ca/bulletin/bulletin-rental-incentive-programs.pdf>

Studio \$1,690 - \$1,859

1-bedroom \$2,039 - \$2,243

2-bedroom \$2,724 - \$2,996

3-bedroom or larger \$3,759

Or should they provide units in this building under HILs (Housing Income Limits) that rent for 30% of tenants' income. If they did this, low-income tenants would be the winners. The rents that would be charged under non-market rents are as follows:

Studio \$950

1-bedroom \$1,200

2-bedroom \$1,600

3-bedroom or larger \$2,000

Within a 10-block radius of the Stainsbury project, at 2300 block Vanness and 1406 East King Ed we already have about 200 shelter rate units. Across the street from the proposal on Victoria Drive, on East 18th, and at Knight and 15<sup>th</sup> there are recently built market rentals sitting vacant. It is not market rentals that are needed in this area. Council often asks what housing type we need in our neighbourhood, it is HILs at 30 % of people's income.

I'm also concerned about the excessive height of this building in an RS-1 zone with 2 storey detached houses across the street on Hull Street. The Staff report calls this a 7 storey building but it will have an amenity space on the roof that Staff don't include in the calculations of height. So, in the end this building will be 8 storeys tall. This is the same height as the Lee Building at Main and Broadway next to single detached homes. Further, the City policy of 2022, Secured Rental Policy Incentives for New Rental Housing <https://bylaws.vancouver.ca/zoning/policy-rezoning-secured-rental.pdf>, calls for only 4 to 6 storey buildings with 100% social housing rentals. I'm asking that this Council stick by your policy of 4 to 6 storey buildings in this location. The [Secured Rental Policy Incentives for New Rental Housing](#) of January 2022 says the following:

*On Table 2: Up to 6 storey residential apartment or mixed use for projects including a minimum 20% of the residential floor area that is counted in the calculation of FSR secured as below*



*market rental units (See section 4 for specific requirements) or where 100% of the residential floor area is secured as social housing.*

It also says: 2.4.3 Social Housing

*Rezoning for projects where 100% of the residential floor area is secured as social housing will be considered on sites zoned RS or RT, including in locations that are not illustrated by Map A in the Appendix. The RR-2C district includes provisions to enable some additional density for 6 storey social housing developments on arterials. As appropriate, staff may also support consideration of rezoning to another RR district or a CD-1.*

This is a rezoning from 0.75 FSR in the RS-1 zone to 3.46 FSR in a CD -1 zone. This is an increase in density of 461%. The FSR in this proposal should be much less, at the most 2.40 FSR as originally bid for through the Vancouver Affordable Housing Agency (“VAHA”). Following is the link to the bid: <https://bids.vancouver.ca/bidopp/RFP/documents/PS20201589-ConstructionManagementforViennaHouse.pdf>

The new [RR zoning in the Zoning and Development By-law #3575](#) , where this lot falls, allows a maximum height of 19.8 m (64.9 feet); and 6 storeys.

Further problems with this project are listed below:

- the proposal should be 100% HILs social housing with no market-rental units
- 32.8 million dollars of taxpayers’ money has been allotted for this proposal and this money should be spent on a building with 100% **non-market** housing units
- there are already market rental units sitting empty in the surrounding new apartment buildings so no more of this type of housing is needed in this area of the city
- the building height is 87.93 ft (26.80 m) to the top of the roof mechanical enclosure, this height will set an unwanted height precedent for this area of low-rise housing. This height is shown in the Applicant Booklet.
- residents with tiny 320 sq ft units in these two 7 storey buildings will be warehoused, not provided decent homes
- reduce the density and build only one 6-storey building to create more open space and distance from the SkyTrain for the residents
- the proposed building is too close to the SkyTrain tracks

- the noise from the SkyTrain will create an unlivable situation in the units and in the building courtyard
- the SkyTrain noise will reverberate off this very tall building into the neighbourhood and this will be very disruptive to the neighbours
- the project is not neighbourly
- the tall building will create shadowing on neighbouring buildings, streets, and sidewalks
- the public Community Garden will be taken away
- the trees and fruit trees on the site will be removed
- plant large trees between the project building and the SkyTrain tracks
- the public mountain views will be blocked from view while looking down Victoria Drive from the south
- not enough parking stalls are provided for the number of units proposed in the building
- provide more parking on site

In summary, make this project a nice place to live and not a warehouse for people. To do that move the building away from the SkyTrain and closer to Victoria Drive, plant mature trees between the building and SkyTrain, reduce the density, reduce the height, and get rid of the interior courtyard because it will just be a place for the SkyTrain noise to reverberate. Do the right thing here.

I'm opposed to this project as it is presented at this Public Hearing.

Sincerely  
Grace MacKenzie, property owner in Cedar Cottage

# APPENDIX C

Hello Mayor and City Council

Concerning 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury Ave. July 5 / 22 Public Hearing

I'm opposed to this project as it is. We don't need any more new market rental buildings in our neighbourhood and we don't need more rentals for the shelter component of Income Assistance. We need rental units for low income people so they will pay 30% of their income on rent. It is called HILs. The market rental units in this project are a big bonus to the developer so they can make a big profit. They are getting the land and money to build this project from the government, the market rental portion is just greed. When I heard that the City said they increased the height and density on this project so the developer could "*maximize the amount of affordable housing being delivered on public land.*" I was appalled. You should be too. This project is not trying to make lovely homes for people, its warehousing people. And the worst part is that these folks, the tenants in this project, will be poor so they won't dare to complain if the building is so loud because of the SkyTrain noise they can't sleep or they can't use the horrible, noisy courtyard. If they complain they will be kicked out as being a trouble maker. You need to send this proposal back so that the City Staff will look at this proposal from the viewpoint of the tenants who will live here, not on how much profit the developer can make or how many people you can jam onto a lot. Following is a list we in the neighbourhood composed, please consider doing what is on the list.

- the proposal should be 100% HILs social housing with no market-rental units
- 32.8 million dollars of taxpayers' money has been allotted for this proposal and this money should be spent on a building with 100% non-market HILs housing units
- the original form of development bid in May 2021 should be kept, it was for a six-story, 101-unit, 2.40 FRS building, not the current proposal of two 7 storey buildings with 123 units and 3.46 FSR
- there are already market rental units sitting empty in the surrounding new apartment buildings so no more of this type of housing is needed in this area of the city
- the building height is 87.93 ft (26.80 m) to the top of the roof mechanical enclosure, this height will set an unwanted height precedent for this area of low-rise housing. This height is shown in the Applicant Booklet.
- residents in these two 7 storey buildings with tiny 320 sq ft units will be warehoused not provided nice homes
- Reduce the density and build only one 6-storey building to create more open space and distance from the SkyTrain for the tenants
- the proposed building is too close to the SkyTrain tracks
- the noise from the SkyTrain will create an unlivable situation in the units and in the building courtyard

- the SkyTrain noise will reverberate off this very tall building into the neighbourhood and this will be very disruptive to the neighbours
- the project is not neighbourly
- the tall building will create shadowing on neighbouring buildings, streets, and sidewalks
- the public Community Garden will be taken away
- the trees and fruit trees on the site will be removed
- plant large trees between the project building and the SkyTrain tracks
- the public mountain views will be blocked from view while looking down Victoria Drive from the south
- not enough parking stalls are provided on site for the number of units proposed in the building
- provide more parking on site

Regards

Denise Chattan long time renter in Vancouver