

2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
06/21/2022	19:17	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	This is the most absurd proposal and an unbelievably large scale of a development on quaint Stainsbury Avenue! I have lived half a block away for 22 years and cannot even comprehend this massive eyesore of 7 stories being built in a totally residential area! There is not a single building higher than 2 stories, starting from the east side of Victoria Drive! Not to mention the stunning north shore views that would be totally blocked for several streets up to Kingsway or even to 33rd Ave! There are numerous commercial streets located west of Victoria Drive, or why not build at the decaying empty lot (for years) at 12th Ave and Commercial! That would have been an ideal location, but Stainsbury Avenue and the immediate surrounding area is just not the environment for such a huge building! The scale of this project is completely unsuitable and it makes me shake my head at what City Council is doing 'ruining our beautiful city! This is a complete joke! I will be stunned to hear there is much support for this in the immediate area. Nobody wants increased traffic, crime and noise in our neighbourhoods! Please find another location and stop ruining communities! Anywhere along Nanaimo street is a much better option (Broadway is perfect) and much more suited for this structure! I cannot even fathom half the size being suitable! CITY COUNCIL, DO NOT IGNORE OUR PLEAS TO STOP THIS RIDICULOUS PROJECT FROM MOVING FORWARD!!!	Julie Chan		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential s.22(1) Personal a	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
06/27/2022	14:16	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	This building should be 100% social housing. It should remain as the original plan stated, one 6 story building. There are enough rental units in the area, some not occupied. People should not have to be warehoused in 320 square feet of space. #2: rezoning 1780 E. Broadway. This development does not follow the Grandview Woodlands plan. It is too tall and too dense. There will be significant shadowing of neighboring houses, especially in the winter. Being luxury condos it will push up the local assessments and taxes for area residents. It will cause undo financial consequences to local resident, both owners and renters in their ability to continue living in the neighborhood. With increasing pressure on community centres, schools, transportation, daycare and green areas families and individuals will lose access to living a healthy lifestyle.	Elizabeth Laquer	N/A	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/02/2022	08:51	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury	Oppose	I oppose this project.	Roberta Olenick		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential s.22(1) Personal a	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	14:52	PH2 - 2. 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		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Unknown	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	15:48	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury	Oppose	Please see the attached Document from the Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours (CCAN)	Mr. B. Straten, CCAN secretary	Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours (CCAN)	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix A
07/03/2022	17:09	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury	Oppose	The building is too tall. It should be only one 6 storey building as is in the Rental Policy of 2022 https://bylaws.vancouver.ca/zoning/policy-rezoning-secured-rental.pdf Provide more parking on site too. No market rentals here only HILs in every unit.	3. Jillian Henderson		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	17:46	PH2 - 2. 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 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	Kristin Leung		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.

2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue - Oppose

07/03/2022	17:56	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	There should be no market rentals in the project. Every unit should be HILs. 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	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	18:56	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-	Oppose	I have attached my letter in doc form.	Grace MacKenzie	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix B
07/03/2022	19:30	PH2 - 2. 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 (HILs). 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	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	19:46	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Build one six storey building with 2.40 FSR. The rents should all be H Ls 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	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/03/2022	20:25	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-	Oppose	Please see the word document attached.	Denise Chattan	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix C
07/03/2022	21:19	PH2 - 2. 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	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/04/2022	17:06	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	I oppose the city's plan in its current form. Cedar Cottage now has a glut of market rent units, to the point of having vacancies. Renters in these apartments are so stretched financially that they cannot even afford underground parking, exacerbating neighbourhood street parking. The Stainsbury project should focus 100% on social housing, to meet the actual needs of Vancouverites' social housing that is more like the area's lovely co-op complexes and less like downtown towers. Not only will the neighbourhood, and renters, be happier, but the project will be in keeping with the City's 2022 Policy on Secured Rental Incentives for Rental Housing, which provides for 4-6 stories with 100% social housing. And let's make it nice by buffering the Skytrain sounds with big trees, keeping the area's community gardens and orchards, in short, allowing the neighbourhood to retain the charm and neighbourly-ness that makes people want to live there. That would be really listening to the citizens of Vancouver and really meeting the housing needs of our struggling neighbours. That is the Vancouver that people want, so much more so than tall buildings.	Patrice Struyk	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.

2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue - Oppose

07/04/2022	18:59	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	I oppose this new proposal as it stands. The apartment sizes are too small at 320 sq. ft. Studies have shown that size is detrimental to the physical, emotional and mental health of individuals having to live in that space. City planners do not allow less than 400 sq. ft. for condo suite. The rents for some of the suites will be set at market rates. They should all be set at 30% of income. Which is the Housing Income Limits policy. The height of this project is too great. City of Vancouver 2022 policy for Secured Rental Policy Incentives for New Rental Housing allows only 5-6 stories not the 7-8 stories that this project plans. The noise of the Skytrain will be excessive with two towers in the space. Most other apartment buildings in the area are at least across the street from the tracks. These buildings would need to be right next to them. I live more then half a block away from the Skytrain and can not hold a conversion outside when the train goes by. Please do not allow this current plan to go through. Give people a healthy, enjoyable place to live, not a warehouse.	Elizabeth Laquer		s.22(1) Personal and Confide	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/18/2022	22:16	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Building height is excessive at 23.4 m. I will be like a wall running east-west. Vancouver is supposed to keep the north mountains visible but this bldg will block it. Across the street a six story bldg under construction already looks so tall but it also has another two story in the middle. From Alice St one only see this bldg looking north. This will be repeated with this development. Why not lower?	Joel Salvador		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/21/2022	08:05	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Hello City Councillors RE: losing quorum at the July 5 2022 Public Hearing for 2009-2037 Stainsbury Ave. We are the Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours, a resident's association. This note is addressed to those City Councillors who left the July 5 2022 Public Hearing meeting for 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury Avenue mid speaker. By doing this you left the meeting without a quorum. Your actions have now created a situation where the citizens of Cedar Cottage must prepare and re-send their notes to Council. And their speeches must be presented again to Council at a different Public Hearing on July 28 2022. Your action shows how arrogant you are and how disrespectful you are to our neighbourhood. Further, since you cancelled the July 5 2022 Public Hearing by losing quorum the City Clerk's office was forced to change this July 5 2022 Public Hearing first to July 21 and now to July 28 2022. This behaviour on The City's part is extremely disruptive to the people living in this neighbourhood. We can only hope you will show more respect toward us in the future. Yours sincerely Mr. B. Straten CCAN secretary on behalf of our members	Mr. B Straten	Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours	s.22(1) Personal and Confiden	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/23/2022	19:37	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Hi Mayor Stewart and City Councillors My name is Kristin Leung and I'm a renter on Stainsbury Ave. I've lived in the area for about 6 years. I'm opposed to the building at 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury going to the Public Hearing on July 28 2022. This should be housing for people who can pay only about 30% of their income on rent. That is called HILs housing. This project is to be social housing and H Ls is considered social housing as far as your City policy goes. This neighbourhood has so many new market rental apartment buildings and everyone of the new apartment buildings on Victoria Drive and Commercial Drive between East 18th and Stainsbury Avenues across the street from this proposal sit with vacancy signs up every month. We have so many apartments here they can't be filled. We don't need more market rental units here. We also don't need any more shelter rate units here either. We have 218 units of these in the immediate area. We need H L S in this project. NO MARKET RENTALS!!! NO MORE SHELTER RATE UNITS!!! The height of the building to too tall. All the other buildings in the area are 4 to 6 storeys tall. This is about 90 feet to the top of the roof enclosures, even though the City doesn't count these for some reason. This makes no sense because everyone can see the height up to the roof enclosures. This building should be built just as it was originally bid for in the City of Vancouver bid of May 2021. A six storey building. Not two 7 storey buildings. Please send this back to your Staff to prepare a report that recommends one six storey building and actually contains 100% social housing and not 30% market rentals. This building is paid for by us citizens and should be social housing not a windfall of market rental housing for the operator of the building. Thanks for looking at my concerns and I do hope you will take these suggestions to heart. Kristin Leung	Kristin Leung		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/23/2022	20:24	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Hello Mayor Kennedy Stewart and City Council I'm opposed to the proposal at 2009 - 2037 Stainsbury. This is tem 2 on the agenda for the public hearing of July 28/22. The project does not provide enough parking on site for 123 units. More parking has to be provided here. The building is too tall, it is 23.4 m (76 8 ft.) according to the Staff Report dated May 24 2022. But I'm sure this does not include the amenity space on the roof so the building will be at least 86 feet tall. This will set an unwanted height precedent in the area even at 76.8 feet. The buildings surrounding this proposal are only 2 to 6 storeys tall. The units in the report are 123 but when I counted the units on the drawings in Appendix E there are 133 units. How many units are there, 123 or 133? Both counts are too much and should be less. The staff report asks Council to approve in principle a building containing 123 social housing units. This building contains 30 % Market Rental Units. Social housing units are considered to be Housing Income Limits (H Ls) or Income Assistance or a combination of basic Old Age Security pension and Guaranteed Income Supplement and are rented at rates no higher than the shelter component of Income Assistance. Council is asked to approve a building of social housing units so there must be no market rentals in this project. Page 10 of the staff report says: 'Affordability' The City's requirement is for social housing buildings to include a minimum of 30% of units as affordable to households with incomes which fall under the BC Housing Income Limits (HILs) levels, while the remaining 70% can be at market rents. This requirement of only 30 % social housing might stand if this were a developer initiated proposal. But it is not. This is a proposal paid for by the taxpayer through funds from The City, the BC Provincial government, CMHC and other government agencies. Therefore this project must be 100% social housing. The taxpayer should not be expected to pay for building 30% market rental units when there is a need in the City for social housing. And especially a need for housing that young people and families can afford through H Ls. This building must be 100% HILs units at 30% of income. Yours truly Jillian Henderson, resident for over 16 years in Cedar Cottage	Jillian Henderson		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.

2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue - Oppose

07/23/2022	22:01	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Mayor Stewart and Vancouver City Council Public Hearing, July 28 2022 at 6 pm, Item #2 on the agenda 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury Avenue re-zoning for social housing I am Jennifer Ellison and I live close to this proposal. I'm opposed to the project as presented in the staff report. This project is to be social housing and yet it has 30% market rental units in it. This project is paid for by the City of Vancouver and BC Housing. There absolutely should be no market rental housing units in this project. This project should be 100% H Ls social housing units at rents 30% of income. Build something that people can actually afford. We don't need more shelter component income units in this project. We have over 200 new units of this type in the area. If government, the taxpayer, is paying for it build what we need, that is HILs. HILs is social housing. The SkyTrain is so noisy it will affect the noise in the units and make them unlivable. Tall mature trees must be planted between the building and the SkyTrain tracks to block out the noise. There should be no courtyard because the noise from the SkyTrain will make it unusable. Get rid of the courtyard and move the building closer to Victoria Dr. Build only one 6 storey building. This is what was originally proposed for the \$32.8 million bid by the City for this project. The list below shows some concerns with this project: 32.8 million dollars of taxpayers' money has been allotted for this proposal. This money should be spent on a building with 100% non-market H Ls social 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 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 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 interior courtyard. Remove the 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, move the building closer to Victoria Drive the public mountain views will be blocked while looking down Victoria Drive from the south not enough parking stalls are provided for the number of units, provide more parking on site Thanks Jennifer Ellison	Jennifer Ellison		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/24/2022	09:23	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Attached is a word document with comments regarding Item #2 on the agenda for the July 28 2022 Public Hearing for 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury Avenue from Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours (CCAN), a residents association with 95 members Your Honor Mayor Kennedy and City Councillors My name is Mrs. Analyze Simeon. I have lived three blocks from this project site for 23 years. I am opposed to the project. My neighbourhood does not need more so called 'affordable' market rental housing or more 'shelter rate' housing. The market rental buildings sit vacant on Victoria Drive and Commercial Drive every month. We have at least 239 new social housing units in the immediate area: 2500 block Grandview Hwy S, 2300 Block Vanness, and 1400 Block East King Edward, just to mention a few. We need housing for working people to be able to afford. That will be 100% HILs housing units for this project. This is to be a project of 123 units of social housing according to your meeting report. But the number of units in this project should be no more than 101 according to the City of Vancouver bid of May 2021. Social housing is defined in your Zoning and Development By-law No 3575 as H Ls and units rented at rates no higher than the shelter component of Income Assistance. So build what people need in our neighbourhood, that is H Ls at 30% of income. This is a publicly funded project and there should be no bonus to the operator by way of market rental units. The taxpayer should be funding only social housing. The building is too dense, too tall and should not have an interior courtyard that will be too noisy to enjoy. Build a building with air conditioning and an interior hallway, just like the one in the 2300 Block Vanness. The interior courtyard is like a chimney. Should there ever be a fire here the walkways will fill with smoke and this means of egress will be impossible to navigate. In conclusion build: 100% HILs units at 30% of income; one 6 storey building not two 7 storey buildings with an interior courtyard; and no more that 2.40 FSR not 2.53 FSR. Yours truly Mrs. Simeon	Mr. B. Straten, CCAN secretary	Cedar Cottage Area Neighbours (CCAN)	s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix D
07/25/2022	09:11	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Mayor and Council I'm opposed to the project at 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury at the public hearing on July 28/22. PARKING! PARKING! If you insist on building here, more parking is needed in this building. There will be 123 units here. The #20 Bus along Victoria Drive is packed during rush hour and other times of the day. Busses drive past the bus stops along Commercial and Victoria near this project, full, every day. People drive cars so they need parking spots provided inside the building. There is no room on the streets for more cars. People drive around and around looking for parking spots now; never mind with 123 more units in the area. And you've created this problem with your re-zoning allowances. The building is too dense, too tall and needs more parking inside the building. Build at the most a 6 storey building here or better still use the 4 storey 2319 Vanness social housing building, a block away, as a template for height, density and building form. There should actually be no building on this site. There is a good reason why some City owned lots were left empty for years. This one is too noisy for anyone to live on, leave it for the garden people as their promised amenity for living in small units in the neighbourhood. The SkyTrain is a couple of feet from the proposed building and with windows facing the train track. Ridiculous. The units and interior courtyard will be very noisy. If you still want to build here against all the local knowledge you're being given then eliminate the interior courtyard and move the building toward Victoria Drive then plant trees between the tracks and the building. This might help with the SkyTrain noise. Honestly I can't see how this was ever considered for human habitation. Something is very wrong here. Mark Simeon, long time resident who lives near this project	Analyze Simeon		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/25/2022	11:35	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Mayor and Council I'm opposed to the project at 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury at the public hearing on July 28/22. PARKING! PARKING! If you insist on building here, more parking is needed in this building. There will be 123 units here. The #20 Bus along Victoria Drive is packed during rush hour and other times of the day. Busses drive past the bus stops along Commercial and Victoria near this project, full, every day. People drive cars so they need parking spots provided inside the building. There is no room on the streets for more cars. People drive around and around looking for parking spots now; never mind with 123 more units in the area. And you've created this problem with your re-zoning allowances. The building is too dense, too tall and needs more parking inside the building. Build at the most a 6 storey building here or better still use the 4 storey 2319 Vanness social housing building, a block away, as a template for height, density and building form. There should actually be no building on this site. There is a good reason why some City owned lots were left empty for years. This one is too noisy for anyone to live on, leave it for the garden people as their promised amenity for living in small units in the neighbourhood. The SkyTrain is a couple of feet from the proposed building and with windows facing the train track. Ridiculous. The units and interior courtyard will be very noisy. If you still want to build here against all the local knowledge you're being given then eliminate the interior courtyard and move the building toward Victoria Drive then plant trees between the tracks and the building. This might help with the SkyTrain noise. Honestly I can't see how this was ever considered for human habitation. Something is very wrong here. Mark Simeon, long time resident who lives near this project	Mark Simeon		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	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 15th 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

APPENDIX D

Dear Mayor Stewart and City Councillors

RE: Item # 2 - Public Hearing of July 28 2022 for the Social Housing Project at 2009 to 2037 Stainsbury Ave with 30% market rentals.

Staff Report: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20220705/documents/rr13.pdf>

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.

The Staff Report on page 2 request that Council approve 123 units of social housing: *the development of a seven-storey residential building containing 123 social housing units be approved in principle.*

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 ask that you do not approve this report presented by Staff at the Public Hearing of July 28 2022 as we feel our neighbourhood citizens' concerns have not been addressed through the rezoning process.

This is not a developer generated proposal where The City must consider the developer's loss of income if the proposal is delayed in some way. Council does not have to give considerations to get a developer to build social or rental housing. This is a City and BC Provincial Government, a public's project, where this Council can definitely make changes to accommodate the neighbourhoods wishes for this proposal. There is nothing standing in your way to do this.

This proposal should first go to the Urban Design Panel before Council decides on it.

The role of the Urban Design Panel (UDP) is to advise City Council and staff about development proposals or policies, including major development applications, rezoning applications and other projects of public interest. The UDP's role is to advise Council. If Council doesn't hear from the UDP before deciding on this proposal then Council is not using a valuable tool available to them.

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 live in the neighbourhood and know that one must stop talking when the SkyTrain goes by because of the noise it generates. We believe that the UDP experts will give an accurate analysis of the noise impact on the tenants. We believe they will agree with us that this building is too close to the track to be livable for the tenants.

We have suggested to the rezoning staff something different to build here, as below, but we feel none of our suggestions have been considered.

We are asking that Council send this back to Staff and the City Architect to prepare Plans 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
- remove the courtyard as it will be too noisy to be useable because of the SkyTrain noise

The City changed the proposal from one six storey, 2.4 FSR, 101 unit building to two seven storey, 3.53 FSR, 123 unit buildings. They said the change was done to "*maximize the amount of affordable housing being delivered on public land.*"

These changes were not done to maximize good urban design or to reduce the noise that will reverberate off this building from the SkyTrain 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:

- VAHA is prioritizing optimizing the development potential of the site to provide as many homes as possible, as well as cost certainty
- design decisions were made to improve operational costs

And even though they knew the following, they chose to recommend the 'O' Courtyard design:

- the 'O' scheme (COURTYARD) was a greater overall value to owner
- an initial high level cost analysis indicated that the 'O' design would be significantly more expensive than the 'J' design due, in large part, to the additional insulation and cladding requirements of the additional exterior walls.

The top priorities were not the comfort of the tenants or the impact on the neighbourhood --- NO, decisions on design were made to maximize housing delivered, keep the operational cost down and make the building of a greater overall value to the owner. All this information is in the Vienna House Study on Building Form Decision. Following is the link:

<https://www.bchousing.org/sites/default/files/rcg-documents/2022-04/Vienna-House-Study-on-Building-Form-Decision.pdf>

Since the Staff report relies on the KCC Community Vision then lets also use the parts of this Vision that indicate that this site should have a less tall building on it.

This project is actually situated on Victoria Drive, so in reality should be 3 to 4 storeys tall according to the [KCC Community Vision](#).

The 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 0.70 FSR in the RS-1 zone to 3.53 FSR in a CD -1 zone. This is an increase in density of 504% over what is allowed in an RS-1. That is not *some additional density*, that's a lot of additional density. The FSR in this proposal should be much less, at the most 2.40 FSR, as originally proposed in the City bid of 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 up to 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.

Background information:

The following two links show the City bids where the City will pay for:

1. an architect:

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

2. a construction manager:

<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 is situated right by the SkyTrain so will likely not be usable anyway. Build one six storey building as originally proposed. The 'J' design is cheaper to build than the 'O' courtyard design because the 'J' design has less additional insulation and cladding requirements of additional exterior walls. The idea that this tiny courtyard will encourage interactions is not believable. It is only about 12 feet wide with overhanging walkways, with some of the walkways looming 75 feet (7 storeys) above. There is a staircase in the middle of the widest part of the courtyard.

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 asked

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.

Other 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.

The following is provided just to show you why we've lost confidence in the whole re-zoning process and the way Council makes decisions.

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 and the City's Architect 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