

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

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Name	Organization	Contact Info	Neighbourhood	Attachment
07/26/2022	14:47	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	I oppose this project as is. It should not have MARKET RENTALS in the building. This project is paid for by the taxpayer through City and BC Government funding and the units should all be what the area needs and that is 100% of the units as HILs, 30 % of income. No need for welfare rate units we have about 300 of these units near this site and at least 250 of these are new shelter rate units. Don't need more in this building. Build for low income working people. The building should be built at 6 storeys and 2.40 FSR with no courtyard. It sits on the skytrain line and needs to have trees planted between the building and the tracks to dull the skytrain noise. Send this to the Urban Design Panel and get their opinion before going any further. They are there to advise and guide Council. Hope you are listening and will build a building as the neighbourhood wants. Leonard Chapman, long time resident of Cedar Cottage	Leonard Chapman		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.
07/26/2022	20:04	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	I have attached a word document. This NEW document has different information in it than the one I sent you for the July 5 Public Hearing so I hope you will read all of it. I'm so exhausted from this whole process. I'm opposed to this project as it is presented in the Staff Report at this Public Hearing.	Grace MacKenzie		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix A
07/27/2022	01:15	PH2 - 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue	Oppose	Hi Mayor and City Council Concerning: 2009 -2037 Stainsbury public hearing on July 28 2022 I am opposed to this project as it is in the report to Council. I want all the units in this project to be Housing Income Limits (H Ls). The project is funded by the government and should be 100% social housing with no market rentals. I've read the 'in opposition' comments and I agree with everyone of these people and their concerns. They hit it on the nose with what needs to be done here. Build one six storey building of 101 units and 2.40 FSR; original City bid for the project. 6 storeys means 6 storeys not 7 just because the City chooses not to include amenity space; insane policy. The building needs to be moved away from the train tracks, get rid of the interior courtyard. Moving it away from the tracks will leave room for the garden group to still have a bit of a garden. Plant tall, mature trees between the tracks and the building to soften the noise of the train for the tenants. Again the use in the building to be 100% social housing with all units as H Ls. There are too many recently built 'affordable' market rental units surrounding this project empty every month, these aren't needed in this area and there are hundreds of new 'shelter rate' units in the area, more aren't needed. I read all the comments 'in support' of the project on the public hearing agenda website. Those in support and those in opposition are saying the same thing. We in the neighbourhood 'oppose the project as is' and want to see 100% HILs (Housing Income Limits at 30% income) social housing here. Those 'in support' want to see social housing here. It is so discouraging that the people involved in planning this project didn't really get in touch with this neighbourhood about what was a good match here. By the planning team, I mean The City, VAHA, BC Housing, and the City Architect. If this team had contacted us and worked with us they would not have had to go to all the work to gather their barrage of 'in support' folks to send in comments. The 'in support' people are from BC Housing, Kindred Construction, UBC School of Community and Regional Planning, Registered Professional Planners, CPA Development and not people from the neighbourhood. A couple are from religious groups, I guess those folks think our neighbourhood doesn't want any social housing here so they are going to stand up for it. They have no idea about this neighbourhood. This process could have been so much easier. I don't know when THE CITY will ever learn to just honestly speak to the neighbourhood. Regards Denise Chattan long time renter in Vancouver	Denise Chattan		s.22(1) Personal and Confidential	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	No web attachments.

Appendix A

Hello Mayor Stewart and City Councillors

RE: Item 2. CD-1 Rezoning: 2009-2037 Stainsbury Avenue at the July 28, 2022, Public Hearing

This note has different information in it than the one I sent you for the July 5 Public Hearing so I hope you will read all of it. I'm so exhausted from this whole process.

I'm opposed to this project as it is presented in the Staff Report at this Public Hearing.

My question to you is, should a "non-profit" operator be allowed profit on the backs of taxpayers?

Is it right that the taxpayer pays for City land, a City Architect, a City Construction Manager, BC Provincial government and CMHC funding to build and run a project where a non-profit will operate it and gain huge market rental income through 30% of the units every month for 60 years?

I don't think so.

If the governments are funding this project, then the units should be social housing that *this* neighbourhood needs. That is 100% of the units as HILs at 30% of income. Not more non "affordable" market rentals or more "shelter rate" units.

The City Bulletin (link below) shows average monthly market rental rates for 2022 on the eastside:

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

Studio \$1,690

1-bedroom \$2,039

2-bedroom \$2,724

3-bedroom or larger \$3,759

The [Zoning and Development By-law Schedule H](#) shows rents that assume 25% to 30% of income spent on rents:

Studio \$950 -- at this rent one makes about \$38,000 a year

1-bedroom \$1,200 -- at this rent one makes about \$48,000 a year

2-bedroom \$1,600 -- at this rent one makes about \$64,000 a year

3-bedroom or larger \$2,000 -- at this rent one makes about \$80,000 a year

If this project provided 100% of the units in this building under HILs (Housing Income Limits) the rents would most likely be closer to the Schedule H rates. If the City applied these rates or close to them to all units, low-income tenants would be the winners.

Think of the need for housing for the Housekeeper at VGH making \$17/hr, the Support Service Aid at BC Woman's Hospital making \$20.97/hr or the Store Attendant in food services at VGH making \$21.77/hr. Don't these working people deserve decent housing? They would have it if this project was 100% HILs units because they would be eligible for the units.

A single parent with one child and working for The City as an Administrative Assistant IV making \$57,037 gross a year and paying \$2,724 a month market rent for a 2 bedroom unit is paying about 57% of their income on rent. This person could afford a HILs unit based on the HILs income criteria. The [Housing Income Limits](#) represent the maximum gross income and are intended to reflect the minimum income required to afford appropriate accommodation in the private market. These income levels are:

\$55,000 or less for a 1 bedroom

\$67,500 for a 2 bedroom

\$78,000 for a 3 bedroom

\$83,500 for a 4+ bedroom

Within a 10-block radius of the Stainsbury project, at 2319 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 or shelter rate units 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 building is next to 2 storey single detached homes and is the same height as the Lee Building at Main and Broadway. This is not good urban design or neighbourly.

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 0.70 FSR in the RS-1 zone to 3.53 FSR in a CD -1 zone. This is an increase in density of 504%. 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.

Listed below are some further problems my neighbours and I find with this project:

- ❓ 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 every month 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 will be warehoused, not provided decent homes. There is too much density in these 2 buildings. There should be no tiny 320 sq ft units, they should be at the least 450 sq ft.
- ❓ 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. Get rid of the interior 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. To do that move the building closer to Victoria Dr.
- ❓ 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. Build 100% of the units as HILs. Do the right thing here.

Sincerely

Grace MacKenzie, property owner in Cedar Cottage. My family, generation after generation, has lived in this neighbourhood in the same house for 80 years.