

PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-04-08	23:05	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am opposed to this project at this location. Affordable housing is needed in this community, but this project is too big and will only cause more problems with traffic and parking and pedestrian safety in the immediate neighbourhood. There is already way too much traffic on that corner. It is very hard to cross the street at that corner as a pedestrian and in even as a driver. Traffic is always backed up all the way to Nanaimo moving east and Knight St moving west. Drivers often take side streets to avoid the congestion. This presents a safety hazard as there are many children and slow walking seniors in the neighbourhood. The buses are always late on this street and inadequate as they only run every 30 minutes outside of peak hours. In addition the church down the street at E. 32nd and Commercial St. is extremely busy. Their parish has increased 3 fold over the past few years and they now have services every day and their parking lot can not hold all of the cars and parishioners are parking on the street all around the church for the entire day Sat and Sun. Also, there is another rental/commercial building going up a block to the east at Victoria & E. 33rd and this will cause further traffic issues.</p> <p>This project should not move forward without promise of improvements to the current infrastructure. Specifically, parking, traffic flow and control on E, 33rd and the "short cut" side streets (especially Commercial Street), pedestrian safe zones & public transit.</p> <p>The shortage of daycare options and overcrowding of the nearest school/annex is also cause for concern and a reason to rethink this location.</p>	Jack Morrow	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2024-04-09	10:31	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	<p>I've previously submitted my comments and noted my opposition. I wanted to upload photos which I've only just finished compiling...</p>	Rick Morrow	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2024-04-09	00:45	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	<p>I oppose the development proposal located at 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue.</p> <p>Note however that I am not against densification of this site. These are exceptionally long parcels, and provide an opportunity to increase housing in the neighbourhood while introducing context-sensitive development to an established and much-loved community. However, the proposal is far too dense, does not fully take advantage of the site slope, and provides inadequate off-street parking. Additionally, many comments in support of the project demonstrate minimal understanding of, and/or lived experience in, the neighbourhood.</p> <p>1) The site is far too dense. The Secured Rental Policy talks about allowing 4-6 storey developments in low-density transition areas. This proposal includes not just one, but two 4-6 storey buildings on one site. Rather than taking advantage of the site depth exclusively for added density, I urge Council to reduce some of the density and spread it across the site (for example, spread one building's worth [approx. 55 units] across two buildings rather than two</p>	Vic Ou	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

full-sized buildings or remove one floor from 33rd knowing that an additional building is proposed at the back). This would limit heights and impacts to neighbours, while still providing housing for at least 50 new households! Supporting this idea, it is noted in the referral report that "the rear building is proposed as a four-storey apartment rather than two-and-a-half-storey townhouses" (for livability and fire safety) indicating that perhaps there is an opportunity to balance out the density as suggested by making two 4 storey buildings. This statement suggests allowances were made to increase density, but none considered to balance it back down.

2) Regardless of how many proposed units, Council should urge the developer to take full advantage of the site slope as demonstrated successfully by the neighbouring co-housing. Sunken units along 33rd will still provide housing without as severe height and shadowing impacts to neighbours.

3) I'm a little confused on how much parking is being provided (the referral report says 9 + 40 bicycle, while the website says 37 + 170 bicycle). In either case, while I understand the intention of parking relaxations to encourage more sustainable modes of transportation, we need to build housing that works for both the lifestyles of today and the future. The proposed parking feels woefully inadequate for a site with 40 2-bedroom units intended for families, and located along one of the worst-served bus lines in the City. I understand that parking relaxations were made due to bus service, however the 33 is reliably unreliable, with long waits between buses and frequent pass-ups, and the 20 is spotty at best. Proximity to a north-south frequent transit line is also unhelpful for those that need to travel east-west.

Planners also need to realize that cycling isn't a viable alternative for everyone, especially for workers without transit-oriented jobs or those that rely on a vehicle to do their job. How can a painter, plumber, or electrician do their job without their vehicle? Take a walk through the neighbourhood and you'll see it's already congested because our neighbours need their cars to do their jobs and keep this city running.

Furthermore, the staff recommendation for residents to implement a residential permit parking program demonstrates that staff don't understand the issue. How will this help when the new residents are also residents? Aside from this, staff did not suggest any parking related recommendations in response to resident concerns. Conformity to a bylaw does not equal good planning, perhaps a citywide bylaw doesn't apply perfectly in every situation.

Lastly, I noticed that half the "support" comments are from residents outside the neighbourhood (as of end of day April 8). And while I, like many of the supporters, think that Vancouver needs more housing, you can see from the "oppose" comments, mainly from neighbours, that there are nuances to the neighbourhood that you'd only understand living or spending significant time here. For example, 33rd should never have been planned and treated as an

				<p>arterial. It is single lane in each direction, and functions more like a busy local street. In addition to the abysmal bus service, it is already the most congested stretch of 33rd (I commute nearly the entirety of 33rd multiple times a week). It is just not reasonable to add so many people into a local neighbourhood site.</p> <p>Note I am however very excited about the proposed pedestrian crossing at Commercial and enhanced landscape buffer between the sidewalk and the street!</p>			
2024-04-08	22:36	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	<p>Affordable rental housing is much needed, but I object to a project of this size moving forward without acknowledgement, consideration or discussion about the tandum need for improvements to the infrastructure that are needed to support and sustain such a project in this particular location. I feel strongly that the project proposed for this site is too large for this particular location and needs a more thoughtful approach. One that includes improvements to parking, traffic control, transit, schools & daycare and amenities in the immediate neighbourhood.</p>	Lisa Robertson	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2024-04-08	21:16	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	<p>This street is so backed up any work day and it's an insane idea to built more density here</p> <p>The schools are overflowing including 700 plus kids at selkirk and the church around the corner has a huge following on Sundays with so much traffic In the area</p>	Angela Mohan	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2024-04-08	17:16	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	<p>I oppose the rezoning application at 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue. This neighbourhood has been mostly single housing residential neighbourhood.</p>	Elaine Ma	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	