

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	09:26	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	I am a homeowner/resident of Kensington Cedar Cottage and I oppose to the re-zoning application for 1749-1769 East 33rd Ave. as submitted. The project is too big for the site and for the immediate neighborhood. It is out of scale with the surrounding area and will put substantial increased pressure on an already overloaded local infrastructure.	Michelle Yardley	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2024-04-08	10:17	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	I am a home owner/resident of Kensington Cedar Cottage and I object to the re-zoning application for 1749-1769 East 33rd Ave. as submitted. The project is just too big for the site and for the immediate neighborhood. It is out of scale with the surrounding area and will put substantial increased pressure on an already overloaded local infrastructure	Nitin Mohan	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2024-04-07	19:24	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	I oppose the rezoning application for 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue. The proposed number of units is too high for the small site. And the proposed number of parking spaces would not accommodate the residents for the project. Currently the traffic flow in the area is very congested along 33rd avenue and Victoria drive. As well, because both 32nd avenue and Commercial Street connect the major streets (Knight to Victoria; Kingsway to 33rd ave respectively) those inner residential streets are highly congested as well. I live by the intersection of 32nd ave and Commercial street and daily hear people honking at each other at the 4 way stop as well as engaging in rode rage. With the highly popular stores along Victoria as well as the busy church, Holy Family Parish regularly drawing non-residents to this neighbourhood, it is difficult for the current residents to find parking on the streets near their homes. Adding this project will exacerbate the traffic congestion and parking problem. Please consider these factors and do not approve this rezoning application	Anita Hua	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2024-04-07	20:11	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	I do not support this project with car stalls without traffic calming, including but not limited to four way stops on 32nd. Specially at dangerous intersections for pedestrians such as 32nd and Commercial, as well as Beatrice.	Peter Kieser	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2024-04-07	20:21	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	Please stop. You are cramming so many people into areas just for the sake of getting more tax dollars. The city is becoming so congested with no thought to roadways etc. I am completely opposed to this development	Dianna Yuen	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2024-04-07	21:22	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	See attached letter of objection.	Rick Morrow	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	Appendix A

2024-04-07	21:49	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am a home owner and resident of Kensington Cedar Cottage and I object to the re-zoning application for 1749-1769 East 33rd Ave. as submitted. The project is just too big for the site and for the immediate neighborhood. It is out of scale with the surrounding area and will put substantial increased pressure on an already overloaded local infrastructure and traffic on 33rd ave, which is already terrible.</p>	Ekaterina Rutherford	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
2024-04-07	21:53	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	<p>I live a block away from the proposed project site. The application package put together by RWA on behalf of their clients Intracorp is very impressive and obviously the result of substantial effort. While my wife and I fully support the city's efforts to address the housing crisis through increased density, promotion of rental housing and other initiatives, we strongly object to the application as submitted. The project is too big for this site and the surrounding neighborhood.</p> <p>One of our first concerns is that the amount of notification seems entirely inappropriate for a project of this scale. We received the original notice of public hearing on March 26th, just 13 days prior to the date of the hearing. That notification had an error on the map which could have easily caused confusion with people in the neighborhood. We received a corrected notice on April 2nd, just one week before the hearing. This is not enough time for residents to consider the issues, given the complexity of the project, the amount of information in the application, and the potential impact of the development.</p> <p>Our specific concerns:</p> <p>Unit Density: The project proposes an increase from the existing 3 single family homes to 109 rental units. The local infrastructure can't support that sort of drastic increase. We would have no objection to some sort of moderate increase in Density. Maybe something similar to the Co-Housing project – 30 units. This proposal is literally almost going from zero to a hundred (3 to a hundred and 9 to be exact).</p> <p>Traffic and Parking: We are aware of the City's efforts to increase density in selected areas and on certain streets. The developments on Cambie Street and King Edward being notable examples. Those streets have the scale and capacity to absorb developments of this size. In terms of scale, those streets have large boulevards, and multiple lanes for additional traffic. The larger buildings don't look out of proportion and don't feel like they dwarf the surrounding context. This location on East 33rd is not that kind of site. There are more suitable locations.</p> <p>While it may technically be an Arterial Street, that part of East 33rd has the size and scale of a local residential street. It is single-lane, 2-way traffic, with parking on both sides. During busy times of the day, it is not uncommon for traffic to be bumper to bumper for almost the entire stretch from Knight Street to Victoria Drive. On days when there are activities at the Church, the surrounding streets are filled with parishioner's vehicles. Often, we can't</p>	Rick Morrow	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

park near our own house.
The application indicates 41 parking stalls are proposed for the development. The development has 109 units. We fully support the use of alternate means of transportation whether that be bicycle, public transportation, car share etc., and we recognize that not everyone owns a vehicle or even aspires to own one. However, we suspect the reality is that more than 40 people in a development of this size will or could own cars. Those extra vehicles have to park somewhere. What if 100 of the residents owned cars. That would put 60 more cars in our already overparked and traffic congested neighborhood.

Project Form and Massing:

The description of the project concept, how the massing is broken up, how the materials create layers etc. are all moot points as the building is just twice as big as it should be.

As a rental apartment building, it's a perfectly reasonable looking design. However, the number of units being proposed, and the resulting scale of the buildings would have a substantial negative impact on the neighbors, as well as the units themselves. The size of the main building means the courtyard is largely shaded. The back building shades the alley and the yards of the neighbors to the North. There would also be a substantial overlooking / privacy concern for the neighboring homeowners on East 32nd as the 3 ½ story building would look directly into their yards.

We purchased our home almost 25 years ago. Over that time, we've watched the neighborhood evolve. Older, small, single-family homes have been replaced by new, larger homes, with suites and laneway homes, or even multi-unit developments such as the Co-Housing project on 33rd, or the pending Alpen Club site redevelopment. We welcome these changes. We hope they will bring new amenities and options to our neighborhood and improve the enjoyment of our home.

The proposed development would not bring positive change. It is strikingly out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood and will put substantial increased pressure on an already overloaded local infrastructure. Trying to improve the housing situation in our neighborhood shouldn't be to the detriment of those currently living here.

The project is just too big. Put 30 units in. Include parking for all the units. Make it 3 stories tall so it doesn't tower over the entire area. That would make sense. That we could support.

2024-04-08	01:15	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	<p>My wife and I strongly oppose the proposed development for the three-lot parcel of land at 1749-1769 East 33rd Ave. We live a short distance from the lot, at East 32nd & Commercial, and our primary concerns are around parking, traffic safety, and the shadow such a large development will cast for properties below East 33rd.</p> <p>The proposed design is simply too large for the area. With 109 units but a mere 49 parking spots underground, where does the City expect the remaining residents to park their vehicles? Many families have more than one vehicle, and even if they rely on public transit or cycling, what about the many visitors to the complex? Where would they park?</p> <p>The parking in this neighbourhood, especially along Commercial St, is already quite busy on days when the Catholic Church across the street from us has mass. The Montessori school right next to the church, on Commercial, also sees many parents picking up and dropping off kids on weekdays. We have had numerous vehicles block our driveway, while jockeying for parking spots.</p> <p>The proposed development on 33rd would undoubtedly magnify the parking problem along surrounding streets, but perhaps the greater concern is the danger posed by increased traffic. There is already a significant problem at the intersection at E32nd and Commercial. Despite there being a 4-way stop in place, far too many drivers run the stop signs. We have heard too many horns blaring at all hours of the day, due to near-collisions.</p> <p>Increased traffic along the lane directly north of the development would also increase the risk for families who walk and cycle there, especially those living in the Vancouver Co-Housing complex. The many vehicles entering and exiting the proposed complex onto Commercial St. would also make traffic there unbearable.</p> <p>Regarding the scope of the project, a five or six storey building on East 33rd would cast quite a shadow onto properties to the north (ie downhill), especially in the fall and winter months when the sun is much lower in the sky. The Vancouver Co-Housing complex to the west would also receive considerably less sunlight if a 5- or 6-storey building were to be built next door.</p> <p>We are definitely in favour of increasing density in the City to address a chronic shortage of housing, but the planned project is simply too large, and grossly inappropriate for the area. A development more similar in size to the existing Co-Housing complex, directly west of the lots in question, would be much more realistic in scale.</p> <p>Regards, Ken Horii and Emily Lai</p>	Ken Horii	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	
------------	-------	---	--------	--	-----------	-----------------------------	--

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	07:07	PH 1 - 5. CD-1 Rezoning: 1749-1769 East 33rd Avenue	Oppose	<p>I am a home owner in the Kensington Cedar Cottage neighbourhood and I object to the re-zoning application for 1749-1769 East 33rd Ave as submitted.</p> <p>The project is too big for the site and for the neighbourhood. It is out of scale with the surrounding buildings and will put substantial increased pressure on an already overloaded local infrastructure.</p> <p>While I support increased access to affordable housing, greater care must be taken to integrate densification within largely single family neighbourhoods. A project similar to the Co-Housing development next to the proposed project would be more in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and still provide more housing.</p>	Sandra Mathison	Kensington-Cedar Cottage	

April 7th, 2024

Rick Morrow and Lisa Robertson

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Attn: Vancouver Planning Dept

Regarding: Objection to 1749-1769 East 33rd Rezoning application

My name is Rick Morrow. My wife Lisa Robertson and I live at [REDACTED] s.22(1) Personal and Confidential [REDACTED] a block away from the proposed project site. The application package put together by RWA on behalf of their clients Intracorp is very impressive and obviously the result of substantial effort.

While my wife and I fully support the city's efforts to address the housing crisis through increased density, promotion of rental housing and other initiatives, **we strongly object** to the application as submitted. The project is too big for this site and the surrounding neighborhood.

I am a Graduate Architect and have worked for the past 30 plus years in the Architectural profession and the Construction business. For about 15 years I worked in traditional Architectural practice, before shifting into Project Management. I currently work as a Project Director for one of the largest Construction companies in the Country. I am very familiar with the development and construction process.

One of our first concerns is that the amount of notification seems entirely inappropriate for a project of this scale. We received the original notice of public hearing on March 26th, just 13 days prior to the date of the hearing. That notification had an error on the map which could have easily caused confusion with people in the neighborhood. We received a corrected notice on April 2nd, just one week before the hearing. This is not enough time for residents to consider the issues, given the complexity of the project, the amount of information in the application, and the potential impact of the development.

I knocked on the doors of some of my neighbors. Of the 18 I talked to, not one supported the application, and many agreed with our concerns. My regret is I did not create a petition. Given a more reasonable notification period to inform the neighbors, I'm confident they would almost unanimously object.

Our specific concerns:

Unit Density: The project proposes an increase from the existing 3 single family homes to 109 rental units. The local infrastructure can't support that sort of drastic increase. We would have no objection to some sort of moderate increase in Density. Maybe something similar to the Co-Housing project – 30 units. This proposal is literally almost going from zero to a hundred (3 to a hundred and 9 to be exact).

Traffic and Parking: We are aware of the City's efforts to increase density in selected areas and on certain streets. The developments on Cambie Street and King Edward being notable examples. Those streets have the scale and capacity to absorb developments of this size.

In terms of scale, those streets have large boulevards, and multiple lanes for additional traffic. The larger buildings don't look out of proportion and don't feel like they dwarf the surrounding context.

This location on East 33rd is not that kind of site. There are more suitable locations.

While it may technically be an Arterial Street, that part of East 33rd has the size and scale of a local residential street. It is single-lane, 2-way traffic, with parking on both sides. During busy times of the day, it is not uncommon for traffic to be bumper to bumper for almost the entire stretch from Knight Street to Victoria Drive. On days when there are activities at the Church, the surrounding streets are filled with parishioner's vehicles. Often, we can't park near our own house.

The application indicates 41 parking stalls are proposed for the development. The development has 109 units. We fully support the use of alternate means of transportation whether that be bicycle, public transportation, car share etc., and we recognize that not everyone owns a vehicle or even aspires to own one. However, we suspect the reality is that more than 40 people in a development of this size will or could own cars. Those extra vehicles have to park somewhere. What if 100 of the residents owned cars. That would put 60 more cars in our already overparked and traffic congested neighborhood.

Project Form and Massing:

The description of the project concept, how the massing is broken up, how the materials create layers etc. are all moot points as the building is just twice as big as it should be.

As a rental apartment building, it's a perfectly reasonable looking design. However, the number of units being proposed, and the resulting scale of the buildings would have a substantial negative impact on the neighbors, as well as the units themselves. The size of the main building means the courtyard is largely shaded. The back building shades the alley and the yards of the neighbors to the North. There would also be a substantial overlooking / privacy concern for the neighboring homeowners on East 32nd as the 3 ½ story building would look directly into their yards.

We purchased our home almost 25 years ago. Over that time, we've watched the neighborhood evolve. Older, small, single-family homes have been replaced by new, larger homes, with suites and laneway homes, or even multi-unit developments such as the Co-Housing project on 33rd, or the pending Alpen Club site redevelopment. We welcome these changes. We hope they will bring new amenities and options to our neighborhood and improve the enjoyment of our home.

The proposed development would not bring positive change.

It is strikingly out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood and will put substantial increased pressure on an already overloaded local infrastructure. Trying to improve the housing situation in our neighborhood shouldn't be to the detriment of those currently living here.

The project is just too big. Put 30 units in. Include parking for all the units.

Make it 3 stories tall so it doesn't tower over the entire area.

That would make sense. That we could support.

Sincerely,

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Rick Morrow and Lisa Robertson / s.22(1) Personal and Confidential