CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-06-25	15:52	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	We have 88 units in this building with hardworking Canadians who in their working years gave their blood and sweat and years to make this country a great country that it is. A lot of seniors like me are retired and have no way to go and rent at the market rate .This new proposals also puts us in danger of walking for our everyday needs and medical appointments. There is parking garage where this new building will be constructed causing 4 years of pollution and nightmare for us residents. The new building is also not affordable for many Canadians young and old. The proposed tower will bring a lot of grief and hardship on us seniors who actually will be forced to move. But tell us where will we go. This is our home. The whole problem is about affordable housing and this proposal is not the solution. This is harsh and crule reality being imposed on us .What about our human rights and dignity to live peacefully in our last days of life. Not many of us are sleeping well in the night already. SHAME ON YOU.	Jacqueline Jamieson	Kerrisdale	
2024-06-26	11:22	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	If this proposal passes, I will be forced to move from my home of 14 yrs, because I would lose the underground parking . I am 86yrs old	Helen Overgaard	Kerrisdale	
2024-06-26	15:59	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	Please see attached letter.	Daniel Kasowitz	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1
2024-06-26	17:59	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	I am 94 years old living and have been living at Fountainebleau for 8 years. This proposal will create a lot of grief for loosing our parking and green space. This is horrible proposal to put us seniors in state of stress.	Milena Kermode	Kerrisdale	
2024-06-26	19:02	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	This proposal should not be considered for redevelopment for multiple reasons. I am an 92 year old women facing the garden . It will cause me non stop noise and pollution . I will not be able to use the garden for walking . I have mobility issue and use the space to keep my health . Also this company is horrible the way they treat humans . The existing building is horribly maintained and has become a health and safety hazzard unless city hall inspectors are notified .we will have no parking for so many care givers coming to take care of many of us Shame on the mayor and council to give green light to this project and causing grief to us seniors	Blanche Wood	Kerrisdale	
2024-06-28	13:12	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	Dear Mayor and all the city council, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed housing development in our Kerrisdale Neighbourhood at 5455 Balsam street. This project will have a detrimental impact on our community. After reading the referral report presented by the developer I think this lot is not suitable as infill land as it already has 2 dedicated purposes. Please look at this more attentively for discussion. Also the adjacent green space at the back has heritage trees on the lot. City talks about green space and seniors housing support. Fontainebleau	Bhavna Solecki	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3 Attachment 4 Attachment 5 Attachment 6 Attachment 7

In conclusion I strongly urge all the elected members of the City to

neighbourhoods. Thanks for your attention in this matter.

reconsider this proposed development as it is simply not the right fit for our

2024-07-02	14:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	2 July 2024 To Mayor and Council,	Fergus Hathorn	Kerrisdale
				Vancouver City Hall		
				Dear Sir/Madam,		
				re Referral Report – 5455 Balsam Street		
				I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed development at 5455		
				Balsam Street.		
				1. General.		
				The Referral Report, dated 28 May, 2024 reads as if it had been written by		
				the proponent rather than as an objective assessment of the proposed		
				development. No mention is made of the earlier ARKS Report,(the most		
				thorough planning exercise ever undertaken) presumably because it would		
				not support such a development. And it draws vague and qualitative but		
				positive conclusions where quantitative information would undoubtedly lead		
				to an opposite conclusion, e.g. when referring to shading. Specific issues are		
				discussed below.		
				2. Size of building – The building is too big for its location and does not meet SRP limitations. P5: "The SRP anticipates that building heights adhere to		
				existing height limits outlined in the current RM-3 zoning, 36.6 m (120 ft.)".		
				This proposal is for 134 feet and according the report "This additional height		
				slightly deviates from the SRP" (Emphasis added). "Slightly? – in whose		
				eyes? Yet even that is not correct since in Appendix A, p3 the Director of		
				Planning is allowed to up that to 151 feet (46.2 m). (No doubt he/she will be		
				asked to allow that and he/she would permit it). Either or any way, this		
				building is grossly out of sync with Kerrisdale's character given its size and		
				nature.		
				3. Separation from other building. The new building would be too close to		
				the existing building. Tower separation in the Kerrisdale area is generally		
				quite substantial. For example, the buildings immediately south of the		
				subject lots are separated by roughly 50-60 yards. This contributes positively		
				to the nature of the area, that is bright and leafy and with a pleasing mix of		
				low rise and well separated high rise buildings. This proposal does not report		
				the separation of the proposed building and the existing buildings but I		
				estimate it to be about half that i.e. 25-30 yards. And that is too close. P5 of		
				the report advances the conclusion, without being burdened with facts, that		
				"The proposal complies with tower separation requirements" What are		
				those requirements? And how does it compare with them? And anyway they		
				may be applicable in other locations in the city such as the downtown (where		
				the rather pejorative "concrete jungle" comes to mind) but are not reflected		
				here in Kerrisdale.		
				4. The style of building is inappropriate for this neighbourhood. Compare		
				this style, i.e. major high rise, with that taking place along the Arbutus		
				Greenway and in other parts of the suburban city, e.g. Dunbar. There it is limited to 4or 5 stories and in a much larger space and on busy streets P6		
				the report states that "The neighbourhood is characterised by a mix of low-		
				rise apartment buildings, high-rise buildings, and large landscaped open		
				spaces in between. The proposed infill building and the open spaces are		
				spaces in service in the proposed initial balluling and the open spaces are		

consistent with this prevailing pattern of development" It is beyond reason how such a conclusion could be reached. This proposed building would consume huge amounts of space and result in major congestion in an otherwise fully developed and quiet area.. The building would not contribute in any positive way to the neighbourhood. 5. Local impacts. A) Loss of sunshine. The report shows various shadow images but makes no attempt to quantify how much sunshine existing residences will lose. That doesn't stop the authors from concluding that "the shadow of the proposed tower has a limited impact on neighbouring properties, particularly when considering the existing building, and the maturing trees on site and adjacent streets" So it's the trees that are causing the problem? Ridiculous! A personal estimate indicates that, to the west, all morning sunshine will be intercepted by the building, while to the east, pretty well all afternoon sunshine will be lost. "Limited impact"? I don't think so. B) Impact on lane. P1 item 1.2 "...prior to approval by Council of the form of development, the applicant shall obtain approval of a development application by the Director of Planning who shall have particular regard to Design development to the lane interface to create a the following: friendlier and safer residential lane environment. Several examples are provided none of which can address the impact of the building. Nevertheless, regarding making the lane friendlier and safer: It is already friendly and safe. This development will certainly not make it safer. We who live on the lane will bear a particular impact. Our homes open directly onto the lane. We have a designated walkway down the west edge of the lane to access recycling and garbage. Children use it to cycle in and access their homes. The doubling of traffic on the lane will certainly not make it safe. C) Parking and traffic congestion. There is no information as to where parking for existing tenants will be sourced. Present conditions suggest that there will be considerable additional congestion in the neighbourhood during construction. 6. Construction There is very little, if anything, in this report concerning the construction of the building. We would like to make sure that, should Council, to our great disappointment, approve this development, there is absolutely no approval (or future approve) for construction to occur from the lane. It would be downright reckless to permit that. 7 Need Figure 4 on page 8 of the Report cites "Progress Towards 10 Year Housing Vancouver Targets for Secured Market Rental Housing as of March 31, 2024". I understand that in excess of 1000 new units of Secured Rental

7 Need Figure 4 on page 8 of the Report cites "Progress Towards 10 Year Housing Vancouver Targets for Secured Market Rental Housing as of March 31, 2024". I understand that in excess of 1000 new units of Secured Rental have been added since 31 March 2024 and that the city is now close to or already over the 20,000 unit target set in 2017. This with three years to go prior to the planned achievement date. It would seem that this project is not required meet this goal.

8. Precedent Approval of this proposal would have far reaching consequences for this and future Councils and for the people of Kerrisdale. Approval will mean every square foot of space will be sought for development." In fill" will be the watchword and how could you turn other developers down then? Kerrisdale would then become a concrete jungle far

				from the pleasant, bright and leafy and liveable place it is today. Once lost, it would be gone forever. 9 Fontainebleau So much of these considerations are focused on what is planned to be constructed, with the proponent and City Planning department in favour of it while those of us who will be adversely impacted by its installation, very much in opposition. But what is it that we would lose. Fontainebleau's garden is not fallow land, some undeveloped, weedy, tract needing to be "improved". It is space, it is light and leafy, airy, and a source of views. Yes! Rich pickings for a city anywhere. Our luck is that it is here in Vancouver. The very attributes that are in depressingly shorter and lesser supply. Can you believe our good fortune? Here in this city, we have this space, this amazing, delightful natural open space. Our city, where sadly, we have drifted to that state, as the old saying goes, of knowing the price of everything and the value of nothing. Fontainebleau. It was constructed by a developer who clearly wanted to add something of value, intangible value beyond just a fine residence. And he succeeded. That intangible value beyond just a fine residence. And he succeeded. That intangible value, now as then, flows not only to the tenants but also to the community at large. Today, everyone who lives nearby or walks by appreciates the value of this light and bright open space, takes in the view, or follows the flight of a Northern Flicker as it swoops into one of its many trees. His building with its garden is a one of a kind, reflecting that developers pride in building something classy, something unique and something very French. How could we even consider demolishing its most valuable attribute. So here we are before you, the decision makers, requesting, that you choose the more difficult path and reject this proposal. "More difficult?" Well, we have some idea of your record on similar decisions. Roughly 100% in favour of whatever development is before you. But surely at some point enough will be			
2024-07-04	07:03	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	I live at 5454 Balsam and have been a tenant in this building for almost 12 years. This project will be a huge and long disruption to what has always been a beautiful neighborhood. Aside from the noise pollution, logistics and parking nightmare this will create, it fails to serve any good purpose other than to line the pockets of the developers rather than to provide "affordable" rental accommodation for our senior and young family population. I am a single 67 year old working professional female and if I am forced out of the building I live in I will be forced to leave Vancouver the city I was born in as I cannot afford the so called "market rents" we now have in this city. It is an abomination that the city is even considering this type of development here in this cherished and well cared for Vancouver neighborhood.	Merilee Clarke	Kerrisdale	

2024-07-04	09:16	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455	Oppose	I am greatly concerned with the proposed development of 5455 Balsam	Katharine Lazar	Kerrisdale	
2024-07-04	09.10	Balsam Street	Oppose	street as a resident of the currently existing Fontainebleau apartment	Ratifallife Lazai	Remisuale	
		Balsalli Street		building. First and foremost is the issue of parking as where the development			
				is proposed to take place is currently where all residents park (approximately			
				100 cars) meaning we will no longer have access to this parkade. There has			
				been no communication with residents regarding where we will be allowed			
				to park during or after the construction and if this parking will be reserved			
				for us. The street surrounding this development is not permit parking and is			
				already quite full of cars meaning that not every resident will be able to find			
				parking near our building. This is of further concern as a majority of the			
				residents are elderly and may not have the ability to walk the number of			
				blocks they would have to in order to find street parking. Further			
				exacerbating this issue is that during the construction period the street			
				surrounding the building may need to be blocked from traffic, or at			
				minimum, will be crowded with construction workers cars and construction			
				vehicles. This will most likely mean that building residents are unable to park			
				near their home at all during the construction period.			
				My next concern is the already poor, mismanagement of the Fontainebleau			
				apartment building. For reference, my floors laundry machines have been			
				broken for over one year. In the 5 floors surrounding me, only 2 floors have			
				working machines. This often means that people are having to wait to do			
				laundry or constantly check to see when a machine is open to be able to do			
				laundry. I myself have had to do my laundry in nearby friends apartments			
				due to my inability to do laundry in my own building. Further, I have inquired			
				with our 'building manager' numerous times over the last year and have not			
				once received a response. Further, I have had a maintenance request to fix			
				flooring issues in my unit for the last year with no movement on this request.			
				Our pool was not open last year and there has been no update provided to			
				residents about if any improvements are being made to open it this year. I			
				am greatly concerned with the existing lack of communication from the			
				building manager to the existing residents and what that will look like if they			
				are then in charge of another building in addition. Even if there are separate			
				building managers I feel that work needs to be done to address the poor			
				management of our building at the very least.			
				As noted, the Fontainebleau is home to many elderly people who would be			
				negatively affected by the nearby construction in that it would limit their			
				ability to park/drive in the neighborhood, have others drive to pick them up			
				and create noise on the street that negatively affects their lives. Further,			
				these are people who have lived here for years on years and many do not			
				have the ability to rehome themselves to another building if this			
				development goes through. I myself will have to contemplate leaving my unit			
				if this construction is approved, but do not wish to do so as this is my home			
				that I have built my life around.			
				I understand that more housing is needed in Vancouver. However, I feel that			
				more thought needs to be put into this specific development before it is			
				approved and more communication with those of us who will be impacted.			
				Try Try to the t		1	l

2024-07-04	10:59	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	this is terrible for the area. It would be the largest in Kerrisdale. you have already increased density in 3 homes tastefully. the value of my apartment will drop as I am on the 5th floor facing west across the street. my view will be totally gone.	David Wilson	Kerrisdale	
2024-07-04	12:00	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	Please see attached letter.	Fergus Hathorn	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1
2024-07-04	12:30	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	Please see attached document.	Deborah Sherrard	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1
2024-06-28	14:31	Balsam Street CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	Re: Opposition to Rezoning of 5455 Balsam Street Dear Mayor and all the city council, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed housing development in our Kerrisdale Neighbourhood at 5455 Balsam street. This project will have a detrimental impact on our community. After reading the referral report presented by the developer I think this lot is not suitable as infill land as it already has 2 dedicated purposes. Please look at this more attentively for discussion. Also the adjacent green space at the back has heritage trees on the lot. City talks about green space and seniors housing support. Fontainebleau apartments is a home to many seniors living on fixed income and are already traumatized with this development. They will be forced to leave their home if this development moves forward. The proposed development sits on a parking lot which is also a garbage disposal area. The back alley is used as neighborhood parking by the adjacent church, Larchwood, caretakers and visitors. The goal of the city of Vancouver City is to ensure older people age and live in their existing home and communities. It is important for them to die in their home as it is an integral part of their final journey. Comfort, dignity and respect are hallmarks of quality end of life care and need to meet emotional, mental, spiritual and physical needs of every human being. This development is just the opposite of all of the above and is a big dishonour to our seniors who have served and given their blood and sweat to this country. This proposal is disrespectful and disrupts their lives and		Kerrisdale	Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3
				health for the next 4 to 5 years . We have approximately 65% of seniors living in Fontainebleau who have caregivers coming in and out to take care of them. A lot of seniors also have mobility issues. The garden space is used as a community garden for friends, family and neigbours to meet, enjoy, walk and			

2024-06-28	15:12	CD-1 Pazoning: 5/155		exercise and take care of their health as a lot of them cannot go far away to gyms and public facilities. The garden is big part for their mental and physical health. Losing parking, green space and garbage areas and walking to take transit is impossible for many living in the building. Do you expect seniors to be pushing carts now 3 blocks to get their groceries and going out of the building for garbage disposal in rain and snow to have a bad fall in their already declining health. The proposed development will lead to years of noise pollution, increased traffic congestion and strain on our public servicesI think we owe our seniors some respect and let them die in dignity, Isn't that a human right of a person who has worked tediously all their lives contributing to this country. Also the project will result in significant environmental damage and destruction of natural habitat. The proposed housing is also out of touch with the character of Kerrisdale and unaffordable for young and old families. There is already a high vacancy rate in the existing tower at 5455 Balsam Street since this company Larco Investment Group acquired the building. I would also urge the council members and the Mayor to look at the complaint files in Vancouver city hall against Larco Investment group filed by residents of Fountainbleau apartments 5455 balsam street over the past 4 years for non compliance. The developer is also endangering health and safety standards of the residents of this building by not following any rules and regulations for maintenance of the existing building. The Vancouver city website emphasizes on improving the lives of seniors and letting them stay in their familiar communities to make Vancouver a more equitable place for our older people. In conclusion I strongly urge all the elected members of the City to reconsider this proposed development as it is simply not the right fit for our neighbourhoods. Thanks for your attention in this matter.		Karrisdala	Attachment 1
2024-06-28	15:13	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	Please see attached letter.	Helen Overgaard	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1

CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-06-29	15:03	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	The rezoning of 5455 Balsam Street will destroy a beautiful chateau-designed garden and the two story garage which accommodates the cars of the 125 residents of the Fontainebleau Apartments at 5455 Balsam Street. We realize that Vancouver wants to cut down on car traffic. But, for many people especially the elderly, having a car is a necessity. Transit (buses) running south and north is four blocks away. Many of the elderly people are incapable of walking there. We cannot do our grocery shopping or go to medical appointments on bicycles or afford taxi fare for every errand. Larco says it will provide parking 10- to 15-minutes away for the Fontainebleau residents. Does Larco actually expect all the seniors, many of whom use walkers, to walk back to the Fontainebleau with groceries in tow? Those who decide to park their cars on the street will have to compete with scores of other cars to find on-street parking. When cars park on the street, they will be vulnerable to vandalism and the vagaries of the weather. When the owner does build a new parkade, some, but not all, parking spots will be available to us Fontainebleau residents but probably at the expensive rate of \$200 per month for a designated parking space, which is what the tenants at Larco's Arbutus Residences are paying. Right now we Fontainebleau residents pay \$37 per month for a designated parking space. The Fontainebleau residents will lose a beautiful garden which is also a bird sanctuary. There are ten species of birds that make the garden their home. Removing the garden will deprive Vancouver of another large green space in a city that prides itself on being "the greenest city in Canada, a green place to live, work, and play." Many of the residents at the Fontainebleau are elderly. This garden gives them an opportunity to socialize, to come out of the confines of their apartments where most of them live solitary lives. See photo of the chateau-designed garden in the attached jpeg file. The garden was designed after the garden at the chateau of Samur	Daniel Kasowitz	Kerrisdale	Attachment 1
2024-06-24	14:21	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street	Oppose	This request is quite outrageous. The population density of this neighbourhood is already high. This proposal adds 145 more rental units. It uses up the whole of the property without allowing any space surrounding the building. We have here an egregious example of greed on the part of these new owners of the existing property. It is shocking that this proposal ever reached the stage of a public hearing. Be true to the residents already in this area. Dr. Shirley Sullivan	Dr. Shirley Sullivan	Kerrisdale	

Report date range from: 6/11/2024 12:00:01 AM to: 7/4/2024 5:00:00 PM

CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2024-06-24	19:34	CD-1 Rezoning: 5455 Balsam Street		I oppose this rezoning. The two blocks of Balsam Street are already sufficiently and historically densified with no increase in services locally. This area is not a transportation hub being served only by the 41 bus and further away by the 16. On street parking is already very limited for residents, visitors and service providers. Balsam Street at 37th is a T junction leading onto a bike route. It already has very poor visibility from the stop sign. Increased traffic from this building, using this intersection worsens safety for pedestrians, bikes and drivers. There are many other infill areas that could be selected rather than further densifying this already dense block. I implore you not to re-zone this area to allow and select a more appropriate site. You can meet the city plan by considering other projects. Thank you	Moray McLean	Kerrisdale	