

333 East 11th Avenue (275 Kingsway)
PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY - DRAFT

NOTE: Includes all comments received up until November 1, 2013

Public Notification

A rezoning and development permit information sign was installed on the site on June 11, 2013. After staff were informed that the sign was missing from the site, a second sign was installed on site on September 9, 2013. On or around June 11, 2013, about 5,800 notifications of rezoning/development permit application and invitation to a community open house were distributed within the neighbouring area. Notification and application information, as well as an online comment form, was provided on the City of Vancouver Rezoning Centre webpage (vancouver.ca/rezapps).

June 25, 2013 Community Open House

A community open house was held from 4:30 - 7.30 pm on June 25, 2013, at the Native Education Centre, 285 East 5th Avenue. Staff, the applicant team, and a total of approximately 89 people attended the Open House.

Public Response

Public responses to this rezoning and development permit application, as of November 1, 2013, have been received by the City as follows:

- In response to the June 2013 open house, a total of 43 comment sheets were submitted from individuals (approximately 60% in favour/30% opposed/9% unsure or unspecified).
- A total of 41 letters, e-mails, and online comment forms were submitted from individuals (approximately 46% in favour/49% opposed/6% unsure or unspecified).

Please note that the City does not typically differentiate comments received from local residents (including those within the notification area) from those received from other members of the public who reside in other parts of the city.

For 333 East 11th Avenue (275 Kingsway), approximately 27% of the feedback was from residents living outside the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood boundary. Comments from Vancouver-area residents reflected a different level of support in comparison to comments from neighbouring residents and residents of Mount Pleasant.

Overall Feedback:

Support	45	54%
Opposed	33	39%
Unsure or Unspecified	6	7%
TOTAL	84	100%

Below is a summary of feedback, grouped by geographic area.

Feedback from Mount Pleasant Residents¹:

Support	26	43%
Opposed	31	51%
Unsure or Unspecified	4	7%
TOTAL	61	100%

Comments from Mount Pleasant residents opposing the application, grouped by theme and listed in order of frequency:

Proposed Height

Several stated that they were not in support of the proposed height, describing the proposal as being “too tall” for the neighbourhood, and out of scale with the surrounding buildings (Howard Johnson and Soma were noted as examples). A couple indicated that they would support the proposal if the height were reduced. Maximum heights of six and nine storeys were suggested as being more appropriate for that location.

Proposed Design and Neighbourly Fit

There is a concern about the building design, that it is bulky and monolithic, that its central green space (the proposed atrium) is turning the building’s back onto neighbours. A few commented on the livability impact on the Soma building (across the lane), such as blocking of sunlight access and privacy concerns. A few commented that the proposal does not fit with the existing heritage character of the neighbourhood. One noted concerns that the existing C3-A Guidelines were not referenced in the design, and that a future building to the north would be up against a blank wall face. A few commented on the minimum unit sizes, describing them as “too small” or “substandard”.

Proposed Density

Several noted opposition to the proposed density, stating it is too high in comparison with other developments in the area. Related to the proposed density is the concern that there is already too much population density in Mount Pleasant without additional amenity and services. A few noted that the proposed number of units was “too high” and suggested that there might not be enough demand based on the existing residential real estate market.

Proposed Rental Units

A few commented that they were not in support of adding more rental units at 333 East 11th Avenue, citing concerns that rental units would encourage a more “transient” population who might be less invested in the Mount Pleasant community. A couple noted support for market rental at that location, but noted their opposition to the proposed building form.

¹ This includes includes online and open house comment forms from Mount Pleasant residents. The majority of commenters provided a residential address or identified themselves as a neighbor of 333 East 11th Avenue or resident of Mount Pleasant. Where no residential address or identifier was provided, comments have been included in the “Vancouver-area” feedback.

Parking and Transportation

A few commented that adding more residential units at East 11th Avenue and Kingsway would add to existing neighbourhood parking and transportation issues. Concerns included road access along the 10th Avenue bikeway, the safety of pedestrian crossings at Kingsway and 10th Avenue, crowded transit, and the availability of on-street parking. One noted support for the proposed reduction in vehicle parking space at 333 East 11th Avenue, provided there are car share and bike parking spaces.

Fit with Mount Pleasant Community Plan

A few commented that the proposal was not a good fit with the Mount Pleasant Community Plan, noting that 333 East 11th Avenue was not one of the three sites identified for additional density. Others noted concerns that the area would continue to see more rezoning applications, stating that property owners were purchasing homes based on “views they believed would be kept intact” based on the Mount Pleasant Community Plan.

Rental 100 Policy

A few noted concerns regarding Rental 100 policy, stating that Rental 100 “should not rule” over neighbourhood plans, and noting that it might conflict with other laws. One expressed concern that Rental 100 does not include a maximum allowable density or height, and another stated that more information was required on “livability” criteria. Another commented that Rental 100 was not a “sustainable” policy, given existing land values in Vancouver.

Impact on Views and Property Values

A few commented that the proposed development, if approved, would negatively impact the north and west views from neighbouring buildings, and would result in decreased property values.

Other comments cited in opposition were:

- I feel that all of the Mount Pleasant allotment of social housing is being placed too close together. This building, which a good cause, should be located elsewhere in Mount Pleasant where no other social housing exists within 10 blocks to share the load on the community.
- Concerned that the City is not listening to residents and showing concern for this neighbourhood.
- Concerned about the number of developers and real estate professionals attending the open house, and whether their opinions will be considered over the residents of the neighbourhood
- The development process fails to take into account the impacts on local residents both in the construction stage (local air quality, congestion, traffic, aesthetics, etc.) and future impacts such as the proposed density, the massing of the building as well as punishing height.

Comments from Mount Pleasant residents supporting the application, grouped by theme and listed in order of frequency:

Proposed Rental Units

Many commented on the need for more rental units in the Mount Pleasant area, and throughout Vancouver, noting their support for adding new units at 333 East 11th Avenue. One stated that they would prefer to see more 2 bedroom units rather than more studios. Another noted support for smaller (and therefore more affordable) units to provide housing for artists, young people and young families in Mount Pleasant. Another noted that they would prefer to see a mix of rental and condo units as part of the proposed development.

Neighbourhood Fit

Several stated that the proposed development would improve or positively influence the immediate neighbourhood, noting that the proposed building would potentially replace a building that provides "limited" community value. Others noted support for the addition of more residential density in the Mount Pleasant area. A few stated that the proposed development could "provide a boost" or increase opportunities for existing local businesses.

Design and Height of the Proposed Building

Several commented in support of the proposed design and height. A couple noted their support for the proposed atrium, calling it a "unique" or "interesting" feature of the proposed building. One noted support for the application, but expressed concerns about the massing and the proposed façade, suggesting that a green wall or other feature could enhance that aspect of the design. Another commented in support of the density but felt that the massing and building façade could be handled "more delicately".

Other comments cited in support were:

- My view will be impacted by this building but the current use of the corner lot adds NO value to our community and I do believe that this development will be a move in a better direction.
- Transit oriented development is key to growth in Vancouver.
- Support but suggest the commercial space be reconsidered. Surely there is a glut in below-condo retail spaces and that part of Kingsway does not attract much in the way of shoppers?
- Support the reduced amount of car parking and the co-op car spaces.
- Would like to know more about how bike parking is accessed for users of the building.
- Where will the future bike share be located?
- Like the inclusion of urban agriculture on rooftop
- I applaud the consultative approach and the palpable desire to actually create something that is both progressive and at the same time contiguous with the spirit and the character of the neighborhood.

Comments from Mount Pleasant residents who are undecided about the application:

- Does add much-needed rental accommodation but it does not add to the attractiveness of the area.
- The only way this would work for me is if there was 1/3 subsidized, non-market rental units included.
- Concerned that this project will look like every other new project in the Mount Pleasant area, and will not fit the unique character of the neighbourhood.
- Concerned about the proposed FSR, which seems like a huge increase.
- Suggest adding a green wall or something unique to the wall facing 11th Avenue, and to add a feature that will promote the gathering of community residents
- Re-greening of space is important; would like to see contracting go mostly to Canadian companies, and the commercial district must be conducive to the community.
- Doesn't contribute to the public realm; no access or circulation for pedestrians.
- Would prefer to see a low-rise and not a mid-rise in this location as this would maintain the value of our, and many other, homes in the neighbourhood.

Feedback from Vancouver-area Residents²:

Support	19	83%
Opposed	2	9%
Unsure or Unspecified	2	8%
TOTAL	23	100%

Comments from Vancouver-area residents opposing the application:

- Doesn't add to the community feel; will block the sun, require too much parking, looks sterile, will have noisy generators and air conditioning.
- This will spike surrounding land values and provide no community amenity.
- This is a direct violation of the Mount Pleasant Community Plan - the site is outside of the 3 named sites for higher density.
- Take a look in section 565A in the Vancouver Charter - under what provision is this development rezoning permitted?

Comments from Vancouver-area residents supporting the application, grouped by theme and listed in order of frequency:

Proposed Rental Units

Many commented on the need for more rental units in the Mount Pleasant area, and throughout Vancouver, noting their support for adding new units at 333 East 11th Avenue. A few commented on the need to replace aging rental stock in Vancouver, noting that new or "modern" rental stock would be more attractive to families or to

² This includes online and open house comment forms from non-Mount Pleasant residents. The majority of commenters provided a residential address or identified themselves as a neighbor of 333 East 11th Avenue or resident of Mount Pleasant. Where no residential address or identifier was provided, comments have been included in the "Vancouver-area" feedback.

young professionals interested in living in Mount Pleasant. A few stated that 333 East 11th Avenue was a good location for a rental building, noting its proximity to transit and to the downtown core.

Design of the Proposed Building

Several noted support for the proposed design, commenting on the “unique” skylight element, and the “eco-friendly” design. One stated that the scale of the project would fit with the surrounding buildings. Another asked whether the roof could be retractable.

Neighbourhood Fit

Several stated that the proposed development would improve the immediate neighbourhood, noting that it would “revitalize” a vacant site and positively influence the area east of Main Street.

Other comments cited in support were:

- Are there any amenities for the community (other than that on the rooftop)?
- What is proposed for the commercial/retail space?
- Transit oriented development is key to growth in Vancouver.

Comments from Vancouver-area residents undecided about the application:

- Not sure how this would relieve the need for affordable homes. It is fine to say we are providing more rental housing on the east side, but this is very much a yuppie / high cost proposal.
- How will this project contribute to creating more affordability for Vancouver? Will the starting rents be accessible to a majority of folks in Vancouver. Will the benefit that the CoV gives this project of increased FSR, be accessible now to the median income of renters in the city now. Will the proponents of the project be willing to enter into a "housing agreement" with the CoV that will guarantee the starting rents of the project?
- How will this project make CoV more ecologically sustainable? How will this project make CoV more livable?
- What spaces in this being are going to promote more cultural understanding between residents?
- Who will this being deal with growing aging population?