

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

NOTE: Includes all comments received up until October 3, 2014

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. The site sign was revised subsequently to reflect the revised applications.

On or around June 11, 2013, approximately 5800 notifications of rezoning and development permit application, and invitation to the first 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). A link to the rezoning application is also provided on the City's Mount Pleasant Community Plan website. Invitation of the open house was also emailed to the community contact list that City staff maintain for the implementation work of the Mount Pleasant Community Plan.

On or around February 6, 2014, approximately 5,600 notifications of rezoning/development permit application and invitation to a second community open house were distributed within the neighbouring area. The City's rezoning website was updated with information about the revised application. Additionally, a notice was sent to 54 individuals who had previously provided comments. A notification of this second open house was also posted on the City's Mount Pleasant Community Plan website.

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 the original application received by the City as of November 1, 2013 are 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 this application, approximately 27% of the feedback received was from people living outside the Mount Pleasant neighbourhood boundary, with many correspondents self-identifying as non-residents. Based on available information provided by the correspondents, staff were able to identify the responses from residents of Mount Pleasant.

Overall Feedback:

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

Feedback from Mount Pleasant Residents¹:

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

Comments **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 instead of giving back to the neighbourhood, 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.

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.

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.

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.

Comments from **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”.

February 20, 2014 Community Open House

The application went through two rounds of revisions in response to comments received from the public since the first open house as well as commentary from the Urban Design Panel. Specifically, the following key design revisions were incorporated:

- provision of a vertical opening along the south façade to enable views into and out of the atrium;
- provision of a setback from the edge of the building for the uppermost two residential levels;
- provision of three south-facing outdoor amenity decks in the vertical opening and removal of roof top amenity and family play area and relocation of these spaces to other parts of the building;
- an increase in the number of storeys (from 13 to 14), however, overall height of the building remained the same as initial submission, with reduced floor to ceiling height on each level.

In order to update the public on the proposed key changes, a second community open house was held from 5:00 - 8:00 pm on February 20, 2014, at the Native Education Centre, 285 East 5th Avenue. Staff, the applicant team, and a total of approximately 86 people attended the Open House.

Public Response

Public responses received by the City as of October 3, 2014 are as follows:

- In response to the February 20, 2014, open house, a total of 70 comment sheets were submitted from individuals (approximately 83% in favour/14% opposed/3% unsure or unspecified).
- A total of 30 letters, e-mails, and online comment forms were submitted from individuals (approximately 60% in favour/33% opposed/7% unsure or unspecified).

Among the written responses received, 52% were from people living outside the Mount Pleasant neighborhood boundary. Though overall non-resident comments reflected a stronger

level of support compared with resident comments, both groups have more than 50% of the correspondence in support of the revised application.

Overall Feedback:

Support	76	76%
Opposed	20	20%
Unsure or Unspecified	4	4%
TOTAL	100	100%

Feedback from Mount Pleasant Residents²:

Support	28	58%
Opposed	16	33%
Unsure or Unspecified	4	8%
TOTAL	48	100%

Comments **supporting** the application, grouped by theme and listed in order of frequency:

Rental Housing

The rental units were seen to be a positive thing for the area and for local businesses, and the programs supporting more rental housing were praised. There was concern about 3-bedroom units being absent from the proposal.

Design

The design was praised for the courtyard and rooftop garden, as well as for the general context, layout, and form.

Height and Density

The project's density was viewed as fair for the location and appropriate for an area near a future rapid transit node. The height was not seen as an issue.

Accessibility

Creating units available and accessible to people with disabilities was seen as a positive development and something to be encouraged in this project and more broadly in the city.

Location

The location was noted as appropriate for this sort of building type. Additionally the land use was noted as an improvement over the current situation and that mixed-use with commercial at grade was a good element.

² 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.

Traffic and Parking

Inclusion of car share and bike share spaces were appreciated. Some comments felt that less parking should be required of rental developments.

Comments **opposing** the application, grouped by theme and listed in order of frequency:

Height and Density

Comments included concern that the building is too tall for the area and that six storeys would be more appropriate. It was also noted that the density proposed is much greater than the 3.0 it is currently zoned for and thus too bulky and dense.

Policy Issues

Some comments stated that the proposal was in conflict with the Mount Pleasant Community Plan and that there exists no provision to allow the heights and densities proposed. It was felt at the time that the lawsuit underway regarding the Rental 100 policy should require this development to wait until the resolution of the lawsuit.

Affordability

Skepticism about the affordability of the units was raised, and some felt that the project seems to merely be a money grab by the developers.

Traffic and Parking

There was fear of both increased traffic and concern that the traffic studies undertaken are not adequate.

Green Space

Concern was voiced about the lack of public green space in this area.

Design

The building design was critiqued as too boxy and lacking in character, and the unit sizes were disparaged as being smaller than jail cells.