

From: ["Johnston, Sadhu" <Sadhu.Johnston@vancouver.ca>](mailto:Sadhu.Johnston@vancouver.ca)

To: ["Direct to Mayor and Council - DL"](#)

CC: ["City Manager's Correspondence Group - DL"](#)
["Hoese, Karen" <karen.hoese@vancouver.ca>](mailto:karen.hoese@vancouver.ca)
["Krishna, Kaye" <Kaye.Krishna@vancouver.ca>](mailto:Kaye.Krishna@vancouver.ca)
["Kelley, Gil" <Gil.Kelley@vancouver.ca>](mailto:Gil.Kelley@vancouver.ca)

Date: 7/11/2018 11:44:24 AM

Subject: FW: Response to Council Questions - Public Hearing: 3560-3570 Hull St and 2070-2090 E 20th Av

Greetings Mayor and Council-

As promised, I am providing you with answers to your questions regarding 3560-3570 Hull St with a few hours to spare... Hope this information answers your questions. We will summarize this information at the start of the discussion of this topic this afternoon (evening?).

- 1. Some speakers raised concern re: increased traffic with 69 units and entrance to parkade off Hull near cul-de-sac where children play, yet the staff presentation concluded there will be no impact on traffic. Please explain further how 69 new units won't impact traffic.**

Firstly, based on the Traffic Study provided, the development is expected to generate about 16-20 trips in the peak hours. This is overall a low number of trips which we would not expect to have any capacity or safety impacts on the local network. Based on the 2016 census, this area has a 49% active commute to work mode share which is the basis for the low number of generated trips. Census tracts surrounding this area have higher active commute mode shares, potentially due to their closer proximity to the transit stations as noted by speakers. Overall, Grandview-Woodland has some of the highest active mode share tracts in the whole city.

Secondly, there were a number of iterations of the development plan considered with respect to access location. The driveway from East 20th Avenue reduces the potential for traffic impacts in the cul-de-sac compared to an access from a theoretical north-south running lane on the east side of the property. It also reduces the potential for short-cutting noted by other speakers.

- 2. Will the cul-de-sac become a through road?**

At this time, there is no plan for the cul-de-sac to become a through road.

- 3. Why was the 10 ft. lane on east not expropriated as residents offered?**

Engineering's long-term plan for lane connections in this area include a lane dedication along the south side of the subject property (which is obtained as part of the proposal), as well as a 10 ft. dedication along the rear of the properties fronting Marshall St. If you look at the current lane dedication to the southeast of the subject site, it is fairly easy to see how this intention is developing (refer to Figure 6 in the policy report). This is referred to as a '100-year plan' for lanes and roads city-wide and it should not be interpreted as an intention to expropriate the remainder of the lane unless new development takes place.

A number of different iterations of access design were considered. Challenges with existing grades and the desire for tree retention ultimately resulted in the final proposed access to underground parking from East 20th Avenue, and a lane along the south property line for fire access.

- 4. Concerns were raised regarding the east side of the site setback. One speaker said it should be 24 ft., not 5 ft. as planned. Staff response?**

As the *Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy* does not contain design guidelines, staff consider the intent of the base zoning (in this case RS-1). This is a 4-lot consolidation which creates a site over 1 acre in size, which is not a typical RS-1 sized lot. Should 2090 East 20th Avenue have been developed under RS-1, the east property line would have been considered as a side yard setback,

which would require a setback of 4% of the site width (approximately 1.5 m (5 ft.) for a standard 33 ft. lot had it not been consolidated). The applicant is proposing 5 ft. (1.5 m), with the top floor reduced in size. Together with the unconstructed 10 ft. lane dedication, the distance from the proposed building edge to the rear property line of the neighbours is 4.6 m (15 ft.). A group of significant trees is also retained at the north end of the east property line, along with existing landscaping along the unopened lane.

The building will be further developed at the Development Permit stage, where blank side walls and landscaping can be addressed. Conditions have been included in Appendix B to address adding windows to the east elevations of Buildings D and E, as well as various landscaping conditions.

5. Some speakers asked what rents will be charged. Does that have to be revealed if there is no request for DCL waiver?

In cases where an applicant is not seeking a DCL waiver, it is up to the applicant whether or not they wish to provide rental rates at the time of rezoning application. In this case, the applicant has not provided detailed rent rates, but has indicated that the rent levels will be market-driven and based on what the local area can support. A comparative table of rental rates (below) has been included in Appendix E of the policy report to provide context around average market rents for the Eastside of Vancouver (based on new construction since 2005). The Housing Agreement will secure the units as rental for 60 years or life of the building, but does not secure the rental rates.

	Average Market Rent in Newer Buildings - Eastside (CMHC, 2017) ¹	DCL By-Law Maximum Averages - Eastside (CMHC, 2017) ²	Monthly Costs of Ownership for Median-Priced Unit – Eastside (BC Assessment 2017) ³
Studio	\$1,531	\$1,496	\$2,278
1-bed	\$1,689	\$1,730	\$2,739
2-bed	\$2,284	\$2,505	\$3,817
3-bed	No data available	\$3,365	\$5,432

6. One speaker raised issue of water table, a house sinking, and sewage back up. Staff response?

The applicant has retained a geotechnical consultant, who is aware of the concerns with respect to soft soil sites in Vancouver. The design and construction strategies for the project will be fully compliant with the building code requirements to have minimal or no impact to adjacent properties. This will be explored as part of the detailed design stage for the development.

The preliminary investigation conducted at the site indicated the soils to consist of firm to stiff clays overlying dense glacial soils at a depth of 12 ft. below grade. The water table is estimated to be about 5-6 ft. below grade. Additional site investigation and testing will be completed during the next phase of the design development (when there is more access to the property) to confirm the water table elevation, variation, and to confirm the characteristics of the soils (strength and compressibility).

Green Infrastructure submission requirements have been included for the Development Permit stage, included in Appendix B of the policy report, which will require the delineation of drainage areas, a geotechnical study evaluating risks for on-site rainwater infiltration. A Rainwater Management Plan is also required as a rezoning enactment condition.

7. What is the percentage of tree canopy loss? (One speaker’s slides showed considerable tree loss.)

The table below shows a breakdown of all existing trees on site, and proposed replacement trees. Of these, 69 are protected, bylaw-sized trees. Staff note that 14 of the more significant trees are polar trees, for which the lifespan is roughly 50 years – they are believed to be roughly 40 years old, and are showing signs of decline.

Total Trees on Site	By-law Sized Trees	Retained Trees (On-Site)	Replacement Trees Proposed
---------------------	--------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------

With regards to canopy coverage, the current canopy is 4,360 sq. m. The proposed cover at time of tree installation is 1,400 sq. m, 1,875 sq. m at 3 years, and 2,350 sq. m at 10 years post-installation. The 16 large-calliper shade trees to be planted around the perimeter of the site will be roughly 60 ft. at maturity.

8. Has there been a wildlife inventory and impact study on birds and whether or not it complies with Vancouver's Bird Friendly City Strategy.

The submission of a Wildlife Inventory is not required for rezoning applications. At the Development Permit stage, the applicant will be required to show how they are meeting the *Bird Friendly Design Guidelines*. A condition of approval of the Form of Development to this effect has been included in Appendix B.

9. One speaker noted that this application does not comply with the Kensington Cedar Cottage vision regarding heritage protection. Please comment.

This application is being considered under the *Affordable Housing Choices Interim Rezoning Policy*. In addition, the *Kensington-Cedar Cottage Community Vision* applies to this area, and allows rezoning application to be considered which propose heritage retention. Section 20.1 of the Vision encourages the retention of character houses. The application also meets the intent of the *Heritage Policies and Guidelines* through the protection of a building with historic merit which is worthy of protection through a municipal designation.

10. Amenities do not list play spaces for children. Why not?

There is an open area at grade, which was enlarged during the rezoning process through staff review, which provides a child's play area. It is located between the apartment building (Building A) and townhouse units (Buildings C and B) and is 9 m (30 ft.) wide.

An indoor amenity on Level 1 of the apartment building is provided (607 sq. ft.), connected to an amenity patio. Another indoor amenity on Level 4 of the apartment building (300 sq. ft.) is proposed, and will be connected to a shared outdoor amenity space on top of the roof, fronting Hull Street. All of these amenity areas will be reviewed at the development permit stage for compliance with the *High-Density Housing for Families with Children Guidelines*.

11. Are there sufficient childcare facilities in the neighbourhood?

Childcare spaces are in low supply across the City, with only an estimated 37% of the need being met for ages 0-4, and 35% of the need being met for 5-12 year olds.

Licensing, funding, and subsidizing childcare is the mandate of the provincial government. However, the City, working with our community partners, plays a role in planning, coordinating, and advocating for childcare and early learning programs.

Recognizing that childcare is a public amenity intended primarily to support families, the City does its part to address the shortfall city-wide by facilitating the development of new childcare spaces with financing growth tools (CACs, DCLs). It is imperative that the City balance the provision of new and affordable housing with much needed public amenities (such as childcare).

This development site is located in Kensington-Cedar Cottage, which is a high need area for child care (see attached). Only 12% of the estimated need for infant-toddler spaces is met (vs. 19% City-wide), and only 39% of the estimated need for spaces for children ages 3 to 4 is met (vs. 59% City-wide). School age care supply is somewhat better than the City as a whole (37% of need met vs. 35% City-wide).

Of note, while the population of Kensington-Cedar Cottage has been stable between 2011 and 2016, the number of children under age 12 has increased.

A new City-supported, licensed childcare centre is coming on stream in Kensington Cedar Cottage in the near future (estimated opening fall/winter 2019) at Sir Sanford Fleming Elementary school.

Best

Sadhu

Sadhu Aufochs Johnston | City Manager
City of Vancouver | 453 W 12th Avenue
Vancouver | BC V5Y 1V4
604.873.7627 | Sadhu.johnston@vancouver.ca
Twitter: [sadhuajohnston](https://twitter.com/sadhuajohnston)

