

**The following item(s) of
correspondence were received in
opposition to Rezoning Reference #
14-19.**

Ibrahim, Sabreena

From: wendyhon1
Sent: June-16-15 1:13 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: Public Hearing

To whom this may concern,

Thank you for your letter informing us that there will be further development in the already overdeveloped and overcrowded area of Burnaby we call home. I am a home owner at 6240 McKay Avenue and in the past year, I've only seen more construction and more traffic problems surrounding this area because of your idea of "rezoning" and bringing more unaffordable housing to an area where low-income families find housing. I am sure I am not the only one who feels this way as you can walk around the neighbourhood to find graffiti and signs that are very much against all this overdevelopment of a once family and low-income friendly neighbourhood. This is getting a little RIDDICULOUS! We were okay with the 3 you've already built in the past year and 2 more are coming but now another one?? When are you guys going to stop ruining this neighbourhood? When the whole of Beresford Street is high rises and housing for the rich and all the low-income families are homeless?

Please! Think of the people of Burnaby and all the families who live in the low-rises! I know my word isn't going to change anything because you have probably sold the land to the developers already but please... JUST STOP!

Sincerely,
from a very concerned neighbour
Wendy Hon

Sent from Samsung Galaxy Note

Chris Kopar
205 – 6677 Sussex Ave
Burnaby, B.C.
V5H 3C5

June 17, 2015

Mayor and Council
c/o Office of the City Clerk
4949 Canada Way
Burnaby, BC V5G 1M2

Dear Mayor and Council Members of the City of Burnaby,

I appreciate the time, effort, and patience you each apply in governing our city. I would like to thank you for taking the time to listen to the many fellow citizens about such a controversial subject as zoning bylaw amendments.

I have three concerns about the proposed amendment to Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965, specifically the amendment to the 6380 and 6420 Silver Avenue locations. They relate to the issues of how a change in the land use designation will affect property affordability, construction inconvenience, and social service levels.

My first concern is that the proposed new high rise apartments and low-rise townhouses will not be affordable to the residents that call this area home. In the last few years there has been redevelopment of several 3 storey multifamily apartments to high rise and low-rise townhouse configuration. A quick napkin calculation utilizing the market price data from the Realtor.ca website reveals that the units being sold in these new developments start at over \$330,000. The Realtor.ca website also provides a breakdown (from Stats Canada data) about the demographics of the area. The majority (77%) of households have an income of less than \$66,000, with 48% having a household income of less than \$30,000. While I commend the city's efforts to address the affordability issue with its tenant assistance plan condition to development, I am still worried that my most vulnerable neighbours will have to move out of the area. Simply put, the majority of residents in the area could not afford to move into one of the units proposed in the new development. Even with a household income of \$60,000 per year, \$30,000 down payment, a low interest rate of 2.75%, and a 25 amortization period, the maximum mortgage available, according to the CMHC, is under \$340,000. I fear that despite the tenant assistance plan's conditions many of my senior, mobility restricted, and rigidly fixed income neighbours will have to move to locations that isolate them from nearby public transport like the SkyTrain and bus routes that they rely on to be mobile and functioning members of our city.

My second point is a little more personal. There has been quite a bit of disruption during the construction of the high-rise and townhouse developments in the last few years. Added to the prospective demolition, new excavation, and construction at the proposed site at 6380 and 6840 Silver Ave, there is the refurbishment of the Metrotown Skytrain station. I feel that the two projects, adjacent

to each other, will be of major disruption to car drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians. In essence the entire area, already impeded by SkyTrain construction, will be even more congested by the proposed new construction. There will be days, if the proposed amendment is passed and construction initiated, where Beresford Ave and the pedestrian walkway on both sides of Beresford Ave will be closed. On those days there will be only Central Blvd's now very narrow walkway for pedestrians and bicyclists to utilize in travelling from the SkyTrain entrance to the western part of the neighbourhood (library, Willingdon Ave.) Simply, this neighbourhood has in the past and continues now in the present to sustain quite a bit of inconvenience for development projects.

My third point relating to the proposed amendment to the Zoning By-Law is the pressure the proposed development will place on the social services in the area. In the last two years there has been the construction of at least 3 new high-rise or townhouse developments within a 500m radius of each other. There is also construction occurring on the very large Station Square development. I am concerned that the influx of new residents in such a small area over such a brief timespan will affect the quality and quantity of social services available to every resident, new or established. Services such as public recreation (parks, library, and Bonsor Recreation Centre) will be utilized by more people. The Burnaby School District (BSD) may also be affected by the rapid influx of new students to the area. Being originally from Toronto and as a teacher, I have seen the effect rapid densification development can have on the quality of education provided to students that simply do not fit into the pre-existing schools. I do not want something similar to occur here. Additionally, I am concerned that the level of fire and police protection will not have been adequately been increased for the rise in residential and commercial space proposed in the amended zoning by-law project.

For these three reasons I feel that the council should decline the amendment to the zoning bylaw at this time. I propose that the issue be revisited at a minimum once the SkyTrain station refurbishment has been completed. Growth is good, but it should occur with an understanding of the consequences. I do not feel the community is ready to absorb the consequences of economically forced migration, increased construction annoyances, and decreased social service levels. I feel that a pause in this particular zoning by-law amendment will also give residents, planners (city, RCMP, BSD, future developers), and social service providers (including the city's own recreation department) in the area time to understand and adapt to the changes that are already occurring in the area. Please delay the continued rapid development of my neighbourhood by not approving this zoning-by-law amendment.

I thank you for your time and I welcome any communication with you or the city concerning these issues.

Chris Kopar



RZ 14-19
SILVER 0 ✓

Ibrahim, Sabreena

From: Trevor Dsouza
Sent: June-18-15 11:23 AM
To: Clerks
Subject: Rezoning Reference #14-19

TREVOR DSOUZA

209 – 6420 Silver Ave, Burnaby, BC. V5H 2Y5

To whom it may concern,

I am writing this email to appeal against the rezoning application put before the city for my apartment building. I have just moved 2 weeks ago to this apartment building from Vancouver solely because of the rising rent in Vancouver. These low rise buildings with affordable rent are home to many new families and the working class. Construction of new high rise towers will not only displace us from the neighborhood but also increase the rent of the area which used to be an affordable housing for low income group.

Therefore it is my sincere request to stop demolition of these buildings and plan to create affordable housing in metrotown.

Regards,
Trevor Dsouza.

Ibrahim, Sabreena

OL

From: HARVEY SUN
Sent: June-14-15 1:45 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: Re: Proposed Amendment to Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965

Dear Burnaby City Council:

My name is Hui Lin Sun. I am a resident of 206 -6420 Silver Ave. Burnaby V5H2Y5.

As an existing resident at 6420 Silver Ave, I am highly against the application and intention by Belford Properties Ltd. in an effort to amend the fore-mentioned bylaw.

My fellow tenants and I are trying all we could to prevent the property developer from taking away the last piece of affordable housing in the community of Metrotown that we are left with access to.

Passing the amendment will cause a drastically negative economic impact in my life, no need to mention the huge inconvenience as a result of having to find a new home and move.

Thank you very much for giving me this chance to be heard.

Hui Lin Sun

Resident of 6420 Silver Ave.
Burnaby, BC

Ibrahim, Sabreena

From: fran reinfjell
Sent: June-21-15 12:57 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: STOP the Demolition

My partner and I hereby want to protest the demolitions in the Metrotown area and everywhere else in Burnaby

Frances Reinfjell
Gary McDonald

Rez Ref # 14-19
Bylaw # 13482

Written Submission to the Public Hearing of
23rd June 2015

Burnaby Zoning Bylaw 1965 (Amends Bylaw 17, 2015)
Rezoning Reference #14-19
Subject Properties: 6380 and 6420 Silver Avenue

Rez Ref # 14-19
Bylaw # 13482

Submission From: Robert Quicke, residing Telmara Manor (apartment 218) at 6525 Telford Avenue (directly east across the lane way of the subject site).

Having received written notice of this public hearing, and being unable to attend due to work out of town, I wish to provide the Burnaby Council with several comments with regards to the application by Belford Properties for a two tower highrise on these properties.

While redevelopment in the area of our residence is both desirable, due to its proximity to efficient public transit (Metrotown Skytrain and Bus Loop) and inevitable (due to rising population in the Greater Vancouver Regional District) I am, at present, **opposed** on several grounds to the rezoning from RM3 (Multiple Families Residential) of these properties.

Points of Concern

I would suggest that, rather than consider development of properties near Metrotown on a "one by one" basis, examining and approving applications for individual locations, Burnaby Council needs to have a Comprehensive Strategy for the whole neighbourhood near Beresford Street south of the Skytrain line. That strategy should include a mix of low-rise, medium rise and high rise apartment buildings, along with rental and resident owned town house modules.

It would seem that, as developers acquire properties along Beresford street and plan high rise complexes, those of us living in the older, low rise complexes south of Beresford will soon be "walled in" by an artificial forest of structures that loom over our humble abodes. This has the potential to restrict our access to sunlight, to open views of the sky and even hinder physical access to the green spaces (such as Maywood Park) that currently exist and those aspects which can provide for a better livability quotient in a neighbourhood.

Already one development along Beresford Street (MetroPlace) is completed and occupied while three more west of Silver have received approval and are under way. What plans are in place to address the resulting congestion? Does the in-place infrastructures (water, sewer, hydro and telecommunications) have sufficient future capacities to handle an influx of new residents to this area?

The construction of new high rise complexes, even those built to the current standards, are often less likely to sustain their habitation potential over the long run. Smaller, low rise buildings, even those 60 or more years of age, are less expensive to repair and upgrade, as

well as providing accommodation to those within society whose financial resources are limited (students, retirees and person who are mobility or emotionally challenged) while newer high rise complexes are usually inhabited only by a minority part of our citizens. Code upgrading older buildings, because of their very design, can be more easily accomplished than are similar upgrades for a high rise edifice.

I have downloaded and read the supporting documentation (dated 20 May 2015) and the reports of the Advisory Planning Commission (dated 11 June 2015). It would seem that the Planning Department recommendations are in favour of this re-zoning and the subsequent redevelopment as planned by the applicant.

While there are many aspects of this development plan that hold merit and are of value to our community, the plan as currently submitted also has some serious problematic elements.

Positive Aspects:

- Increased density within walking distance of transit;
- A planned child care component;
- Encouragement of Electric vehicle use;
- Provisions for bicycle secure parking;

Problem Aspects:

- Height;
- Public Safety;
- Capacity;
- Lane Access;
- Restaurant;
- Location;
- Sanitary Infrastructure;

Let me elaborate.

HEIGHT: While no measurements were given in the documentation, as stated in the development outline two towers are planned for this site, one of 26 floors and one of 41 floors. Given an approximation of 10 feet (3.05 metres) per floor these are 260 feet (79.3 metres) and 410 feet (125.06 metres) high, with the taller one closest to Beresford Street. This will contribute to the "walled in" atmosphere alluded to earlier in my presentation.

PUBLIC SAFETY: At this point in time, no fire rescue equipment exists in the GVRD to reach anywhere near the tops of either of these towers nor many others in the City. (The largest one of which I am aware is the City of Vancouver 136 foot "cherry-picker" basket lift stationed in its downtown core). In the event of a prolonged power outage, or strong smoky fire event, I question how residents in the upper floors of any high-rise would be able to cope with the long descent on fire door inhibited, concrete stairways. I would ask the Council and Planning Department staff: ***What logic is there in permitting construction which could place future residents in harm during a serious crisis?***

CAPACITY: As outlined in the development plan, a total of 479 residential units will be built in this complex which supersedes the 109 currently on the site. Based on the sizing breakdown in the development proposal (assuming an unlikely conservative eventuality that each bedroom contains just *one* resident) at least 761 new residents will be added to this one site. Given that this development plan includes a child care facility and a childrens' play area, we can safely presume a much higher total residency since couples with offspring will be part of the marketing target for these new apartments. ***Is this a realistic jump for our neighbourhood to sustain?***

LANE ACCESS: As stated in the development plan, vehicle access for the 41 floor tower will be from the rear lane way east of Silver. The lane way is already overtaxed and, possessing a 90 degree right turn at its southern extremity, making it unsuitable for use by more traffic. That lane way also provides access for myself and other tenants of Telmara Manor.

Since the occupancy last summer of MetroPlace next door to our homes, we have already seen repeated instances of traffic flow disruption in that lane way. This becomes even more obvious on those days when municipal garbage collection takes place, as multiple green disposal bins are extricated from underground parking locations and placed into the lane way for subsequent retrieval by the large packer trucks.

Additionally, northbound exit from the lane way puts a stress on Beresford Street vehicle flow. Eastward traffic must skirt past the community shuttle stop between Sussex and Telford to use Sussex or Dow (both residential streets) to reach Imperial. Westward traffic must negotiate a rather poorly designed exit onto, or across Willingdon.

How can the addition of 5 times the residential capacity not seriously hinder those of us already dependant on that lane way for egress from our homes?

RESTAURANT: The development plan calls for a 365 seat restaurant. This neighbourhood is a residential area and such a component is simply out of character and incompatible with the needs and desires of our neighbours.

While it might be of some recreational benefit to the residents of the new towers, and those of us nearby, a 365 seat dining facility will most likely market itself to the wider community, thus aggravating the already over taxed parking in our neighbourhood. [See also the following item]

LOCATION: While commercial ventures which provide community enhancement, such as Neighbourhood House (in MetroPlace), dental, medical and optical services are desirable in a development such as proposed here, a large commercial enterprise, such as the proposed restaurant is better suited to a commercially zoned area, as is the north side of Central Avenue or Kingsway where transit access is similar to that available on Silver at Beresford, but where prolific parking and easier vehicle traffic flow are possible.

SANITARY INFRASTRUCTURE: I have already alluded to the potential over burdening of the *insitu* water and sewers in this neighbourhood and can only speculate on what might happen if, during a prolonged heavy rainfall (not unheard of in our winter climate), all of the potentially 800 new residents of this development decide to flush their toilets during the same break of a Canucks television broadcast.

Closing Remarks and Suggestions

I am not one to point out flaws without also offering some insight into potential solutions.

TO ADDRESS TRAFFIC FLOW:

- Maintain the north side of Beresford Street as a “No Stopping/ No Parking” zone from Dow to Willingdon;
- Establish a “3 minute Drop-off Zone” for transit passengers on the south side of Beresford between Telford and the lane east of Telford;
- Make the balance of Beresford, from Willingdon to Dow a metered 2 hour parking zone;
- Establish designated “Car Share” parking zones (20 to 30 metres long) from Beresford on one side of Sussex, Telford, Silver and McKay Streets;
- Make parking on all other residential streets south of Beresford and north of Imperial (between Dow and Willingdon) 2 hour enforced use, except with a residential permit from city hall;
- Eliminate the stop sign at westbound Beresford at Willingdon and install a traffic control light system (Integrated with that currently at Central and Willingdon) to allow a safe and orderly exit from Beresford, north or south on Willingdon and across towards Patterson;
- Remove the hydro poles which intrude on the lane way between Telford and Silver and make the lane way “one Way” northbound use;

TO ADDRESS PUBLIC SAFETY AND NEIGHBOURHOOD LIVABILITY

- Place a moratorium on all future developments where heights exceed the fire services reach for rescue;
- Ensure any future development along Beresford will provide for avenues of light and visibility to those of us who may reside in the smaller and older complexes in this neighbourhood;
- Determine that residential zoning will not be overridden by developers including commercial enterprises in otherwise sound and necessary growth plans;

I hope that my thoughts and observations will prove useful to the Council and Planning Departments of the City of Burnaby and that together, we will be able to accommodate the development of a viable city centre focus around Metrotown which is also enhance the well-being, health and comfort of all residents in this area.

Hodnett, Pierrette

From: Cleave, Sid
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2015 4:45 PM
To: Hodnett, Pierrette
Subject: FW: Proposed rezoning 6380, 6420 Silver Ave

From: helen chris
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2015 10:32 AM
To: Clerks
Subject: Proposed rezoning 6380, 6420 Silver Ave

Dear Mayor Corrigan and Council

This is to inform you that I strongly oppose the rezoning of 6380 and 6420 Silver Avenue.

Reasons include:

Legality of rezoning proposal and process in question:

The Metrotown Community Plan which is to be followed unless amended states that Maywood neighbourhood low-rises (such as the Silver Ave apartments) "should be protected", not demolished.

The Metrotown Community Plan and Burnaby's Official Community Plan have not been amended as required under the Local Government Act to allow for the increased "s" density/FAR proposed for this site or for the four Town Centres in Burnaby. Hence the rezoning proposal appears to be illegal.

The maximum height for the R5 zoning on Silver Ave is 3 storeys.

The creation of the 's' zoning in Dec 2010 was to be in the context of an amendment to the community plan including the legally required broad public consultation which was to begin "immediately" with Metrotwon but has not taken place.

Comprehensive Development designation that accompanies the "s" designation has been applied to numerous sites in Burnaby both in and out of Town Centres, but "there is no process" for this designation according to email from planning staff J Schumann. There needs to be open, transparent, known processes and public consultation for such zoning designations or pre-designations.

Mayor and Council are on the public record calling for respect for local bylaws, public consultation, transparent democratic processes, diversity, inclusion, welcome of diverse ethnic and cultural groups, concern for vulnerable families, etc. These laudable concerns need to be applied to this situation also and urgently.

Impact on people's lives and our community and taxes:

The rezoning would result in eviction of the tenants from their homes in 109 units - how many people would this be? Estimate: at least 300. Hundreds have already been evicted from other buildings in Maywood.

The tenants are lower-income people many from vulnerable groups and/or with intersecting disadvantages/vulnerabilities that are eligible for protection in BC and Canadian human rights laws. These

include: low-wage workers, under-employed & unemployed people, single parents and their children, immigrants, refugees, non-English speakers, elders, fixed income, persons with disabilities, ethnic and racial minorities, etc.

The tenants will not be able to afford to buy or rent the proposed condo tower units at this address or other Metrotown or Burnaby sites.

The tenants will be displaced from their homes and from their neighbourhood and community in Burnaby.

The potential rezoning and the threatened eviction of these and thousands of others in Maywood causes distress, turmoil, hardship and fear in the lives of these people.

Such distress and social marginalization are known to increase the incidence of: homelessness, violence against women, spousal abuse, child abuse and neglect, suicide and self harm, substance abuse, violent crime, sexual exploitation, radicalization, family breakdown, poverty, educational non-achievement, and adverse mental and physical health, as well as all the extreme dollar costs to taxpayers of efforts to ameliorate these easily avoidable effects.

I am told that other evicted tenants were told to "move to Surrey" by the Mayor at a Public Hearing for rezoning another Maywood building. Councillors have called the Maywood neighbourhood - which resembled parts of N Bby, Kitsilano, Montreal - a 'slum', a 'ghetto' and a 'mistake'.

Such comments damage the reputation of Burnaby in the wider community and world.

Such comments furthermore encourage a climate of contempt and disregard for the individuals and the vulnerable groups living in the Maywood area, and for others like them elsewhere: single mother families, refugees, immigrants, ethnic/cultural/religious minorities, low-wage employees, low-income people, seniors, persons with disabilities. The climate of contempt Council is encouraging with these statements may nurture violence towards women, sexism, racism, and social ostracism and exclusion.

These people like all people should not be treated with dignity and respect, and not as disposable fodder for low wage employers and social service providers.

Density measure:

There is no guarantee of increased population density from the construction of the towers as density is not measured by population per acre, but by units per acre - according to information from planning staff L Pelletier at a Public Hearing in 2014. The tower condos proposed units may be bought and not occupied or not occupied year-round or by more than one person. Thus the goal of accommodating expected higher population under the RGS may not be met by this strategy.

Liability & evidence based policy on seismic issues:

A Jan 2014 highly-publicized report from UBC and UVic seismic engineers that I have brought to Council's attention numerous times concluded that shaking from an earthquake in the lower mainland would be 3-4 times more intense than previously estimated and last longer. It stated that "tall buildings" would be particularly at risk. The report urged/recommended that community plans and building codes be updated to incorporate this new evidence. This is in line with need for evidence based policy. The proposed towers are "tall buildings". Council's encouraging and allowing construction of these "tall buildings" without regard for first addressing the recommended revisions of plans and building codes puts thousands of lives at unnecessary risk in the event of an expected earthquake, and may put the City of Burnaby at risk of financial liability for failure to act on existing evidence in the course of its fiduciary duties to residents and businesses.

It makes little sense to spend millions on seismic upgrades for schools when the staff, children, and parents spend far more time in homes in "tall building" that are not built to meet the current evidence base.

Planning process invalidated and compromised by appearance of corruption:
Council's commitment to avoiding corruption and the appearance of corruption, and its commitment to transparency, democracy, integrity, and consultation in development in Burnaby are compromised and cast into doubt and disrepute by the Council's political party's acceptance of political campaign donations from both developers and development related trade unions. Donations of approx \$140,000 were received in the 2014 campaign from developers alone.

Planning staff have actively favoured particular developers by recommending the services of at least one (Bosa) to a property owner considering development, and by advising another developer (EPTA Properties) of the impending financial doom of a particular community non-profit organization (the Hastings Legion) that was facing extreme financial pressure due to high property taxes, according to an article on the Globe and Mail.

Planning staff have compromised the integrity of the planning process by stipulating requirements that do not in fact exist that favour large developers. Staff have informed property owners that assembling multiple properties is required prior to redevelopment where it is not required by anything in plans or bylaws.

Sincerely,

Helen Ward - 4819 Albert St Burnaby

Ibrahim, Sabreena

From: Murray Martin
Sent: June-23-15 11:24 AM
To: Clerks
Subject: Public hearing submission June 23rd

Rez Ref # 14-19
Bylaw # 13482

RE: Rez. #14-19
6380 and 6420 Silver Avenue

Dear Council,

I am writing in regard to the rezoning of two low-rise purpose built rental units at 6830 and 6420 Silver Ave. As a long-time resident of Burnaby I am deeply opposed to this rezoning application.

Burnaby faces a crisis in rental housing and the destruction of existing rental property will exacerbate the problem. Vacancy rates in Burnaby are close to 1% and the number of purpose built rental apartments declined in 2013-2014 by 267 units according to CMHC data. CMHC states that this has resulted in tenants in these buildings being forced to find 'alternative rental accommodations in and around the area, pushing vacancy rates lower and rents higher.' (1) The total number of purpose built rental has declined from 12,715 in 2004 to 12,357 units in 2014 (2). This represents a 3% decline of purpose-built rental units in Burnaby in the last decade while the population has grown between 15-20% over the same period of time.

According to a 2014 OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) report, Canada's shortage and lack of affordability of rental housing is due in large part to the replacement of purpose-built rentals with condos (3). The result is when purpose-built rentals are demolished to make way for condominiums, lower income workers and families face higher rents and lower vacancy rates. Many will be forced to move out of Burnaby by the lack of availability of relatively inexpensive rental housing.

While the root of the problem with housing affordability does lie with the Federal and Provincial governments, municipalities can take action to protect existing purpose-built rentals. Condominium development coming at the expense of lower-income folk living in Burnaby will aggravate problems with homelessness, gentrification and housing affordability in Burnaby and Metro Vancouver. With this in mind I am asking Burnaby City council not to approve the rezoning of the purpose built rental properties at 6380 and 6420 Silver Avenue.

Thank you,

Murray Martin
7235 Salisbury Ave, Apt 1403
Burnaby BC, V5E4E6

- (1) Rental Market Report - Vancouver and Abbotsford-Mission CMAs - Fall 2014, page 3
(2) Rental Market Report - 2004 Vancouver Rental Market Report, page 9 and (above 2014)
(3) <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/economy/housing/the-real-estate-beat/canadas-condo-mania-to-blame-for-lack-of-affordable-rentals-oecd/article19133344/>

Ibrahim, Sabreena

From: Joe Salimba
Sent: June-23-15 2:40 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: rezoning of 2 apartment buildings at 6380 and 6420 silver ave.

i'm very,very,very strongly opposed to demolition of those 2 apartment buildings.

Rez Ref # 14-19
Bylaw # 13482