
From: Nada
Sent: November 24, 2020 1:19 PM
To: Clerks
Cc: Mom
Subject: Fwd: Submission for By Law NO. 14234, Rez. #16-33
Attachments: Rez #16-33, Nada Knezevich.pdf; ATT00001.htm
Categories: Public Hearing

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Hello,

My name is Nada Knezevich and I live across the street from the address that will be part of today's zoning bylaw amendment 3.2 being heard today at 5pm.

I have attached a submission and would like to request that I put my name down to speak at today's hearing, which I will join via Zoom.

I've never attended a hearing and definitely not via Zoom. Can you explain how I can put my name down to speak at today's hearing? Is it possible to speak at the beginning?

And can you acknowledge receipt

TO: Mayor Mike Hurley, Councilor Dhaliwal, Councilor Calendino, Councilor Wang, Councilor Keithley, Councilor Jordan, Councilor Johnston

From: Nada Knezevich (owner of 6470-6472 Selma Ave.)

Date: Nov. 24, 2020

Re: Rezoning Reference #16-33, Hearing scheduled for rezoning application of 6449 & 6469 Selma Ave.

Hello, my name is Nada Knezevich and I, along with my mother, am the owner of 6470-6472 Selma Ave, which is directly across from the 6469 Selma the southern property of the two referenced in today's hearing.

I have a few points that I wanted to make with regards to this application.

- 1) I want to point out that this application for rezoning is contrary to the Royal Oak OCP as listed on the Burnaby.ca website, which states that for subarea 9 "(5.9.1) The interior portion of the area is indicate as redeveloping to medium-density multiple-family residential emphasizing ground-oriented townhouse forms."
 - a. The recent redevelopment in the last few years of addresses 6510-6518 Selma Ave, from a single family house to a 5 townhouse complex, would be an example that followed the Royal Oak OCP. Note with the redevelopment for 6510-6518 Selma Ave, that was a growth of one residence to five.
 - b. If this development application were to be put through, we would go from two (2) single homes to 74 units, or 37 times growth, that is more than "medium-density" and definitely not "ground-oriented townhouse form" as outlined in the Royal Oak OCP.
- 2) There appears to be a conflict of interest, as per the Oct. 21, 2020 meeting, rezoning reference #16-33, section 4.3, which states that the completion of the sale of the City-owned property, 6449 Selma, is/was a prerequisite of the rezoning application. I kindly request, on behalf of myself and my neighbours that the city be transparent of all details and proceedings with regards to the sale of the property, to the community, and I request that the hearing on this matter be adjourned until such time as the city is able provides full disclosure, so that the community is able to provide input on these matters.
- 3) I question the site coverage calculation of 47% and setback requirements.
 - a. Point G on the plans calculated the area base on a building footprint of 10,296sqft, whereas the in L of the plans the L1 footprint is 10,341sqft. It's not a big difference, but to me it looks like an error. I'm not sure if there are any others.
 - b. And another point is that if you calculate the percentage of the setbacks, they come to 43% only. Which is 10% less ($100\% - 43\% = 57\%$) than the 47% listed in the plans. And a portion of that is driveway. I just think the 47% coverage referenced is misleading.
 - c. I question allowing a minimum setback of 16.10 ft for the east side (Selma Street side) as it is less than the average of over 20 ft on the street.
- 4) In addition to what was already submitted in the signed petition included as Res 16-33 correspondence Tracking 2, I'd like to emphasize that the plans in this application do not provide enough parking and will

only exasperate the existing problem of not enough parking for our block. Please note, that for the whole block (cul-de-sac) in question, that the total number of street parking spaces, not including the two addresses for this application, totals only five (5). Because of either "no parking" areas on the street, and the driveways of people's houses, there is very little street frontage that allows for street parking. We are a block without alleys, and three of the five spaces indicated are for the houses on the corner of Irving, who's property's parking is accessed from Irving, thus giving them street front parking. That, on top of the narrowness of the road (which will be even less once sidewalks are soon installed), makes it very difficult to navigate the road.

- a. As a personal anecdote, our driveway is a sunken driveway, and in certain circumstance I am not even able to drive out and turn right (the quickest way out, northward towards Irving) to leave our block. These circumstances are if someone parks badly across the street, or if there has been a major snow event, which we have had more frequently, such that the piles of snow are high, and if the street has not been plowed (we are always the last to be plowed...if Irving St. is plowed, we usually are not.) I am often forced to turn left and turn around in the cul-de sac before I can drive out.
 - b. This is just an indication of the current parking difficulties that we currently experience on this street, and before the car population increase that would result if this development were to proceed, and is the reason why the minimum of 44 parking stalls (only 37 for residents) would not be sufficient parking spaces for this proposed development.
- 5) This point is to express the potential personal impact of approving this application. Our property, 6470-6472 Selma, is a two level home, but it was built with the basement in-ground (which was what was permitted at the time of development.) In fact our house's top/second floor is basically street level. If the Selma Apartments were to be approved, at 69ft high (with rooftop) we would never see a sunset again.
- 6) This point is to express the potential impact of the demolition and clearing of 6469 Selma on the whole neighbourhood. Please note that 6469 Selma Ave is a very old house, and that the back, westward side of the property is fully lined with dilapidated sheds. I would like to point out that there is a huge rat problem in the neighbourhood, and I would like to request that the owner of the property make sure that he uses proper pest control methods to clear out the rats that are most surely residing on his property.

Thank you,

Signed



NADA KNEZEVICH

From: Christina Ollson
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2020 2:02 PM
To: Clerks
Subject: Rez.#16-33 74 Unit Bldg Proposal for 6449 &

Categories: Public Hearing

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. **The City will never ask for personal or account information or account password through email.** If you feel this email is malicious or a scam, please forward it to phishing@burnaby.ca

Good afternoon,

I am writing as the current occupant of 6449 Selma Ave, Burnaby, BC V5H 3R3.

One of the 2 houses being proposed to be demolished for a 74 Unit building.

I have been experiencing high levels of anxiety as I only found out about this proposal the prior weekend from a neighbour pointing out the notification board in the 6469 Selma Ave front yard.

I did not receive any notification from my landlord (City of Burnaby) that this property had been sold and plans were even being considered. After speaking with Blair Mon Nov 16, he informed me the licensing/zoning department did not notify their department and this has happened before.

Obviously, I object to the proposal even though I imagine I have no say.

I will be attending the zoom meeting at 5pm today as per the notice that was received in the mail this afternoon.

Sincerely,
Christina Ollson
Location Manager