

Isfeld, Lori

From: Linda Light "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 9:07 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Item 9 at Sept. 19 public hearing

Dear Mayor and Council:

I am writing to ask that you postpone any decision on Item 9: Increasing Housing Choice and Character Retention Incentives in the Mount Pleasant and Grandview-Woodland Communities until there has been a fulsome public discussion of the proposed changes and their implications for these two neighbourhoods and the Cedar Cottage neighbourhood abutting Grandview-Woodland.

There has been insufficient public notification and public consultation on these matters, and what little there was took place over the summer when many people were not in town. Further, changes have been made to these proposals as recently as a few days ago. With respect, it is highly offensive to expect the interested public to keep on top of such a wide range of complex matters, where important components keep changing, with little or no notification and on such short notice. There is no way that such a process can be considered responsible public consultation.

While some of the recent changes appear to be in the right direction (reducing the frontage allowed for land assembly in one of the areas, for example, from 100' to 50'), there are many issues that are problematic in this proposal (including character home retention incentives that are simply not strong enough to discourage demolition in any meaningful way). I was involved in the Kitsilano rezoning process in the late 80s and early 90s that resulted in the RT7 and RT8 zoning that has been so successful in retaining the character of Kitsilano. That process took place over a five-year period and involved a great many public meetings where residents were encouraged to express their views in an open public format. That felt like real consultation. Mount Pleasant and Grandview-Woodland deserve no less.

Thank you in advance for postponing these decisions until meaningful public consultation, discussion and feedback can take place.

Sincerely,

Linda Light

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Isfeld, Lori

From: susan briggs "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential)"
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 9:57 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Re: Item 9, Tuesday, September 19, 2017

Dear Mayor and Council:

I am writing to ask that you postpone any decision on Item 9: Increasing Housing Choice and Character Retention Incentives in the Mount Pleasant and Grandview-Woodland communities. Residents of these neighbourhoods have not yet had complete or satisfying public discussion of the proposed changes and their implications for these specific neighbourhoods or those that surround them.

Holding summer consultations, with little advance notice, meant that few residents of Grandview Woodland or Mount Pleasant attended the public information sessions. Worse, the already-complex rezoning proposals underwent changes after the summer public sessions were held. Thus, local residents are ill-informed about and have not yet had time to consider the meaning or effect of these changes. Such a process can not be considered responsible public consultation.

Granted, some of the recent changes appear to protect these two long-established neighbourhoods (reducing the frontage allowed for land assembly in one of the areas, for example, from 100' to 50'), but many other elements in this proposal are problematic, including character home retention incentives that are simply not strong enough to discourage demolition.

It must be noted that other Vancouver neighbourhoods have experienced successful rezoning processes. Kitsilano, for instance, was able to rezone and retain its character, but only after a five-year process that saw numerous public meetings. At those meetings, Kits residents were able to express their views in open public form rather than being forced to write comments on sheets of paper that were stuffed in boxes as Grandview-Woodland and Mt. Pleasant residents left their public information sessions. All neighbourhoods should be treated as Kitsilano was; we all deserve time to participate in genuine public consultation.

Thank you in advance for postponing these decisions until meaningful public consultation, discussion, and feedback can take place.

Sincerely,
Susan M. Briggs
"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential)"

Isfeld, Lori

From: Scott Nelson "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 2:39 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Grandview RT5 rezoning

Dear Mayor Robertson and Council,

I regret that I will be unable to attend the public hearing tomorrow on the grandview/woodland RT5 rezoning. I live in the existing RT5 zone just off commercial drive near McSpadden Park. I'm pleased with the general direction the rezoning process has taken so far, although I think the character retention incentives should be generally stronger. As they stand now it seems like these incentives would neutralize the difficulty of working with a character home, but not provide a significant advantage. A somewhat higher FSR increase or more generous exclusions ought to be included. In addition, I feel like the proposed bylaw changes short change properties without lanes on the character retention and density incentives. I think this ought to be corrected in the bylaw.

For most properties in the new RT5/5N zone, the proposed bylaw will create a modest incentive for character home retention (0.75 vs 0.6 FSR for single family, 0.85 vs 0.75 FSR for infill / duplex). There is also a modest FSR incentive to add additional housing units in the form of laneway or infill housing. However these incentives do not translate very well to properties without lane access. Having no lane takes the infill and laneway options off the table and the attached FSR incentive with it. This leaves little to no incentive for character retention - especially for houses that are below the 0.45FSR underutilized cutoff and houses that are not assessed as having character merit, but could have character merit if they were restored with period cladding and architectural features (My neighbour's house falls into this category, as do many more in the neighbourhood). With a retained character home, having no lane usually means not being able to build a garage. Redevelopment provides a way to build a garage (and it's associated FSR exemption), which further incentivizes demolition over retention*. The other missing piece unavailable to properties with no lane access is the density incentive for laneway or infill housing. More often than not, the blocks with no lanes are situated close to commercial and victoria drive. These are the most walkable parts of the neighbourhood, so I feel like we ought to be incentivizing density at least as much as in the rest of grandview-woodland. These blocks are also some of the most visible in grandview (i.e. adjacent to McSpadden Park, Victoria Park and Templeton Park) and so I feel that the character retention incentive should be at least as strong as in the rest of the neighbourhood.

Here are some changes I think the city could make to level the playing field for properties without lane access:

- Allow 0.85 FSR for additions or MCD on properties without lane access conditional on the number of housing units being the maximum allowable for the property. This would provide both a character retention and a density incentive.
- For two properties that back onto each other, allow infill on the property with the larger rear yard, and an addition to 0.85FSR on the other property
- Allow infills if the property with no lane backs onto a park or if there is a flanking street or park.
- For retained character homes, allow FSR exclusions for bicycle, e-bike, scooter or motorcycles parking in an accessory building for at the rear of the property even if there is no lane or full width driveway for access

With these or similar changes, I think that properties without lanes will be able to access the same incentives as the rest of grandview woodland to retain character homes and provide more diverse housing options. I hope that you will consider taking action so that our little corner of Grandview can benefit from the same kind of policies that are being put in place elsewhere in the neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Scott Nelson

*most people in my neighbourhood who have front garages park their car on the driveway in front of the garage and use the garage itself for other things.

Isfeld, Lori

From: Stephen Bohus "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 9:15 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: opposed: REZONING: Increasing Housing Choice and Character Retention Incentives in the Mount Pleasant and Grandview-Woodland Communities

Dear Mayor and Council,

Please kindly record my opposition to item #9 on the Public Hearing agenda.

The proposed zoning changes will not incentivize the retention of character homes in RT zones in Grandview and Mount Pleasant.

In fact, the changes are flawed and poorly conceived and lack any meaningful public consultation. There has been no peer review of the proposed changes. The "Open House" exercise last week at the Croatian Center did not even have any comment forms. This is appalling. Does the City Planning department not want to hear from residents?

It would be a disservice to rush and pass a poorly-conceived document.

In its current form, the incentives are in place to in fact demolish pre-1940s homes and replace these with new construction. It is a much easier process to do this rather to to infill a character home site.

The RT-7 and RT-8 zoning bylaws for Kitsilano show that the City of Vancouver once had the skills and will to make District Schedules that allow for successful infill and incentives for character home retention.

Surely Eastside residents should be given the same treatment as Westside residents; are we not all equal?

Sincerely,

Stephen Bohus, BLA

Isfeld, Lori

From: Michael Kluckner "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 3:06 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Fwd: Character Home Initiatives

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please repost this to the RT-5 hearing section, as per the first sentence. I gather it was posted into the RS zoning material.

Thanks.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Michael Kluckner "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Date: Sat, Sep 16, 2017 at 10:10 AM
Subject: Character Home Initiatives
To: Public Hearing <publichearing@vancouver.ca>

Dear Mayor and Council,

While I applaud the intent of preserving character houses and creating new opportunities for small suites and a more diverse landscape in the RT areas, I don't believe these new regulations will have the desired effect.

This is a fast-buck speculator's town – and it always has been. The potential loss of about 350 square feet (the .1 FSR penalty for demolishing a character house on a 33 x 120 foot lot) is not sufficient disincentive for a builder for whom time is a critical aspect of making a living and making a profit. I predict these regulations will be seen as too complex, the permit process too onerous, to be used to any great degree.

The result will be the quick evolution of a new Vancouver Special – a cheaply built house little different from what has been happening in the past several years. The neighbourhood will gentrify and the population will probably drop as shared houses and the older homes occupied by multi-generation immigrant families get snapped up and redeveloped.

The loss of design guidelines is another concern. It is unclear to me how "neighbourhood character" can mesh with "modern expression." The result will not be a blossoming of good new architecture, but rather a generic box. As bland as the "Neo Craftsman"-style of design-controlled houses are, they at least present the impression of quality materials and fit relatively well into the streetscapes, whether as detached houses or front-back duplexes.

On another matter, I was unable to get a clear answer at the public information session about "lot consolidation" intended to enable small multi-family dwellings. If ever there was a recipe for neighbourhood disruption and the displacement of the poorest members of a community, it is this. Learn from history – this is the "blockbusting" that went on in Kitsilano 50 years ago, and the wasteland created by lot assemblies elsewhere in Vancouver is an indication of what will happen in Grandview and Mount Pleasant.

If you want multi-family, zone for it rather than creating this patchy little speculator's paradise. Mount Pleasant and Grandview already have good multi-family zones. Spread those zones into nodes throughout the RS areas – that is real community building, something that the planners have missed completely in the RS proposal.

Mount Pleasant and Grandview are the two most diverse neighbourhoods in the city. Their character depends on their diversity – of the people living there and the buildings they live in. If you want your legacy to be disruption, displacement and gentrification, vote for these initiatives. If, however, you want these diverse neighbourhoods to evolve sustainably, send this back for further refinement. In my opinion, these new rules will create another land rush and little else.

Michael Kluckner, "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

Isfeld, Lori

From: David Carman "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 9:20 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: RT5-RT6 Zoning

Hello,

I am writing to voice my disapproval at this point of the proposed RT5-RT6 zoning in Grandview-Woodland (Item 9: Increasing Housing Choice and Character Retention Incentives). Giving the public less than a week to respond to a final revised draft bylaw, after a short and inadequate consultation process that has had no public input on many of the important details, is unacceptable. The public hearing should be postponed until there are substantial changes to the draft to make it community supportable.

When a similar zoning debate took place in Kits quite a number of years ago there was much more community consultation, participation and time given to a matter that can potentially create drastic change in a neighbourhood.

Regards,
David Carman

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 10:40 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: FW: Postpone approval of RT five and RT six to allow community input

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

-----Original Message-----

From: Livio "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 7:22 AM
To: Correspondence Group, City Clerk's Office
Subject: Postpone approval of RT five and RT six to allow community input

Mayor and council.

Please postpone approval of RT5 and RT6 to allow for community input.

Thanks

Livio
Sent from my iPhone

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Celia Brauer "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 11:38 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Response to Infill Options for Vancouver Residents - Item 9 - REZONING: Increasing Housing Choice and Character Retention Incentives in the Mount Pleasant and Grandview-Woodland Communities

Greetings,

I am a resident of a home with RS-7 zoning at "s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"

I would like to speak about new infill housing options for RS-7 since I would like to built an infill on my existing property. I have a 8600 square foot lot and am just shy of the 10,000 squarer foot limit on RS-7. In this case, I cannot add a small bit of density to the area which seems like a shame. There is no possibility to build a laneway house since there is a townhouse development at the back of my lot.

Sincerely,

Celia Brauer
"s.22(1) Personal and Confidential"