

Isfeld, Lori

From: Guy Cross s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Tuesday, September 19, 2017 5:28 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Public Hearing - September 19, 2017 - Increasing Housing Choice and Character Retention Incentives in the Mount Pleasant and Grandview-Woodland Communities

Dear Mayor and Council,

I am writing to express my opposition to subject proposed bylaw amendments.

While I am not fully informed as to the details of proposed amendments, my understanding is that local residents are of the view that the City is advancing these amendments with little to no public input, and that the changes will allow for amalgamation of lots, additional density, and land uses that are currently permitted under established planning -- all of this, in the absence of further public consultation and/or established local support.

Please reject these proposed amendments and direct staff to undertake appropriate public consultation.

Thank you,

Guy Cross

Isfeld, Lori

From: Jaydene Cormier s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Wednesday, September 20, 2017 11:31 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Comments for Item 9 of the September 20 Public hearing-against

Dear Mayor and Council. I am a 20 year home-owner of an over 100 YO character house in Mount Pleasant.

We were very much looking forward to the proposed zoning changes and are sadly shocked at the potentially glaring penalization it brings.

We love our house and our preference would be to keep it and continue to add value to it. Make no mistake our choice is to do all of those things and would welcome the opportunity to continue with the proposed incentives provided to upgrade and add a laneway house. This could be a game changer for our family.

However, given the (presently unknown) set of building upgrade requirements we may not be able to afford that option. It may be more economical and albeit environmentally and mechanically sound to replace the structure altogether – but to do that we would be penalized 0.1 FSR. Our only option being proposed in replacing our house is to replace it with a smaller, 0.5 FSR house and .16 laneway.

To not have the option to build a duplex discriminates against us.

We are long term residents of Mt. Pleasant, looking to continue to raise our three kids and care for our aging parents in a safe, family home and for years to come – we love our community and appreciate that good communities need solid backbones – people that are committed to the future of their street, neighbourhood and communities – people who want to invest in their property for the long run.

I am not sure if it is the developers you are targeting – but it is the homeowners who are unfairly discriminated against. Should this go ahead – that 60 year old bungalow and the 10 others like it on our street, many of whom have been run down and unattended for decades – will be worth more than my house and other character houses in the neighbourhood – if only because their resale will allow for a duplex build. The long-term impact is those character houses start to go into ruin as people do not invest in something that does not ensure a positive return. This is not a solid plan looking into the future. It contravenes your own density goal.

I encourage you to keep incentives for people to augment these old houses and but please don't penalize us in the process by not affording us the same choices as our neighbours. I ask you to keep the duplex option (or 0.6+0.16) available to homeowners of character houses, noting that incentives move people, and penalties detract.

The second point I would like council to address is the proposed relaxed off-street parking requirement. I support densification most definitely, however, it needs to be thoughtfully done. Other cities like San Francisco that have densified and not managed the parking demand are now facing enormous challenges.

In the past ten years we have seen eleven houses on our block demolished and rebuilt into duplexes, four of which are happening as we speak and there are numerous bungalow style houses that I am sure will be preyed upon as soon as they are marketable. The parking issues that have ensued have been measurable. Those one family homes that may have had a max of two cars are now home to two families with up to four cars.

Families moving into duplexes have stuff, ride bikes, have camping gear, kids play hockey, and stuff means the car moves out. I don't blame them, but I also believe people need to be encouraged to remain responsible to the space cars take up. Unless it is a couple without children or a single person none of the new garages with these home have a vehicle in them, and its not because they are all riding bikes and transit. Families need cars, it's a fact. Increasing affordability means more families, which means more cars. We must take this into account with the zoning proposal.

We support your efforts to increase density, housing stock and hopefully affordability so that more families and can live and work in Vancouver. I ask you not to relax the parking requirement and encourage inclusion of off-street parking requirement outside of a garage structure, lest we fall into the same predicament at SF.

Thirdly I respectfully have to point out that this has all happened a bit too fast, over the summer months and with out adequate consultation. The third open house was woefully inadequate, in so many ways.

I think council would have to look back quite far in the archives to find a rezoning proposal like this in September, that was initiated in April of the same year. I believe we could all agree it is just a bit rushed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaydene Cormier