

Isfeld, Lori

From: Elizabeth Murphy s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2017 5:41 PM
To: Robertson, Gregor; De Genova, Melissa; Carr, Adriane; Ball, Elizabeth; Affleck, George; Reimer, Andrea; Deal, Heather; Jang, Kerry; Louie, Raymond; Stevenson, Tim; Public Hearing
Cc: Johnston, Sadhu; Quinlan, Kevin; Kelley, Gil; Munro, Kent; D'Agostini, Marco; Molaro, Anita; Pecarski, Randy; Huber, Paula; Dunnet, Allison; Hiebert, Karis; Cho, Edna
Subject: RT5/RT6 zonig changes public hearing
Attachments: Murphy-Public Hearing RT5-RT6 Sept-21-2017.pdf

September 21, 2017

Mayor Robertson and Councillors
City of Vancouver

Dear Mayor Robertson and Councillors,

Re: RT5 / RT6 Zones - Proposed Amendments in the Mount Pleasant and Grandview-Woodland Communities

It is appreciated that the proposed RT5 zoning is to have conditional incentives for retention of character homes. However, many aspects of these zoning changes will have the opposite effect and should be amended. Therefore, approval on this item should be deferred until these issues can be addressed and the proposal changed to reflect it.

The consultation process of a few open houses is not sufficient. **Please refer this back to staff to work with the community in a more meaningful way** by addressing the many issues raised by the Grandview Woodland Area Council (GWAC) and Mt. Pleasant residents.

Both Grandview and Mt. Pleasant are heritage areas. Most of the areas include streetscapes that are intact with existing character and heritage houses, many of which are already converted into multiple suites and duplexes. It is important that the changes to the RT5 zone reflect that and encourage the retention of those buildings with renovations and new development that retain the character streetscape. These areas deserve more attention.

There are too many issues to list them all here. The following represent only a few of the many concerns.

RT5 and RT6 Zoning Schedules requested changes shown in italics and underlined.

4.4 Front Yard

4.4.1 The required front yard shall be ~~a minimum depth of 7.3 m or 20% of the lot depth, whichever is less.~~
a minimum depth equal to the average of the minimum front yard depths on the two adjacent sites shall be provided, except that:

(a) where an adjacent site is vacant, the next adjacent site that is not vacant should be used to determine the average;

(b) if one or more of the adjacent sites front on a street other than that of the development site, or the adjacent sites are separated by a street or lane, or the Director of Planning is satisfied that one or more of the adjacent sites is an anomaly, then such adjacent sites shall not be used in computing the average;

(c) where the site is adjacent to a flanking street or lane, the depth shall equal the single adjacent site.

4.7 Floor Space Ratio

4.7.1 On a site without a character house, the floor space shall not exceed 0.60, except, if consideration is first given to the intent of this Schedule and all applicable policies and guidelines adopted by Council, the Director of Planning may permit an increase to the maximum floor space ratio, as follows: (Make RT5 match RT6)

4.18 Dwelling Unit Density

4.18.1 The total number of dwelling units shall not exceed 62 units per hectare, except when a character house is retained up to 74 units per hectare, except where the calculation of dwelling units per hectare results in a fractional number, in which case, the nearest whole number shall be taken and one-half shall be rounded up to the next nearest whole number.

Delete entirely: section 4.19 Number of Buildings On Site and 4.19.1 (Relates to allowing two new houses on one lot, also delete all other references.)

1. Rebalance the development options to the economic benefit of retention of character houses.

The proposed RT5 development options are too biased towards demolition and new construction rather than for character house retention incentive options. The economics of the development options benefits demolition and new construction by allowing a duplex with two secondary suites; two detached houses on one small lot; a laneway house with a detached house; multifamily dwellings of 4 strata units on 50 ft. lots with up to 2 lot assembly. (Thankfully reduced from 100 ft. lots) However, density has increased from 74 units per hectare, from 62 UPH, for new development, when most retention incentive zones only allow 74 UPH for retention options.

In contrast, for character house retention options are only: single detached with a secondary suite and laneway house; strata infill; multiple conversion dwelling (MCD) of two or three units for strata; or a combination of MCD and infill, either strata or non-strata.

Therefore, this should be rebalanced to reduce the options for new development while increasing the options for more incentives for retention of character homes, especially since Grandview and Mt. Pleasant are mostly intact with its historical character.

a) Increase incentive options for retention of character houses:

- i. Allow an additional secondary suite with a single-family for a total of two secondary suites; and
- ii. Allow a secondary suite with an MCD duplex in a character house.

b) Reduce the proposed options for new construction:

- i. If a character house is demolished, do not allow a laneway house with a new single family;
- ii. Do not allow two principal detached houses on one small lot for new construction. This undermines the incentive for character retention with infill;
- iii. Do not allow assembly of lots for new multifamily construction to decrease speculation and inflationary development pressures that inflate land prices.; and
- iv. Do not allow parking relaxations for new construction, only for character retention options.

Increasing secondary suites is consistent with the city's policy to provide more rentals, mortgage helpers, and improve affordability. MCDs require full building code upgrades to for strata. Secondary suites can have relaxations through the Secondary Suite Program so are more affordable for owners.

Changes are needed to the Vancouver Building Bylaw (VBB) for relaxations to the building code to allow two secondary suites, similar to what was done for one secondary suite to meet health and safety requirements. Please have staff include recommended changes to the VBB as part of this report.

Secondary suites are less likely to have negative impacts on the site such as loss of trees, landscape and sunlight that larger infills would have.

Note that secondary suites are more attractive for some homeowners than MCDs or infill since secondary suites are less likely to have tax implications on capital gains tax exemptions for the loss of principal residence status that would come with strata or a separate detached dwelling unit.

Providing more Secondary Suites as incentives for character retention means more rentals, a key city policy. With the ban on short term rentals in secondary suites, this also means more long term rentals.

2. Use the existing RT5 / RT6 Design Guidelines that emphasize compatibility with the historical architecture and streetscape character of the area rather than the proposed amendments.

Most of the original houses built in Grandview and Mt. Pleasant still exist intact with original streetscapes. Most of the buildings have been modified over time and converted to multiple units. There are many opportunities to upgrade and improve these character houses for adaptive reuse to meet today's needs for more housing types.

The design guidelines need to reflect the historical character of the areas. The existing design guidelines do that, but the proposed amendments gut these measures from the guidelines. So the existing RT5 design guidelines should be reused rather than the proposed rewrite in the report.

3. Generally too rushed. Please refer the report back to staff for more detailed work and consultation with the community.

Staff are already having to make many corrections through memo because there has not been enough time to work through all of the many details to make this zoning change successful. Even the maps are being redrawn for corrections at the last minute. And there was no meaningful community consultation for this major change.

There are so many more detailed issues that I would like to raise but feel the many changes required are not possible on the floor of council at a public hearing.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Murphy

Public Hearing September 21, 2017

<http://council.vancouver.ca/20170919/phea20170919ag.htm>

Report

<http://council.vancouver.ca/20170725/documents/p3.pdf>

Draft bylaw

<http://council.vancouver.ca/20170919/documents/phea9draftbylawZD.pdf>

Memo 1

<http://council.vancouver.ca/20170919/documents/phea9memo.pdf>

Memo 2

<http://council.vancouver.ca/20170919/documents/phea9memo2.pdf>

Memo 3 - Revised Maps

<http://council.vancouver.ca/20170919/documents/phea9memo3.pdf>

Isfeld, Lori

From: warren paley s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Thursday, September 21, 2017 7:36 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Re: rt5 proposed changes

rt5 proposed changes : i will try to conclude somewhat... laneway apartments that will only sort of basically from the exterior sort of look like a house but aren't (with with limited sq.footage and numerous drawbacks and in reality are in an alley in rt 5 zoned areas with a preponderance of small/standard vancouver city lots 33'x122'/124' etc...\that are already zoned for duplexes will not work., and especially so on lots of the size in the mt.pleasant/trout lake area. in my opinion and under good consense, i would recommend to anyone who owns a duplex and has a laneway built next to it[if this gets rubber stamped] . , to in my opinion seek legal action against those responsible/the city..# it would be better for the city to look to land assemblys, townhomes, subsidies, co op style housing , tax incentives to not tear down etc..taxing the rich , and profiteers and so on . i do agree that there have been many character type homes ripped down., and this is a sad situation. but its really only aesthetics /[tour buses taking pictures etc...]and nostalgia and misdirected consense etc.....# the erroneous way to fix the problem you are proposing however i'd say is in huge error ,bad judgement and so on : ie. you don't fix a problem by adding more of a problem. thanks wpaley # and whats with this "our"lanes initiative crup.. i doubt if any of you live in these areas.

On Sun, Sep 17, 2017 at 10:27 PM, warren paley s.22(1) Personal and Confidential wrote:
. again i am totally against duplexes and laneways in the same zoning. 1000% to put lightly . thanks mr. paley

On Sun, Sep 17, 2017 at 9:45 PM, warren paley s.22(1) Personal and Confidential wrote:
laneways on at even 4800 to 5300 sq.ft. lots wouldn't be all that good. mr. paley