

Tuerlings, Leslie

From: Greg Booth s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 2:51 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: July 17, 2018 Public Hearing; Item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS: Development and Building Regulatory

Dear Mayor & Council:

Re: July 17, 2018 Public Hearing; Item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS: Development and Building Regulatory Review – Minor Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law.

I am strongly opposed to proposed changes under the Making Room Program that would allow homes to have more than one front door and change the intent of the RS zones.

- * The above change is the first step in a proposed radical reshaping of my neighbourhood from a single-family to multi-family zone as described in the Making Room Program.
- * Zoning is in place to provide community stability and radical transformations in use should not be made under the guise of “text amendments”.
- * Driving through a radical re-structuring of our neighbourhood in the summer and with no time for public input is almost an abuse of democracy.
- * Instead of forcing through zoning, these proposals should be put on hold until there has been meaningful public consultation on the clearly stated assumptions and goals.

In 2008 many neighbourhood supporters were excited about the possible election of the Vision party, as Vision had promised real neighbourhood consultation. Vision continued over the years to promise consultation, but never delivered. The proposed wholesale rezoning of the communities in our city this summer month, marketed as a tool to increase affordability, echoes the former policies of the NPA. These policies were a major part of the reason Vision was initially elected in 2008. Will the Vision party (except for Councillor Deal) have to stand the test in the fall of whether the electorate approves of their final gift to the development industry, no, they will not.

Yours truly,

Greg Booth

Tuerlings, Leslie

From: Colin Race s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 11:32 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Public Hearing July 17, 2018, Item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS:

Dear Mayor & Council:

Re: July 17, 2018 Public Hearing; Item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS:
Development and Building Regulatory Review – Minor Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law.

I am strongly opposed to proposed changes under the Making Room Program that would allow homes to have more than one front door and change the intent of the RS zones for the following reasons:

- The above change is the first step in a proposed radical re-structuring of my neighbourhood from a single-family to multi-family zone as described in the Making Room Program. This would be done by initially allowing two front doors to enable duplexes and changing the intent of the zone. We expect further proposals for rezoning that would enable multiplexes, shops and other residential and non-residential uses.
- The goal of these changes is clearly to erase RS neighborhoods by re-defining the intent of RS zones from single-family to “residential”.
- Zoning is in place to provide community stability and transformations in use should not be made under the guise of “text amendments”.
- These proposed changes make a lie of the Mayor’s promise to keep the public informed and listen to our input, not just hear industry insiders.
- Trying to push through a radical re-structuring of our neighbourhood in the summer and with no time for public input is undemocratic & unjustifiable.
- These changes are proposed as though unconnected to the overall goal of the Making Room Program to intensify development in the residential zones.
- If carried out, the Making Room Program would eliminate character houses and replace them with multiplexes for middle income buyers. This is in direct contradiction to the Intent of the RS-5 zone and should not be approved.
- Character houses provide affordable secondary suite rentals for lower income-earners which would be lost under the Making Room Program. The interests of more vulnerable lower-income renters should come before those of better-off prospective buyers.
- Allowing duplexes or even multiplexes will not create affordable ownership for middle income earners and only be affordable for wealthy buyers. Decades of mismanagement have driven land prices so high that no amount of increased supply will create affordability.
- Eliminating affordable rental housing in favour of housing for the wealthy is designed to satisfy developers’ constant demands for intensified development in residential areas. If approved, these changes would be seen as rewarding decades of election funding, except for Councillor Carr of the Green Party who has not accepted corporate donations and has consistently supported community input.
- While these changes would benefit developers, they would speed up the demolition of our few remaining character houses and the loss of neighbourhood character and livability.
- The most affordable housing is existing housing and up-zoning has clearly led to housing price increases. Upzoning the RS zones would only exacerbate the housing crisis as affordable rentals and more affordable homes are demolished to make way for unaffordable new housing.
- With only a few months left in office, this Council does not have the mandate to approve radical changes in zoning, especially changes that are rammed through in summer without adequate public notice and no consultation.

- There are alternative, workable approaches to provide housing for lower & middle income workers without removing affordable rental accommodation for lower income earners and degrading residential neighbourhoods.
- But this Council has consistently opted for the cash that comes from selling density and enlarging the City's coffers instead of livability and neighbourliness. The electors of Vancouver have had enough and will be supporting candidates with respect for citizens.

Instead of forcing through zoning changes that are not in the interests of our neighbourhoods, these proposals should be put on hold until there has been meaningful public consultation on the clearly stated assumptions, goals, objectives and proposed actions of the Making Room Program backed up with objective research. Once this is complete, recommended changes supported by the neighbourhoods should be considered after the fall election.

Yours truly,

Colin F. Race

Tuerlings, Leslie

From: Gordon Ross s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 10:18 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: July 17, 2018 Public Hearing; item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS: Development and Building Regulatory Review

Dear Mayor & Council:

Re: July 17, 2018 Public Hearing; Item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS: Development and Building Regulatory Review – Minor Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law,

I am strongly opposed to proposed changes under the *Making Room Program* that would allow homes to have more than one front door and change the intent of the RS zones for the following reasons:

- The goal of these changes is clearly to erase RS neighborhoods altogether by re-defining the intent of RS zones like Upper Kitsilano from single-family to “residential”.
- The above change is the first step in a proposed radical re-structuring of my neighbourhood from a single-family to multi-family zone. This would be done by initially allowing two front doors to enable duplexes. Further proposals for rezoning are anticipated that would enable multiplexes, shops and a wide variety of other residential and non-residential uses.
- These proposals would entail a complete change to a zone that my neighbours and myself bought into with the understanding that zoning is in place to provide community stability not startling transformations in use.
- This proposed radical re-structuring of our neighbourhood is being rushed through with unseemly haste and without clarity as to the overall direction of the *Making Room Program* and what it entails. This is in direct contradiction of the Mayor’s promise to keep the public informed and listen to our input, not just hear industry insiders.
- The overall goal of the *Making Room Program* is to eliminate character houses and replace them with multiplexes in order to provide ownership opportunities for middle income brackets. But character houses provide some of the most affordable rental opportunities in the City for lower income-earners in the form of secondary suites which will most certainly be lost as a result of this and other proposals under the *Making Room Program*. I am opposed to sacrificing the interests of lower-income renters in our neighbourhood to benefit better-off prospective buyers.
- There is no evidence to suggest that multiplexes in residential neighbourhoods, especially on the West Side, will create affordable purchasing opportunities for middle income families. Decades of city mismanagement have driven land prices so high that the proposed rezoning will not result in affordable homes and will likely drive housing prices ever higher. The most cursory calculations show that the price of a unit, even in a four-plex, would likely be unaffordable for middle-class buyers and would likely only be affordable for the wealthy.
- As there is no clear rationale for changing the RS zoning for multiplexes, it must be assumed that eliminating much-needed rental housing in favour of upscale housing for the wealthy is designed to satisfy the development industry’s demands for lucrative new development prospects. Approval of these changes would be seen as rewarding decades

of Councillors' election funding support, with the notable exception of Councillor Carr of the Green Party.

- All the benefits from the proposed up-zoning would go to developers, and all the costs would be paid by neighbourhoods like Upper Kitsilano. These changes would speed up the demolition of remaining character houses and the displacement of remaining long-term residents. They would guarantee a foreseeable future of unlimited construction noise, dust and debris and a general loss of the character and livability.
- The most affordable housing is existing housing and up-zoning has clearly led to housing price increases. Approving more intensive development in the RS zones would only exacerbate the housing crisis as affordable rentals and older, more affordable homes are demolished to make way for unaffordable new housing.
- With only a few months left in their terms and with most Councillors leaving office, this Council does not have the mandate to approve radical changes in zoning, especially changes that are rammed through without adequate public notice, let alone consultation.
- There are alternative, more workable approaches the City could take to provide housing for middle income workers without removing much needed rental accommodation for lower income earners and degrading residential neighbourhoods, including:
 - zoning areas where housing can be sold to local workers only,
 - Increasing the % of new market condos required to have 3 bedrooms,
 - legalizing additional secondary suites,
 - relaxing overly-onerous Building Code requirements for secondary rental suites.
- This Council has consistently chosen the cash that comes from selling density and enlarging the City's coffers instead of livability and neighbourliness. The electors of Vancouver have seen the results of this approach and will be supporting candidates with respect for neighbourhood aspirations.

Instead of forcing through zoning changes that will very likely not achieve the stated goals and generate deserved opposition from neighbourhoods, the City should carry out a thorough and meaningful public consultation process on this proposed up-zoning and other aspects of the *Making Room Program*. Once this process is complete, recommended policies and zoning changes that are supported by affected neighbourhoods should be brought before Council for consideration **after the fall election**.

Yours truly,

Gordon Ross



West Point Grey Residents Association
Info@wpgra.ca
www.wpgra.ca

July 16, 2018

City of Vancouver
453 West 12th Avenue
Vancouver, BC, V5Y 1V4

Dear Mayor and Council,

Re: Public Hearing July 17, 2018, Changes to all RS Zones -

2. TEXT AMENDMENTS: Development and Building Regulatory Review – Minor Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law, the Downtown Official Development Plan, and Various Land Use and Development Policies and Guidelines

Reference: Agenda <https://council.vancouver.ca/20180717/phea20180717ag.htm>

Report: <https://council.vancouver.ca/20180619/documents/rr1d.pdf>

The West Point Grey Residents Association (WPGRA) is opposed to subject amendments.

The city proposes making changes to all RS zones across Vancouver, including West Point Grey (WPG), with no input from the local WPG community, or any other affected neighbourhood. This is contrary to the CityPlan Terms of Reference for the council endorsed Community Vision for West Point Grey.

This report proposes to make major substantive changes to the RS zones, while misrepresenting them as minor text amendments, together with a number of unrelated items, in a miscellaneous report that doesn't include these issues in the subject.

In particular, it is our view that the following proposed amendments, affecting all RS zones, should not be advanced in the absence of meaningful public consultation and established support.

A.THAT the General Manager of Planning, Urban Design and Sustainability be instructed to make application to amend the Zoning and Development By-law, generally as presented in Appendix A, to amend:

(i)the intent statements for the RS District Schedules to better reflect the form of development in those districts; (*proposes change from "single family character" to just "residential"*)

(ii)Section 4.17 in the RS-1, RS-3, RS-3A, RS-5, RS-6 and RS-7 District Schedules to allow more than one front door;

(iii)Section 4.4.1 (d) in the RS-1 District Schedule and 4.4.3 in the RS-3 andRS-3A Districts Schedule to allow covered porches to extend further into the front yard;

(vi)references to the Director of Planning and Development Permit Board, throughout the by-law, to clarify authority and improve consistency of language; (*gives more authority to the Director of Planning without requiring to go to the Development Permit Board*)

Through CityPlan, local residents and businesses invested nearly two years in a comprehensive neighbourhood-based planning process to develop a Community Vision for West Point Grey. Regrettably, however, since adopting the WPG Vision in 2010, the City has failed to engage the local community in relation to Vision Implementation, or to otherwise respond to supported Vision directions, including for increased housing variety.

For example, the WPG Vision strongly supported the retention of character and heritage houses, and new housing options including infill and MCDs with a view encouraging it. Consequently, while some of the proposed changes may be appropriate in that context, these proposals go well beyond minor miscellaneous text amendments and require further consultation

We are strongly opposed to indiscriminate, city-wide rezoning that ignores established planning and undermines the diversity of Vancouver's neighbourhoods.

Yours truly,

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Phyllis Tyers
On behalf of the
West Point Grey Residents Association Board of Directors

Ludwig, Nicole

From: JULIE MARTZ s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Sunday, July 15, 2018 10:23 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: July 17 2018 public hearing item #2 Text amendments: development and building regulatory review

Dear Mayor & Council:

Re: July 17, 2018 Public Hearing; Item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS: Development and Building Regulatory Review – Minor Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law,

I am strongly opposed to proposed changes under the *Making Room Program* that would allow homes to have more than one front door and change the intent of the RS zones for the following reasons:

- The goal of these changes is clearly to erase RS neighborhoods altogether by re-defining the intent of RS zones like Upper Kitsilano from single-family to “residential”.
- The above change is the first step in a proposed radical re-structuring of my neighbourhood from a single-family to multi-family zone. This would be done by initially allowing two front doors to enable duplexes. Further proposals for rezoning are anticipated that would enable multiplexes, shops and a wide variety of other residential and non-residential uses.
- These proposals would entail a complete change to a zone that my neighbours and myself bought into with the understanding that zoning is in place to provide community stability not startling transformations in use.
- This proposed radical re-structuring of our neighbourhood is being rushed through with unseemly haste and without clarity as to the overall direction of the *Making Room Program* and what it entails. This is in direct contradiction of the Mayor’s promise to keep the public informed and listen to our input, not just hear industry insiders.
- The overall goal of the *Making Room Program* is to eliminate character houses and replace them with multiplexes in order to provide ownership opportunities for middle income brackets. But character houses provide some of the most affordable rental opportunities in the City for lower income-earners in the form of secondary suites which will most certainly be lost as a result of this and other proposals under the *Making Room Program*. I am opposed to sacrificing the interests of lower-income renters in our neighbourhood to benefit better-off prospective buyers.
- There is no evidence to suggest that multiplexes in residential neighbourhoods, especially on the West Side, will create affordable purchasing opportunities for middle income families. Decades of city mismanagement have driven land prices so high that the proposed rezoning will not result in affordable homes and will

likely drive housing prices ever higher. The most cursory calculations show that the price of a unit, even in a four-plex, would likely be unaffordable for middle-class buyers and would likely only be affordable for the wealthy.

- As there is no clear rationale for changing the RS zoning for multiplexes, it must be assumed that eliminating much-needed rental housing in favour of upscale housing for the wealthy is designed to satisfy the development industry's demands for lucrative new development prospects. Approval of these changes would be seen as rewarding decades of Councillors' election funding support, with the notable exception of Councillor Carr of the Green Party.
- All the benefits from the proposed up-zoning would go to developers, and all the costs would be paid by neighbourhoods like Upper Kitsilano. These changes would speed up the demolition of remaining character houses and the displacement of remaining long-term residents. They would guarantee a foreseeable future of unlimited construction noise, dust and debris and a general loss of the character and livability.
- The most affordable housing is existing housing and up-zoning has clearly led to housing price increases. Approving more intensive development in the RS zones would only exacerbate the housing crisis as affordable rentals and older, more affordable homes are demolished to make way for unaffordable new housing.
- With only a few months left in their terms and with most Councillors leaving office, this Council does not have the mandate to approve radical changes in zoning, especially changes that are rammed through without adequate public notice, let alone consultation.
- There are alternative, more workable approaches the City could take to provide housing for middle income workers without removing much needed rental accommodation for lower income earners and degrading residential neighbourhoods, including:
 - zoning areas where housing can be sold to local workers only,
 - Increasing the % of new market condos required to have 3 bedrooms,
 - legalizing additional secondary suites,
 - relaxing overly-onerous Building Code requirements for secondary rental suites.
- This Council has consistently chosen the cash that comes from selling density and enlarging the City's coffers instead of livability and neighbourliness. The electors of Vancouver have seen the results of this approach and will be supporting candidates with respect for neighbourhood aspirations.

Instead of forcing through zoning changes that will very likely not achieve the stated goals and generate deserved opposition from neighbourhoods, the City should carry out a thorough and meaningful public consultation process on this proposed up-zoning and other aspects of the *Making Room Program*. Once this process is complete, recommended policies and zoning changes that are supported by affected neighbourhoods should be brought before Council for consideration **after the fall election**.

Ludwig, Nicole

From: Marion Lea Jamieson
Sent: Sunday, July 15, 2018 6:20 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Re: July 17, 2018 Public Hearing; Item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS: Development and Building Regulatory Review

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

July 15, 2018

Dear Mayor & Council:

Re: July 17, 2018 Public Hearing; Item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS: Development and Building Regulatory Review – Minor Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law,

The Upper Kitsilano Residents Association is strongly opposed to proposed changes under the *Making Room Program* that would allow homes to have more than one front door and change the intent of the RS-5 zone for the following reasons:

The goal of these changes is clearly to erase RS neighborhoods altogether by re-defining the intent of the RS-5 zone of Upper Kitsilano from single-family to “residential”.

The above change is the first step in a proposed radical re-structuring of our neighbourhood from a single-family to multi-family zone. This would be done by initially allowing two front doors to enable duplexes. Clearly this change anticipates further proposals for rezoning that would enable mutiplexes, shops and a wide variety of other residential and non-residential uses.

These proposals would entail a complete change to this zone and undermines the implicit understanding that zoning is in place to provide community stability, not startling transformations in use.

This proposed radical re-structuring of our neighbourhood is being rushed through with unseemly haste and without clear notification, let alone consultation, as to the overall direction of the *Making Room Program* and what it would entail. This is a shameless contradiction of the Mayor’s promise to keep the public informed and listen to our input, not just hear industry insiders.

The overall goal of the *Making Room Program* is to eliminate character houses and replace them with multiplexes in order to provide ownership opportunities for middle income brackets. But character houses provide some of the most affordable rental opportunities in the City for lower income-earners in the form of secondary suites which will most certainly be lost as a result of this and other proposals under the *Making Room Program*. We are opposed to sacrificing the interests of lower-income renters in our neighbourhood to benefit better-off prospective buyers.

There is no evidence to suggest that multiplexes in residential neighbourhoods, especially on the West Side, will create affordable purchasing opportunities for middle income families. Decades

of city mismanagement have driven land prices so high that the proposed rezoning will not result in affordable homes and will likely drive housing prices ever higher. The most cursory calculations show that the price of a unit, even in a four-plex, would likely be unaffordable for middle-class buyers and would likely only be affordable for the wealthy.

As there is no clear rationale for changing the RS zoning for multiplexes, it must be assumed that eliminating much-needed rental housing in favour of upscale housing for the wealthy is designed to satisfy the development industry's demands for lucrative new development prospects.

All the benefits from the proposed upzoning would go to developers, and all the costs would be paid by neighbourhoods like Upper Kitsilano. These changes would speed up the demolition of remaining character houses and the displacement of remaining long-term residents. They would guarantee a foreseeable future of unlimited construction noise, dust and debris and a general loss of the character and livability.

The most affordable housing is existing housing and upzoning has clearly led to housing price increases. Approving more intensive development in the RS zones would only exacerbate the housing crisis as affordable rentals and older, more affordable homes are demolished to make way for unaffordable new housing.

With only a few months left in their terms and with most Councilors leaving office, this Council does not have the mandate to approve radical changes in zoning, especially changes that are rammed through without adequate public notice, let alone consultation.

There are alternative, more workable approaches the City could take to provide housing for middle income workers without removing much needed rental accommodation for lower income earners and degrading residential neighbourhoods, including:

- o zoning areas where housing can be sold to local workers only,
- o Increasing the % of new market condos required to have 3 bedrooms,
- o legalizing additional (tertiary) secondary suites,
- o relaxing overly-onerous Building Code requirements for secondary rental suites.

This Council has consistently chosen the cash that comes from selling density and enlarging the City's coffers instead of livability and neighbourliness. The electors of Vancouver have seen the results of this approach and will be supporting candidates that show respect for neighbourhood aspirations.

Instead of forcing through zoning changes that will very likely not achieve the stated goals and generate deserved opposition from neighbourhoods, the City should carry out a thorough and meaningful public consultation process on this proposed upzoning and other aspects of the *Making Room Program*. Once this process is complete, recommended policies and zoning

changes that are supported by affected neighbourhoods should be brought before Council for consideration **after the fall election.**

Yours truly,

Marion Jamieson

Director

For the Upper Kitsilano Residents Association

Ludwig, Nicole

From: EDWARD CHUE s.22(1) Personal and Confidential
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 10:13 AM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: Re: July 17, 2018 Public Hearing; Item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS: Development and Building Regulatory Review – Minor Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law,

Dear Mayor & Council:

Re: July 17, 2018 Public Hearing; Item #2. TEXT AMENDMENTS: Development and Building Regulatory Review – Minor Amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law,

I am strongly opposed to proposed changes under the *Making Room Program* that would allow homes to have more than one front door and change the intent of the RS zones for the following reasons:
The goal of these changes is clearly to erase RS neighborhoods altogether by re-defining the intent of RS zones like Upper Kitsilano from single-family to “residential”. The above change is the first step in a proposed radical re-structuring of my neighbourhood from a single-family to multi-family zone. This would be done by initially allowing two front doors to enable duplexes. Further proposals for rezoning are anticipated that would enable multiplexes, shops and a wide variety of other residential and non-residential uses. These proposals would entail a complete change to a zone that my neighbours and myself bought into with the understanding that zoning is in place to provide community stability not startling transformations in use. This proposed radical re-structuring of our neighbourhood is being rushed through with unseemly haste and without clarity as to the overall direction of the *Making Room Program* and what it entails. This is in direct contradiction of the Mayor’s promise to keep the public informed and listen to our input, not just hear industry insiders. The overall goal of the *Making Room Program* is to eliminate character houses and replace them with multiplexes in order to provide ownership opportunities for middle income brackets. But character houses provide some of the most affordable rental opportunities in the City for lower income-earners in the form of secondary suites which will most certainly be lost as a result of this and other proposals under the *Making Room Program*. I am opposed to sacrificing the interests of lower-income renters in our neighbourhood to benefit better-off prospective buyers. There is no evidence to suggest that multiplexes in residential neighbourhoods, especially on the West Side, will create affordable purchasing opportunities for middle income families. Decades of city mismanagement have driven land prices so high that the proposed rezoning will not result in affordable homes and will likely drive housing prices ever higher. The most cursory calculations show that the price of a unit, even in a four-plex, would likely be unaffordable for middle-class buyers and would likely only be affordable for the wealthy. As there is no clear rationale for changing the RS zoning for multiplexes, it must be assumed that eliminating much-needed rental housing in favour of upscale housing for the wealthy is designed to satisfy the development industry’s demands for lucrative new development prospects. Approval of these changes would be seen as rewarding decades of Councillors’ election funding support, with the notable exception of Councillor Carr of the Green Party. All the benefits from the proposed up-zoning would go to developers, and all the costs would be paid by neighbourhoods like Upper Kitsilano. These changes would speed up the demolition of remaining character houses and the displacement of remaining long-term residents. They would guarantee a foreseeable future of unlimited construction noise, dust and debris and a general loss of the character and livability. The most affordable housing is existing housing and up-zoning has clearly led to housing price increases. Approving more intensive development in the RS zones would only exacerbate the housing crisis as affordable rentals and older, more affordable homes are demolished to make way for unaffordable new housing. With only a few months left in their terms and with most Councillors leaving office, this Council does not have the mandate to approve radical changes in zoning, especially changes that are rammed through without adequate public notice, let alone consultation. There are alternative, more workable approaches the City could take to provide housing for middle income workers without removing much needed rental accommodation for lower income earners and degrading residential neighbourhoods, including: zoning areas where housing can be sold to local workers only, increasing the % of new market condos required to have 3 bedrooms, legalizing additional secondary suites, relaxing overly-onerous Building Code requirements for

secondary rental suites. This Council has consistently chosen the cash that comes from selling density and enlarging the City's coffers instead of livability and neighbourliness. The electors of Vancouver have seen the results of this approach and will be supporting candidates with respect for neighbourhood aspirations.

Instead of forcing through zoning changes that will very likely not achieve the stated goals and generate deserved opposition from neighbourhoods, the City should carry out a thorough and meaningful public consultation process on this proposed up-zoning and other aspects of the *Making Room Program*. Once this process is complete, recommended policies and zoning changes that are supported by affected neighbourhoods should be brought before Council for consideration **after the fall election**.

Yours truly,
Edward Chue

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential



Get [Outlook for Android](#)