



Mayor and Council Feedback

Case number: 101011439307

Case created: 2018-06-18, 07:17:00 PM

Incident Location

Address: 311 UNADDRESSED LOCATION, VANCOUVER, VAN 311

Address2:

Location name:

Contact Details

Name: Ms MARION JAMIESON

Address: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Address2:

Phone: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Email: s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Alt. Phone:

Preferred contact method: Either

Request Details

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Describe details (who, what, where, when, why): | comments on June 19, 2018 Agenda Item #1. Housing Vancouver Update and Related Reports RR-1(a), RR-1(b), RR-1(c), RR-1(d) |
| 2. Type of feedback: | Negative |
| 3. Department: | Mayor and Council |
| 4. Were any other cases or service requests created as a result of this feedback? | No |
| 6. (Don't ask, just record - did caller indicate they want a call back?): | No |
| 7. Select category: | Housing and Homelessness |
| 8. Select topic: | Affordability |
| 9. Specific area of concern: | Housing Vancouver Update |
| 10. Neighbourhood: | Kitsilano |
| 11. Original Client: | Upper Kitsilano Residents Association |
| 12. Original Email address: | s.22(1) Personal and Confidential |

Additional Details

Map and Photo

- no picture -

June 18, 2018

City of Vancouver Mayor & Council

Dear Mayor Gregor Robertson and Councillors,

Re: June 19, 2018 Agenda Item #1. Housing Vancouver Update and Related Reports RR-1(a), RR-1(b), RR-1(c), RR-1(d)

The Upper Kitsilano Residents Association urges Council not to approve the above Policy Reports as they include recommendations that are too far-reaching to be treated as minor house-keeping amendments. **These reports should be accepted for information only and referred back to staff for a meaningful public consultation process before consideration by Council after the fall election, not rushed through in the summer.**

These reports would form the basis for future Council decisions to rezone all residential areas of the City for multi-plexes. This strategy of stealth upzoning has never been clearly enunciated and is continually disguised as minor amendments. This underhanded approach is carried out without public consultation and is unworthy of a democratic institution. The recommendations in the above referenced reports are part of this administration's intention to carry out a complete re-design of half of the City and should not be approved in principle or otherwise without meaningful consultation.

As 90% of citizens surveyed think the retention of character buildings should be encouraged we were very disturbed by the cavalier manner in which staff dismissed the disincentives for demolition that formed the basis of the Character House Zoning Review. Instead, the Housing Vancouver Emerging Directions report set out a blueprint for erasing the RS neighbourhoods altogether and replacing them with multi-family zones. Converting a character house into a multiplex would require drastic renovations that would destroy its original character.

Report RR-1(d) suggests furthering the intention of the Emerging Directions report to erase the RS neighborhoods altogether by re-defining the intent of the RS zones from single-family to "residential" and allowing two front doors in preparation for up-zoning to multi-family. Report RR-1(b) further recommends "that Council direct staff to advance work on amendments to the Zoning and Development By-law to enable duplex use in some or all RS areas of the city" and "identifies

opportunities for laneway homes and infill to townhouse and low-rise rise apartments and may include opportunities for shops and workspace within neighbourhoods..." These suggestions would radically transform 50% of the City and must be put to an extensive process of collaborative public consultation to ascertain the degree of support they have among neighbourhoods.

Perhaps the most unconscionable aspect of this strategy is that it would in time eliminate most secondary suites - the most affordable accommodation for the lowest income brackets. Report RR-1(b) baldly states that while "Basement suites and laneway homes ...provide important and affordable rental housing", the goal of the Making Room program is to eliminate these affordable rental dwellings and instead provide ownership opportunities for middle and upper income brackets. Whether the "missing middle" would be able to afford these dwellings is questionable. This report also suggests that a home converted into a duplex "would provide two ownership opportunities and secondary suites". This idea clearly anticipates future changes to FSR to allow significantly larger heights, lot coverage etc.

At the higher end of the rental market, RR-1 (d) suggests allowing laneway houses to be on separate title rather than rental and RR - (e) suggests changes that would make them larger and facilitate their speedy approval. In a City with a 0% vacancy rate, the only possible reason for these directions is to satisfy the development industry's perpetual demands for these changes.

Report RR-1(b) also states that "The Making Room program represents a transition away from neighbourhood-by-neighbourhood planning to a comprehensive, city-wide approach. This statement wildly misrepresents this administration's planning approach as it has repeatedly carried out autocratic, top-down, city-wide planning with no public consultation.

In conclusion, these reports propose radical changes to zoning and it is an insult to the residents of all residential neighbourhoods to continually slide "minor amendments" past them that would negatively impact their lives and communities. We therefore strongly oppose the substance of these report and advise Council not to approve them in principle or otherwise.

Yours truly,

Marion Jamieson
Director, Upper Kitsilano Residents Association

Kennett, Bonnie

From: Barb Rufer
Sent: Sunday, July 15, 2018 12:16 PM
To: Public Hearing
Subject: July 18, 2018 Public Hearing to Consider Changes to Laneway Houses

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

Dear Mayor & Council:

Re: July 18, 2018 Public Hearing to Consider Changes to Laneway Houses

I am strongly opposed to proposed changes under the *Making Room Program* that will allow laneway houses to be higher and bigger; to allow them on separate title so they can be sold rather than rented; and to speed up their approval process; for the following reasons:

- These proposals are part of the current City administration's longer-term plan to allow two houses on each residential lot and then to allow the lots to be subdivided. This longer term goal to radically re-structure the residential areas should be clearly enunciated and the public meaningfully involved in whether or not the overall direction has public support and if so, where and how it should be implemented.
- It would be irrational to reduce the rental stock by allowing laneway houses to be sold in a city with a 0% vacancy rate where renters, especially with families, can't find housing. While the *Program* admits that "basement suites and laneway homes ...provide important and affordable rental housing", its goal is to eliminate these affordable rental dwellings and instead provide ownership opportunities for middle and upper income brackets. I am deeply opposed to throwing lower-income renters in our neighbourhood under the bus to benefit wealthier buyers.
- There is no evidence to suggest that larger laneway houses on separate title will create affordable purchasing opportunities for middle class families. Decades of city mismanagement have driven land prices so high that the proposed rezoning will not result in affordable laneway homes and will likely drive housing prices ever higher. Basic research and simple calculations suggest that the cost of a large new laneway house on a separate lot would likely be the same or higher as the cost of a detached home - in other words, unaffordable for middle income buyers.
- The proposed enhancement of laneway houses is a direct gift to residential landowners made at the expense of renters and neighbourhoods. As residential zone landowners are the least in need of assistance, I oppose this politically motivated largess.

- As there is no logical rationale for approving larger laneway houses on separate title, it must be assumed that eliminating much-needed rental housing in favour of upscale housing for the well-to-do is designed to satisfy the development industry's demands for lucrative new development prospects. Approval of these changes to laneway houses 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 these proposed changes to laneway houses would go to well-to-do 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 and guarantee a foreseeable future of unlimited construction noise, dust and debris and a general loss of the character and livability of Upper Kitsilano.
- 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 the middle income workers without removing much needed rental accommodation for lower income earners and degrading the 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 likely be supporting candidates with more 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 proposed changes to laneway houses and other aspects in 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,

Barbara Rufer

s.22(1) Personal and Confidential

